

Journal of Dental Research

Nano hydroxyapatite coated implants improves the bone nanomechanical properties

Journal:	<i>Journal of Dental Research</i>
Manuscript ID:	JDR-12-0553.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Reports
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Aug-2012
Complete List of Authors:	Jimbo, Ryo Coelho, Paulo; New York University, Biomaterials and Biomimetics Bryington, Matthew Baldassarri, Marta; NYU College of Dentistry, Biomaterials and Biomimetics Tovar, Nick; NYUCD, Biomaterials and Biomimetics Currie, Fredrik Hayashi, Mariko Andersson, Martin; Chemical and Biological Engineering Ono, Daisuke Vndeweghe, Stefan Wennerberg, Ann; Malmoe University, Dept. of Prosthetic Dentistry
Keywords:	Dental implant(s), Nanoindentation, Nanotechnology
Abstract:	Nanostructure modification of dental implants has long been sought as a mean to improve osseointegration through enhanced biomimicry of host structures. Several methods have been proposed and demonstrated for creating nanotopographic features; here we described a nanoscale hydroxyapatite (HA) coated implant surface and hypothesized that it will hasten osseointegration and improve its quality relative to non-coated implants. Twenty threaded titanium alloy implants, half prepared with stable HA nanoparticle surface and half grit-blasted, acid-etched, and heat treated (HT), were inserted into rabbit femurs. Preoperatively, the implants were morphologically and topographically characterized. After 3 weeks of healing, the samples were retrieved for histomorphometry. Moreover, the nanomechanical properties of the surrounding bone were evaluated using nanoindentation. While both implants revealed similar bone-to-implant contact, the nanoindentation demonstrated that the tissue quality was significantly enhanced around the HA-coated implants, validating the postulated hypothesis.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Date submitted: 6/20/2012**
4

5
6 **Date last revised: 8/25/2012**
7

8
9 **Date accepted: 9/11/2012**
10

11
12
13 **Nano hydroxyapatite coated implants improves bone nanomechanical properties**
14

15 Ryo Jimbo¹, Paulo G Coelho², Matthew Bryington³, Marta Baldassarri², Nick Tovar²,

16
17 Frederik Currie⁴, Mariko Hayashi¹, Martin Andersson⁵, Daisuke Ono⁶, Stefan

18
19 Vandeweghe^{1,7}, Ann Wennerberg¹
20
21

- 22
23
24
25 1. Department of Prosthodontics, Faculty of Odontology, Malmö University, Sweden
26 2. Department of Biomaterials and Biomimetics, New York University, New York,
27 USA
28 3. Division of Restorative and Prosthetic Dentistry, The Ohio State University College
29 of Dentistry, Columbus, Ohio, USA
30 4. Promimic AB, Gothenburg, Sweden
31 5. Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering, Applied Surface Chemistry,
32 Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden
33 6. Division of Applied Prosthodontics, Nagasaki University Graduate School of
34 Biomedical Sciences, Nagasaki, Japan
35 7. Department of Periodontology and Oral Implantology, Dental School, Faculty of
36 Medicine and Health sciences, University of Ghent, Belgium
37
38
39

40 **Correspondence to;** Ryo Jimbo, Department of Prosthodontics, Faculty of
41
42 Odontology, Malmö University, 205 06 Malmö, Sweden
43

44 Fax +46 40 665 8503

45
46 Phone +46 40 665 8679

47
48 E-mail: ryo.jimbo@mah.se
49

50
51 **Running title: Nanomechanical evaluation of nano HA implants**
52

53 **Word counts: 2,694**
54

55
56 **Number of figures: 4**
57

58 **Abstract counts: 138**
59
60

ABSTRACT

Nanostructure modification of dental implants has long been sought as a mean to improve osseointegration through enhanced biomimicry of host structures. Several methods have been proposed and demonstrated for creating nanotopographic features; here we described a nanoscale hydroxyapatite (HA) coated implant surface and hypothesized that it will hasten osseointegration and improve its quality relative to non-coated implants. Twenty threaded titanium alloy implants, half prepared with stable HA nanoparticle surface and half grit-blasted, acid-etched, and heat treated (HT), were inserted into rabbit femurs. Preoperatively, the implants were morphologically and topographically characterized. After 3 weeks of healing, the samples were retrieved for histomorphometry. Moreover, the nanomechanical properties of the surrounding bone were evaluated using nanoindentation. While both implants revealed similar bone-to-implant contact, the nanoindentation demonstrated that the tissue quality was significantly enhanced around the HA-coated implants, validating the postulated hypothesis.

