

**CHARACTERIZATION OF 3D PRINTED
BIOACTIVE GLASS AND HYBRID SCAFFOLDS
USING MICRO-CT IMAGE ANALYSIS**

K.A. Iroshan

188050N

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Mechanical Engineering
Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa
Sri Lanka

October 2023

**CHARACTERIZATION OF 3D PRINTED
BIOACTIVE GLASS AND HYBRID SCAFFOLDS
USING MICRO-CT IMAGE ANALYSIS**

K.A. Iroshan

188050N

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Mechanical Engineering
Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa
Sri Lanka

October 2023

DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work and this Thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or Institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature:

Date: 01/05/2024

The supervisors should certify the Thesis with the following declaration.

The above candidate has carried out research for the Doctor of Philosophy Thesis under our supervision. We confirm that the declaration made above by the student is true and correct.

Name of Supervisor: Dr. Nuwan Dayananda

Signature of the Supervisor:

Date: 12/05/2024

Name of Supervisor: Dr. Angelo Karunaratne

Signature of the Supervisor:

Date: 17/05/2024

Name of Supervisor: Dr. Thilina Lalitharatne

Signature of the Supervisor:

Date: 20/05/2024

Name of Supervisor: Prof. Julian Jones

Signature of the Supervisor:

Date: 29/05/2024

DEDICATION

To Sri Lankans who honestly serve the country in the middle of an economic crisis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Ph.D. research is the most challenging journey of my life. First and foremost, I would like to sincerely thank my supervisors, Dr. Angelo Karunaratne, Dr. Nuwan Dayananda, Dr. Thilina Lalitharatne, and Prof. Julian Jones, for guiding me throughout the Ph.D. journey. Thanks to my supervisors' patience, inspiration, and encouragement, I could complete my Ph.D. research successfully. The NIHR Global Health Research funded my Ph.D. research (grant number 1613745: NIHR Group on POsT Conflict Trauma in Sri Lanka; PrOTeCT). I would also like to thank previous and current members of the Bionics Laboratory of the Department of Mechanical Engineering at the University of Moratuwa, members of Professor Julian's group, and all the members of the NIHR PrOTeCT group. I acknowledge Prof. Ruwan Gopura and Dr. Pujitha Silva from the University of Moratuwa team of NIHR PrOTeCT for mentoring me during the Ph.D. program. I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Ranga Rodrigo and Dr. Damith Chaturanga from the University of Moratuwa, who evaluated my progress throughout the Ph.D Research and gave valuable advice.

I would like to acknowledge the collaboration from Imperial College London. Thank you, Prof. Julian Jones, Dr. Angelo Karunaratne, Dr. Lucy Foss, and Dr. Alba Maria, for all the arrangements you made to facilitate my 12-month visit to Imperial College London. I was so happy to work with Dr. Francesca Tallia, Dr. Yu Chien, and Dr. Jeff Clark on the micro-CT scanning of biomaterial samples. I am grateful to Dr. Gowsihan Poologasundarampillai and Dr. Amy Nommeots-Nomm for sharing their experience in imaging the bioactive glass sintering and guiding throughout the study. Furthermore, I sincerely thank Dr. Peter Lee for facilitating my visit to the Research Complex at Harwell and Diamond Light source and advising me during the research work. Finally, I would like to thank my beautiful wife, Hasara Malavipathirana, my mother, Neetha Padmini, my father, Kamalawansa, and my family members for their support and encouragement. I was lucky to have many good friends during my Ph.D. journey.