Keywords: osseointegration; nano-hydroxyapatite coating; nanoindenter; histomorphometry

INTRODUCTION

The current trend for biomaterial modification has a specific direction, to enhance the bioactivity to functionally, structurally, and in principle, replace the native organ. Throughout the history of biomedical engineering, we have learned that mimicking from biology would be the ultimate modification, and hierarchical biomimetic architecture leads to the creation of different functional elements (Alberts et al., 2002). Nanoscale alterations has been suggested to increase its bioactivity (Goransson et al., 2009), and is now evident that various molecular interactions occur at this size level (Dalby et al., 2002).

Nanostructures applied to biomaterials have been suggested to contribute to higher grade of osseointegration (Ellingsen et al., 2004), and it has been shown that biology responds sensitively to different nanostructures (Coelho et al., 2011; Jimbo et al., 2012). In fact, Webster and Ahn specified that nanostructures below 100 nm in size are most effective in cellular integration and suggested that these should be differentiated from the so-called submicron structures (Webster and Ahn, 2007). What is unique about the effect of HA nanocoating is that the stimulatory outcomes are related not only to the topography, but also to the effect of chemistry, which generates a synergetic effect (Jimbo et al., 2012). Further, compared to the traditional 'thick' HA coatings, which generated clinical problems (Albrektsson, 1998), the mono-layered thin HA-coating seems to be stable and shows no signs of foreign body reaction (Jimbo et al., 2012).

1
2
3 In a previous study observing the gene expression around turned-nano HA-
4 coated implants, the nano HA-coating significantly enhanced osteogenic gene
5 expression while increasing osteoclastic activity suggesting the nano HA is actively
6 involved in the bone formation (Jimbo et al., 2011b).
7
8
9
10

11 However, some studies have shown that the biological outcomes of the same
12 coating do not present enhancing results (Svanborg et al., 2011) due to several factors.
13 Therefore, three-dimensional evaluation using the micro computed tomography has
14 been implemented in order to compensate and to obtain further detailed information
15 (Jimbo et al., 2011a). In this study, the effect of nanostructured HA-coating was
16 evaluated histologically. Further in order to determine the nanomechanical properties
17 of the surrounding bone around the implant, a nanoindentation testing was conducted
18 based on the hypothesis that the mechanical aspect of the bone is improved due to the
19 effect of the nanostructured HA.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **MATERIALS & METHODS**

35 **Implant Surface Preparation**

36 Twenty threaded implants (Ti6Al4V, $\varnothing 3.3 \times 6$ mm) were used. All implants
37 were sandblasted and acid etched (Aadva surface, GC Dental, Tokyo Japan). Half of
38 the implants (HA) were coated with nano-sized HA according to the Promimic
39 HA^{nano}™ method (Jimbo et al., 2012). The other half of the implants were subjected
40 to only heat treatment in the same manner as the HA implants (HT).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **Morphological characterization**

53 Surface morphology of the randomly selected implants from each group was
54 examined by scanning electron microscopy (SEM, LEO Ultra 55 FEG, Zeiss,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Oberkochen, Germany) at an accelerating voltage of 6 kV (n=3).
4

5 In order to confirm that the microtopography had not changed by the nano HA
6 coating, surface topography was characterized by an optical interferometer
7 (MicroXam; ADE Phase Shift, Inc., Tucson, AZ, USA). Three implants from each
8 group were randomly selected and each of them measured on 9 regions (3 tops, 3
9 thread valleys, and 3 flanks).
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 The parametric calculation was performed after the removal of errors of form
17 and waviness by the use of a Gaussian filter ($50 \times 50 \mu\text{m}$).
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Implantation and sample preparation**

24 The animal study was approved by the Malmö/Lund, Sweden, regional animal
25 ethics committee (approval number: M282-09). One HA and one HT implant were
26 inserted into the left and right tibia, respectively, of 10 adult Swedish lop-eared
27 rabbits (mean weight, 4.2 kg). The animals were anesthetized with intramuscular
28 injections of a mixture of 0.15 mL/kg medetomidine (1 mg/mL Dormitor; Orion
29 Pharma, Sollentuna, Sweden) and 0.35 mL/kg ketamine hydrochloride (50 mg/mL
30 Ketalar; Pfizer AB, Sollentuna, Sweden). Lidocaine hydrochloride (Xylocaine;
31 AstraZeneca AB, Södertälje, Sweden) was administered as local anesthetic at each
32 insertion site at a dose of 1 mL. After the surgical site exposure, osteotomy was
33 prepared using a series of drills (final diameter $\varnothing 2.9$), and thereafter, the implants
34 were inserted. Post-operatively, buprenorphine hydrochloride (0.5 mL Temgesic;
35 Reckitt Benckiser, Slough, UK) was administered as an analgesic for 3 days. In order
36 to observe the early bone formation and to compare the outcomes of the study to other
37 studies using the nano HA-coated surface (Svanborg et al., 2011), a time point of 3
38 weeks was chosen.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 At 3 weeks postoperatively, the rabbits were euthanized and the bone samples
4 were retrieved and placed in 4% formaldehyde for 24 h; thereafter, were placed in a
5 series of dehydration and infiltration baths, and finally, were embedded in light-curing
6 resin (Technovit 7200 VLC; Heraeus Kulzer Wehrheim, Germany).
7
8
9
10

11 12 13 14 **Ground sectioning and histological analysis**

15
16 All samples were processed for undecalcified ground sectioning. In brief, the
17 embedded samples were cut in the middle of the implant, and one central
18 undecalcified cut and ground section of approximately 15 μm was prepared and
19 stained with toluidine blue and pyronin G. Histological evaluation was performed
20 using a light microscope (Eclipse ME600; Nikon, Japan), and histomorphometrical
21 data were analyzed by Image J (v. 1.43u; National Institutes of Health). The bone-to-
22 implant contact (BIC) along the entire implant was calculated at $\times 10$ to $\times 40$ objective
23 magnification.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Nanoindentation**

38
39 The remaining resin blocks were processed in the same manner as the
40 histological sections (thickness: approximately 100 μm); further polishing was
41 performed to remove scratches using diamond suspensions of 9 to 1 μm particle size
42 (Buehler, Lake bluff, IL, USA). Nanoindentation (n=28/specimen) was performed
43 using a nanoindenter (Hysitron TI 950, Minneapolis, MN, USA) equipped with a
44 Berkovich diamond three-sided pyramid probe (Baldassarri et al., 2012). A wax
45 chamber was created so that tests were performed in distilled water (Wallace, JM,
46 2012). A loading profile was developed using a peak load of 300 μN at a rate of 60
47 $\mu\text{N/s}$, followed by a holding time of 10 s and an unloading time of 2 s as presented in
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Figure 1B. The extended holding period allowed bone to relax to a more linear
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1B. The extended holding period allowed bone to relax to a more linear response, so that no tissue creep effect was occurring in the unloading portion of the profile (ISO 14577-4). Therefore, from each indentation a load-displacement curve was obtained, presented in Figure 1B (Oliver and Pharr, 1992a).

For each specimen, mechanical testing was performed in the threaded region (cortical area), in which generally new bone formation is present at early observation time points. Since interfacial bone modeling and remodeling (and potentially bone kinetics and mechanical properties) has been shown to change as a function of the interplay between surgical instrumentation and implant geometry (Coelho et al., 2010), the region between threads was subdivided into four bone quadrants as depicted in Figure 1C. Bone tissue was detected by imaging under the light microscope (Hysitron TI 950, Minneapolis, MN, USA)(Butz et al., 2006) and indentations were performed in the selected areas. From each analyzed load-displacement curve, reduced modulus (GPa) and hardness (GPa) of bone tissue were computed and its elastic modulus E_b (GPa) was calculated as follows:

$$\frac{1}{E_r} = \frac{1 - \nu^2}{E} + \frac{1 - \nu_i^2}{E_i}$$

where E_r is the reduced modulus (GPa), ν (0.3) is the Poisson's ratio for cortical bone, E_i (1140 GPa) and ν_i (0.07) are the elastic modulus and Poisson's ratio for the indenter (Hoffler et al., 2000; Hoffler et al., 2005; Oliver and Pharr, 1992b).