ABSTRACT

An ideal synthetic bone graft acts as a temporary template (scaffold) to regenerate bone. The scaffold should have an interconnected pore structure with similar mechanical properties to the bone. The scaffold should be fabricated with a biocompatible, biodegradable, and bioactive material. Bioactive glasses and hybrids have been identified as promising materials for synthetic bone grafts as they form a bond with the bone and stimulate new bone formation. Although the properties of bioactive glasses and the production processes of bioactive glass and hybrid scaffolds have been improved over the last five decades, producing patient-specific scaffolds with ideal properties is still a challenge. Optimizing the topology, production process, and chemical structure of bioactive glass and hybrid scaffolds is an iterative process with a comprehensive characterization of structural, bioactive, and biological properties. Micro-CT imaging can be used to characterize the production process, the structure of the scaffold, and the bone in-growth into the scaffold. Preparation of samples, selection of imaging parameters, the image reconstruction method, denoising, detection and tracking of Volumes of Interest, accurate image segmentation, and quantification of descriptors are vital in the characterization process conducted using micro-CT. This work presents a new multiscale and 4D (3D over time) micro-CT image analysis framework to characterize 3D-printed bioactive glass and hybrid scaffolds and demonstrate the effective use of micro-CT imaging in analyzing the production process of 3D printed bioactive glass and hybrid scaffolds. The Image analysis framework contains image processing components for denoising, tracking volumes of interest, and machine learning-based segmentation of micro-CT images to characterize bioactive and hybrid scaffolds from micro to macro scale. All the image processing components were evaluated using appropriate performance measures. Two studies were conducted to demonstrate the image analysis framework and effective use of micro-CT in the characterization process. The first study was a four-dimensional analysis of bioactive glass sintering within a 3D printed scaffold, conducted using synchrotron-sourced micro-CT. This study delivered new insights on the sintering of bioactive glass composition ICIE16. The second study was conducted to optimize the printing window of 3D-printed hybrid scaffolds using lab-based micro-CT. The results of this study identified the printing window that produces the best quality 3D printed hybrid scaffolds.

Keywords: Bioactive glass, 3D printing, Micro-CT, 3D image analysis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration of the Candidate & Supervisor	i
Dedication	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
Abstract	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Figures	viii
List of Tables	xiii
List of Abbreviations	xiii
1 Introduction	1
2 Literature Review	4
2.1 Bioactive glass and hybrid scaffolds	4
2.1.1 Bioactive materials for bone implants	4
2.1.2 Bioactive glass	5
2.1.3 Development of bioactive glass scaffolds	6
2.1.4 Bioactive glass composites	8
2.1.5 Hybrid scaffolds	9
2.2 Micro-CT	9
2.3 Characterization of Bioactive Scaffolds using Micro-CT	10
2.3.1 Analysis of the sintering process of glasses	11
2.3.2 Characterization of pore architecture	12
2.3.3 Analysis of bone ingrowth and biodegradation	15
2.3.4 Prediction of mechanical properties	17
2.4 Aims and objectives	17
3 4D MULTISCALE IMAGE ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK	19
3.1 Introduction	19
3.2 Methodology	21
3.2.1 Development of the image analysis framework	21

3.2.2	Image pre-processing	21
3.2.3	Noise reduction	23
3.2.4	Image segmentation using classical methods	24
3.2.5	Image segmentation using machine learning	24
3.2.6	Image classification	27
3.2.7	Detection and Tracking of VOIs	27
3.2.8	Quantitative Analysis	30
3.2.9	Performance evaluation	33
3.3	Results and Discussion	34
3.3.1	Noise reduction	34
3.3.2	Image Segmentation	35
3.3.3	Detection and Tracking of VOIs	40
3.4	Conclusions	41
4	4D ANALYSIS OF BIOACTIVE GLASS SINTERING	43
4.1	Introduction	43
4.2	Methodology	43
4.2.1	Scaffold preparation	43
4.2.2	In-situ imaging of glass sintering within 3D printed scaffolds.	44
4.2.3	Image reconstruction	44
4.2.4	Image Analysis pipeline and the quantitative analysis	46
4.3	Results and Discussion	48
4.4	Conclusions	52
5	OPTIMIZING THE PRINTING WINDOW OF HYBRIDS	54
5.1	Introduction	54
5.2	Materials and Methods	54
5.2.1	Hybrid synthesis	54
5.2.2	3D printing of porous hybrid scaffolds	55
5.2.3	Micro-CT imaging	56
5.2.4	Micro-CT image analysis	59
5.2.5	Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM)	60
5.2.6	Thermal analysis	60