Statistical Analysis

The mean values of surface roughness were compared by one-way ANOVA, followed by a post hoc Tukey–Kramer test with the significant level set at 0.05. The

1
2
3 non-parametric Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used for bilaterally inserted implants
4
5 with the significance level set at 0.05. For the nanomechanical testing, linear mixed
6
7 models were performed in order to determine the influence of different surfaces (HA
8
9 vs HT) and bone position within threads (Figure 1C) on rank elastic modulus and rank
10
11 hardness values (statistical summaries for the different variables are also presented
12
13 but statistical inferences were made based on ranked data).
14
15
16
17

18 **RESULTS**

19 **Morphologic and topographic analysis**

20
21
22 SEM micrographs of both groups are presented in Figure 2A-D. At high
23
24 magnification, it is evident that the HA-coated surface was fully covered with rod-
25
26 shaped HA particles approximately 10–15 nm wide and 100–200 nm in length (Figure
27
28 2D).
29
30
31

32
33 No significant topographical differences between the two groups in the micro
34
35 level were seen, thus, it was confirmed that the microtopography was not altered by
36
37 the nano HA coating (Figure 2E).
38
39
40

41 **Histomorphometry**

42
43 The histological sections presented newly formed trabeculae with deeply
44
45 stained mineralized tissue for both groups after 3 weeks of healing, and no visible
46
47 differences in bone formation could be confirmed, as presented in Figure 3A.
48
49
50

51
52 The mean BIC (SD) values for the HT and HA groups are presented in Figure 3B. In
53
54 brief, the BIC for the entire threads were 32.1% (9.9) and 35.7% (8.0) for the HT and
55
56 HA groups, respectively. There were no significant differences between the two
57
58 groups. ($p = 0.21$).
59
60

Nanoindentation

The mean \pm SE elastic modulus and hardness for the HA group was 6.01 ± 0.40 GPa and 0.29 ± 0.025 GPa, respectively. For the HT group, the mean \pm SE elastic modulus and hardness were 2.69 ± 0.19 GPa and 0.14 ± 0.007 GPa, respectively (Figure 4A). Significantly higher levels of hardness rank and elastic modulus rank were observed for the HA group relative to the HT group ($H= p<0.001$; $E= p<0.001$, Figures 4B and 4D). No significant differences in the levels of both hardness rank and elastic modulus rank were observed between positions 1-4 ($H= p=0.17$; $E= p=0.18$, Figures 4B and 4D). When surface group and position were evaluated altogether, significantly higher values of hardness rank and elastic modulus rank were observed for the HA group relative to the HT group at all positions (Figures 4C and 4E).

DISCUSSION

The method to determine the degree of osseointegration was mainly dependent on histology/histomorphometry and biomechanics. However, it has been discussed that these evaluation techniques may not actually capture the entire phenomenon. Especially when evaluating the effect of nanometer structures, detailed evaluation approaches are essential to clarify their roles during osteogenesis (Jimbo et al., 2011a; Jimbo et al., 2011b). In our previous study, we reported that the presence of HA nanotopography on implant surfaces enhanced osteogenic markers such as alkaline phosphatase and osteocalcin and at the same time suppresses inflammation. It is strongly suggested that the chemico-topographical modification in the nano-level

1
2
3 enhances the bioactivity and osteogenesis, which was difficult to prove with
4
5 conventional methodologies.
6

7
8 The histomorphometric results of the current study did not show statistical
9
10 differences between the test and the control surfaces. Both surfaces presented high
11
12 BIC after 3 weeks, which is a commonly selected time point in a rabbit model to
13
14 evaluate early bone response (Svanborg et al., 2011). These enhanced
15
16 histomorphometric outcomes seen for both surfaces may be attributed to the base
17
18 surface topography, which had a moderately rough micro topography (Wennerberg
19
20 and Albrektsson, 2009). The significant impact of the sandblasting, and acid etching
21
22 may have hindered the effect of the nanostructures, at least in the morphometric
23
24 evaluation. Further, since the coating layer is a monolayer of less than 100 nm and it
25
26 is known to metabolize into the living system, remnants of HA particles could not be
27
28 observed microscopically and no inflammatory responses were detected, as it was the
29
30 case with thicker HA coatings (Albrektsson, 1998; Reigstad et al., 2011). Thus,
31
32 qualitatively and quantitatively from a morphologic evaluation, no differences could
33
34 be detected.
35
36