5.2.7 Mechanical Testing	61
5.3 Results and Discussion	61
5.4 Conclusions	63
6 THESIS CONCLUSIONS	66
7 FUTURE DIRECTIONS	68
References	70

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Description	Page
Figure 1.1	Iterative process of optimizing bioactive materials and scaffolds	2
Figure 2.1	Main components of a micro-CT scanner	11
Figure 2.2	Large circled feature which is hard to classify as bone using image segmentation	15
Figure 3.1	Illustrate micro-CT images captured at different length scales to characterize 3D printed bioactive glass scaffolds; (a). Micro-CT images captured to analyse bone ingrowth into the scaffolds with an isotropic voxel size of 18.9 μm ; (b). Resampled micro-CT images were obtained to analyze and characterize the structure of the scaffold with an isotropic voxel size of 3.2 μm ; (c). Micro-CT images captured to understand particle densification during the sintering with an isotropic voxel size of 0.8 μm .	20
Figure 3.2	Components of the proposed image analysis framework	20
Figure 3.3	Rotations for a 3D image	22
Figure 3.4	Response of non-local means filter. (a) Original Image (b) filter response $\sigma = 10$ (c) Filter response $\sigma = 25$. (d),(e),(f) histograms of the images (a),(b),(c). (g),(h),(i) line intensity profiles of lines drawn on (a),(b),(c).	23
Figure 3.5	Main steps of Implementing a machine learning model to classify voxels	25
Figure 3.6	A set of image features considered for fast random forest voxel classification; (a). Response of gaussian blur; (b). Response of Sobel filter; (c). Hessian determinant values of the image.	25
Figure 3.7	(a). Micro-CT image slice after background and soft tissues are removed using thresholding and (b). Manually segmentation of the scaffold.	26
Figure 3.8	(a). Image slices, which include cross-sections of struts over a single direction, and (b). image slices with cross-sections of struts over both directions.	28
Figure 3.9	(a) shows a segmented 3D image of the scaffold (b) shows a VOI required to track.	28

Figure 3.10	Image processing pipeline to detect VOIs; (a). Pre-processing (i) Image slice of a reconstructed 3D image (ii) cropped, rotated, and resampled 3D image (iii) 3D image generated with image slices that include VOIs; (b) Noise reduction and segmentation of VOIs (i) Image slice before the noise reduction (ii) Image slice after the noise reduction (ii) Implicit Contour fitted to Regions of Interest (iii) Segmented 3D image;(c) VOI detection.	29
Figure 3.11	Tracking VOIs over the image series.	30
Figure 3.12	Pseudo code of the function to stitch VOIs based on center coordinates	31
Figure 3.13	(a). Segmented child volume to calculate intra-strut porosity (dataset1), (b). Segmented child volume to calculate inter-strut porosity (dataset 3).	31
Figure 3.14	(a) 3D visualization of a segmented scaffold; (b). 3D visualization of scaffold after filling pores using morphological closing.	32
Figure 3.15	(a). Distance between struts centers of the 3D printed scaffold and (b) pore diagonal distance (PDD) of an inter-strut pore.	33
Figure 3.16	Response of the non-local means filter. (a). Cross-section of a strut in the original image. (b). Response of non-local means filter. (c), (d) are histograms of (a), (b); (e), (f) are intensity profiles of lines drawn on (a), (b).	35
Figure 3.17	(a)Image slice before the noise reduction. (b) Image slice after noise reduction. (a) and (d) shows line profile plots of the lines drawn in (a) and (b), respectively.	36
Figure 3.18	(a). Micro-CT image slice before noise reduction; (b). Micro- CT image slice after noise reduction; (c). Intensity profile of the line drawn on (a); (d). Intensity profile of the line drawn on (b); (e). Histogram of the image (a); (f). Histogram of the image (b).	37
Figure 3.19	(a). Micro-CT image slice before noise reduction; (b). Micro- CT image slice after noise reduction; (c). Intensity profile of the line drawn on (a); (d). Intensity profile of the line drawn on (b).	37
Figure 3.20	Histogram of a 3D cropped image of dimension 360×360×172 obtained from data-set 2 (4-week).	38
Figure 3.21	Segmented 3D image obtained by manual thresholding.	38
Figure 3.22	(a). Cross-section of a preprocessed image captured after reaching a higher densification (around 90%).(b) Histogram of the image (a). (c). Image of the glassy phase segmented using Otsu's thresholding.	38
Figure 3.23	(a). Preprocessed image slice of a VOI, obtained to quantify diameter change of struts; (b). The contour of the level-set function fitted to the boundaries of the strut cross-section; (c). The segmented strut cross-section that obtained using the level-set segmentation.	39

Figure 3.24	(a). Implicit Contour fitted to Regions of Interest; (b). Segmented 3D image.	39
Figure 3.25	(a). Preprocessed image slice of a VOI obtained to quantify relative densification where individual glass particles are visible; (b). Segmented image of glassy phase using fast random forest voxel classification; (c). Segmented image volume used to calculate the relative densification of the glassy phase.	39
Figure 3.26	(a). 3D segmented bone volume a micro-CT image(dataset 2) and (b). 3D segmented scaffold volume a micro-CT image (dataset 2).	41
Figure 3.27	(a) Tracking VOIs of scaffold over time; (b)Child volumes/ VOIs obtained over time (i) based on coordinates obtained from proposed method; (ii) based on fixed coordinates; (c) Segmented image of VOIs within a 3D printed scaffold designed with wood-pile architecture.	42
Figure 4.1	Experimental set-up on used for the in-situ imaging the glass sintering within a bioactive glass scaffold.	45
Figure 4.2	The reconstruction of a slice (8 bits) from a volume (fast sintering stage) using CGLS(a) and FBS(b). (c) and (d) represents the intensity profile of drawn lines on each slice CGLS and FBS, respectively.	45
Figure 4.3	Automated image analysis pipeline to analyze the sintering process. (a) 3D reconstructed image (image size: $2560 \times 2560 \times 2159$). (b) 3D image after initial preprocessing (image size: $1356 \times 1296 \times 1540$). (c) Resampled image (image size: $339 \times 324 \times 385$). (d) Image slices that contain VOIs. (e) Implicit contour to ROI in 2D. (f) Segmented VOIs (strut slices) in the resampled image. (g) Labeled VOIs (strut slices) in the resampled image. (h) VOI considered to calculate the diameter of a strut. (i) VOI considered to calculated relative densification. (j) Segmented VOI that considered to calculate the diameter of a strut. (k) Segmented VOI considered to calculated relative densification. (l) Distance between strut centers diagonally in the XY plane.	47
Figure 4.4	Densification of glass particles with a 3D-printed scaffold as temperature increased during sintering.	49