37
38 Intriguingly, bone nanomechanical testing showed that the tissue properties were
39
40 uniform throughout the evaluated (all four quadrants) region for each group by
41
42 significantly enhanced for the HA group relative to the control. Both the rank elastic
43
44 modulus and rank hardness presented significantly higher values regardless of
45
46 different regions, suggesting that the presence of nano HA had an effect both at the
47
48 immediate interfacial regions and the relatively distant regions. It has been reported
49
50 that bone nanomechanical properties are strongly correlated to the intrinsic material
51
52 property of the tissue, *i.e.*, mineralisation of the bone or characteristics of the organic
53
54 matrix (Boivin et al., 2008; Currey, 1975). More specifically, the calcium content of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 bone and the Young's modulus have been suggested to have a positive relationship
4 (Currey, 1988). It is a fact that the properties of the collagen fibers will be affected by
5 formalin fixation, thus and properties through nanoindentation, while in larger scale
6 than collagen fiber level, could be affected. However, since both groups were
7 subjected to the exact same fixation process, it is most likely that the two groups
8 examined in this study were compared on a relative basis and possibly not by an
9 absolute bone mechanical property basis.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 A possible explanation for the higher mineralization could be that the calcium
22 and the phosphate released from the surface had been incorporated to the surrounding
23 new bone, therefore, strengthening the mineralization properties. Although in general,
24 it has been known that hydroxyapatites are the most stable form of the calcium
25 phosphate family, the apatite nanoparticles that has been utilized in this study was
26 synthesized according to a soft-templating method (He et al., 2012). According to this
27 method, the apatite formed has a high resemblance to the apatite found in bone, with a
28 small particle size, relatively low crystallinity, calcium deficiency and carbonated.
29 Thus, the nano HA used in this study is a soluble form of hydroxyapatite. This
30 phenomenon has been confirmed by Wennerberg *et al.* (2011), who found that radio
31 labelled ^{45}Ca coated to the implant gradually detached from its surface and was
32 localized in the surrounding new bone, which eventually was metabolized
33 (Wennerberg et al., 2011).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Another possible explanation is the effect of nanostructures enhancing the
50 mineralization. As suggested by Tsukimura et al., nanostructured surfaces enhanced
51 the mineralization of rat bone marrow-derived osteoblasts (Tsukimura et al., 2011). It
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 is suggested that along with the effect of chemistry, the effect of topography was
4
5 involved in the enhancement.
6

7
8 Furthermore, the highly active mineralization cascade of the interfacial bone
9
10 around the nanostructured HA-coated implants can be explained from a genetic
11
12 aspect. It has been reported that alkaline phosphatase expression in bone around
13
14 nanostructured HA-coated implants was significantly higher than that of the bone
15
16 around the non-coated surfaces, and the relative expression differences between the
17
18 HT and HA surfaces amplified over time (Jimbo et al., 2011b). Since high alkaline
19
20 phosphatase activity enhances osteopontin expression, which is known to be a
21
22 cohesive factor for mineralization, it is suggested that HA-coating was partly
23
24 responsible for the enhanced bone nanomechanical properties.
25
26

27
28 Although osseointegration is defined from direct measurement of bone-to-
29
30 implant contact, the clinical interest today is focusing more on the stability of the
31
32 implant that will withstand dynamic loading. Needless to say, this would require new
33
34 bone formation, at the same time; the mineralization level of forming bone may be an
35
36 essential factor. Using the nanoindenter, capabilities of the nano HA to strengthen the
37
38 bone quality are evidenced, validating the hypothesis that nanoscale HA-coated
39
40 implant surface will hasten the quality of osseointegration.
41
42

43 While initial bone apposition is an important aspect of osseointegration, longer
44
45 healing periods especially those experiencing dynamic loading are of greater clinical
46
47 interest. This study thus presents purely experimental findings as only a single 3 week
48
49 observation was made. Further studies are required to develop conclusions of clinical
50
51 performance.
52
53

54 55 56 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** 57 58 59 60

GC Dental is acknowledged for providing the implants. This study was funded by the grants from the Swedish Knowledge Foundation. The authors declare no conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

Alberts B, Johnson A, Lewis J, Raff M, Roberts K, Walter P (2002). *Molecular Biology of the Cell*. New York, NY: Garland Science.