Figure 4.5	Visualization of child volumes cropped from a VOI of the scaffold obtained from micro-CT images at different stages of sintering after segmenting the glassy phase and intra-strut pores: (a) (i), (b) (i), (c) (i) morphological changes of glass particles within a child volume of a strut in the early stage of sintering; (d) (i) pore network within a child volume of a strut during the intermediate sintering stage; (e) (i) pores within a child volume of a strut just after the intermediate sintering stage; (f) (i) pores of a child volume within a strut at the end of sintering. (a) (ii), (b) (ii), (c) (ii), (d) (ii), (e) (ii), (f) (ii) show 2D image slices of volumes (a) (i), (b) (i), (c) (i), (d) (i), (e) (i), (f) (i), respectively.	49
Figure 4.6	VOIs of micro-CT images obtained at different stages of sintering: (a) (i) Segmented slice of a strut considered in sintering analysis, captured after the complete burn out of the binder. (b) (i) Segmented strut slice during the fast sintering stage. (a) (i) Segmented strut slice after the completion of the sintering process (a) (ii), (b) (ii), and (c) (ii) are cross-sections of (a) (i), (b) (i), and (c) (i) sequentially.	50
Figure 4.7	Quantification of changes in the global-level 3D-printed scaffold architecture as a function of sintering time, by image analysis: (a) Change of strut diameter. (b) Change of pore diagonal distance.	51
Figure 4.8	Shrinkage of a child volume within the scaffold after the sintering. (a) (i) Child volume before sintering and (ii) image slice of the child volume (a) (i), which captures centerline of strut layer over x-direction. (b) (i) Child volume after sintering and (ii) image slice of the child volume (B) (i), which captures the centerline of the strut layer over x-direction. The bounding box is scaled in pixels where 1 pixel length=3.21 μm .	52
Figure 5.1	Dimensions of the planned 3D printed scaffolds.	56
Figure 5.2	Laboratory-based μCT system (ZEISS Xradia 510 Versa).	57
Figure 5.3	Imaging set up used to capture the projections of the scaffold.	57
Figure 5.4	Scout projections of 2 different sides of the scaffold with 90° rotations; (a). FOV for the initial selection of FOV ; (b). For the final selection of FOV	58
Figure 5.5	(a). Reconstructed image slice for the FOV obtained with 0.4x objective; (b). Reconstructed image slice for FOV obtained with 4x objective and finally selected imaging parameters.	59
Figure 5.6	Image analysis pipeline	60
Figure 5.7	3D visualization of Micro-CT images (Segmented) of 3D printed hybrid scaffolds (Side View) at different gelling points.	62
Figure 5.8	3D visualization of the Micro-CT images (Segmented) of 3D printed hybrid scaffolds (Top View) at different gelling points.	63

Figure 5.9	Mean shrinkage of hybrid scaffolds printed at different gelling points;	
	(b). Mean porosity of hybrid scaffolds printed at different gelling points.	63
Figure 5.10	SEMs of hybrid scaffolds printed at different gelling points(Top view);	
	(a) Printed after 40 minutes of gelling (under-gelled); (a). i. ×50 mag-	
	nification; (a). ii. ×100 magnification; (a). iii. ×200 magnification; (b)	
	Printed after 60 minutes of gelling; (b). i. ×50 magnification; (b). ii.	
	×100 magnification; (b). iii. ×200 magnification; (c) Printed after 80	
	minutes of gelling (over-gelled); (c). i. ×50 magnification; (c). ii. ×100	
	magnification; (c). iii. ×200 magnification.	64
Figure 5.11	Storage modulus of the samples printed at different gelling levels ; 1:	
	after 40 minutes of gelling, 2: after 50 minutes of gelling; 3: after 60	
	minutes of gelling; 4: after 80 minutes of gelling.	65
Figure 7.1	Use of micro-CT images to develop AI models to predict properties of	
	biomaterials	69

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
Table 2.1	Descriptive features in the quantification of microporous architecture	13
Table 3.1	Hyperparameters of trained classification models	27
Table 3.2	Performance evaluation of proposed segmentation algorithm for dataset1	40
Table 3.3	The performance of each machine learning model	40
Table 5.1	Results of TGA conducted to evaluate the organic content in the hybrid.	65

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
AM	Additive manufacturing
CAD	computer-aided design
CCD	Charge Coupled Device
CCPi	Collaborative Computational Project in Tomographic Imaging
CGLS	Conjugate Gradient Least Squares
CIL	Core Imaging Library
DMA	Dynamic Mechanical Analysis
DSC	Dynamic Scanning Calorimetry
DSCD	Distance between Strut Centers Diagonally
DTA	Differential Thermal Analysis
ECM	Extracellular Matrix
FBP	Filtered Back-projection
FN	False negative
FP	Fales positive
GBT	Gradient Boosting Trees
GLCM	Gray Level Co-occurrence Matrix
HA	hydroxyapatite
HCA	hydroxycarbonate apatite
HSM	Hot Stage Microscope
IoU	Intersection over Union
Micro-CT	Micro Computed Tomography
PDD	Pore Diagonal Distance
RF	Random Forest
ROI	Region of Interest
SEM	Scanning Electron Microscopy
SVM	Support Vector Machine
TGA	Thermogravimetric Analysis
TN	True negative
TP	True positive
VOI	Volume of Interest
VOIs	Volumes of Interest