Albrektsson T (1998). Hydroxyapatite-coated implants: a case against their use. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 56:1312-1326.

Albrektsson T, Wennerberg A (2004). Oral implant surfaces: Part 1--review focusing on topographic and chemical properties of different surfaces and in vivo responses to them. *Int J Prosthodont* 17:536-543.

Baldassarri M, Bonfante E, Suzuki M, Marin C, Granato R, Tovar N, *et al.* (2012). Mechanical properties of human bone surrounding plateau root form implants retrieved after 0.3-24 years of function. *J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater* 100B:2015-2021.

Bhushan B (2009). Biomimetics: lessons from nature--an overview. *Philos Transact A Math Phys Eng Sci* 367:1445-1486.

Boivin G, Bala Y, Doublier A, Farlay D, Ste-Marie LG, Meunier PJ, *et al.* (2008). The role of mineralization and organic matrix in the microhardness of bone tissue from controls and osteoporotic patients. *Bone* 43:532-538.

Butz F, Aita H, Wang CJ, Ogawa T (2006). Harder and stiffer bone osseointegrated to roughened titanium. *J Dent Res* 85:560-565.

Coelho PG, Suzuki M, Guimaraes MV, Marin C, Granato R, Gil JN, *et al.* (2010). Early bone healing around different implant bulk designs and surgical techniques: A study in dogs. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res* 12:202-208.

Coelho PG, Freire JN, Granato R, Marin C, Bonfante EA, Gil JN, *et al.* (2011). Bone mineral apposition rates at early implantation times around differently prepared titanium surfaces: a study in beagle dogs. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Implants* 26:63-69.

Currey JD (1975). The effects of strain rate, reconstruction and mineral content on some mechanical properties of bovine bone. *J Biomech* 8:81-86.

Currey JD (1988). The effect of porosity and mineral content on the Young's modulus of elasticity of compact bone. *J Biomech* 21:131-139.

1
2
3 Dalby MJ, Riehle MO, Johnstone HJ, Affrossman S, Curtis AS (2002). Polymer-
4 demixed nanotopography: control of fibroblast spreading and proliferation. *Tissue*
5 *Eng* 8:1099-1108.
6

7 Ellingsen JE, Johansson CB, Wennerberg A, Holmen A (2004). Improved retention
8 and bone-to-implant contact with fluoride-modified titanium implants. *Int J Oral*
9 *Maxillofac Implants* 19:659-666.
10

11 Goransson A, Arvidsson A, Currie F, Franke-Stenport V, Kjellin P, Mustafa K, *et al.*
12 (2009). An in vitro comparison of possibly bioactive titanium implant surfaces. *J*
13 *Biomed Mater Res A* 88:1037-1047.
14

15 He W, Kjellin P, Currie F, Handa P, Knee CS, Bielecki J, *et al.* (2011). Formation of
16 Bone-like Nanocrystalline Apatite Using Self-Assembled Liquid Crystals.
17 *Chemistry of Materials* 24:892-902.
18

19 Hoffer CE, Moore KE, Kozloff K, Zysset PK, Brown MB, Goldstein SA (2000).
20 Heterogeneity of bone lamellar-level elastic moduli. *Bone* 26:603-609.
21

22 Hoffer CE, Guo XE, Zysset PK, Goldstein SA (2005). An application of
23 nanoindentation technique to measure bone tissue Lamellae properties. *J Biomech*
24 *Eng* 127:1046-1053.
25

26 Jimbo R, Coelho PG, Vandeweghe S, Schwartz-Filho HO, Hayashi M, Ono D, *et al.*
27 (2011a). Histological and three-dimensional evaluation of osseointegration to
28 nanostructured calcium phosphate-coated implants. *Acta Biomater* 7:4229-4234.
29

30 Jimbo R, Xue Y, Hayashi M, Schwartz-Filho HO, Andersson M, Mustafa K *et al.*
31 (2011b). Genetic responses to nanostructured calcium-phosphate-coated implants. *J*
32 *Dent Res* 90:1422-1427.
33

34 Jimbo R, Sotres J, Johansson C, Breiding K, Currie F, Wennerberg A (2012). The
35 biological response to three different nanostructures applied on smooth implant
36 surfaces. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 23:706-712.
37

38 Oliver WC, Pharr GM (1986). A method for interpreting the data from depth-sensing
39 indentation instruments. *J Mater Res* 1:601-609.
40

41 Oliver WC, Pharr GM (1992). An Improved Technique for Determining Hardness and
42 Elastic-Modulus Using Load and Displacement Sensing Indentation Experiments. *J*
43 *Mater Res* 7:1564-1583.
44

45 Puckett SD, Taylor E, Raimondo T, Webster TJ (2010). The relationship between the
46 nanostructure of titanium surfaces and bacterial attachment. *Biomaterials* 31:706-713.
47

48 Reigstad O, Johansson C, Stenport V, Wennerberg A, Reigstad A, Rokkum M (2011).
49 Different patterns of bone fixation with hydroxyapatite and resorbable CaP coatings
50 in the rabbit tibia at 6, 12, and 52 weeks. *J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater* 99:14-
51 20.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Seeman E, Delmas PD (2006). Bone quality--the material and structural basis of bone
5 strength and fragility. *N Engl J Med* 354:2250-2261.
6

7
8 Svanborg LM, Hoffman M, Andersson M, Currie F, Kjellin P, Wennerberg A (2011).
9 The effect of hydroxyapatite nanocrystals on early bone formation surrounding dental
10 implants. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 40:308-315.
11

12
13 Tsukimura N, Yamada M, Iwasa F, Minamikawa H, Att W, Ueno T *et al.* (2011).
14 Synergistic effects of UV photofunctionalization and micro-nano hybrid topography
15 on the biological properties of titanium. *Biomaterials* 32:4358-4368.
16

17
18 Webster TJ, Ahn ES (2007). Nanostructured biomaterials for tissue engineering bone.
19 *Adv Biochem Eng Biotechnol* 103:275-308.
20

21
22 Wennerberg A, Albrektsson T (2009). Effects of titanium surface topography on bone
23 integration: a systematic review. *Clin Oral Implants Res* 20(Suppl 4):172-184.
24

25
26 Wennerberg A, Jimbo R, Allard S, Skarnemark G, Andersson M (2011). In vivo
27 stability of hydroxyapatite nanoparticles coated on titanium implant surfaces. *Int J*
28 *Oral Maxillofac Implants* 26:1161-1166.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: (A) Drill sequence used for the implantation. (B) Load in vivo time quasi-static testing profile, and a representative load displacement graph of the nanoindentation analysis. (C) The region of interest created for the study. The area within the thread of was subdivided into four quadrants in order to determine whether there is a area differences in the bone nanomechanical properties.

Figure 2: Surface morphologic properties investigated by scanning electron microscopy. Lower magnification images for (A) heat treated (HT), and (B) nano hydroxyapatite-coated (HA) implant surface. At this magnification (error bars: 1 μm), the rough surface structure of the base substrate can be seen and is difficult to see detailed differences between the two groups. The higher magnification images (marker bars: 200 nm) clearly indicate differences between the (C) HT, and the (D) HA surface. It is evident that the needle-like structure of about 100 nm in length fully covers the surface for the HA surface. (E) Surface topography measurements conducted by the optical interferometer. No statistical differences were detected in the micro-level.


Figure 3: Descriptive histologic images of the HT and HA implants placed in the rabbit tibia. For both groups, it was evident that new bone formed from the existing bone, and was in contact to the implant surface. No differences were noted between the two groups.

Figure 4: (A) Graph representing the mean hardness (GPa) and elastic modulus (GPa) for the HA and HT groups. (B) Summary statistics (rank of each property \pm 95% confidence interval) for rank hardness as a function of implant surface group and rank hardness as a function of different positions (1-4). (C) Rank hardness as a function of implant surface group and different positions (1-4). (D) Summary statistics (rank of each property \pm 95% confidence interval) for rank modulus as a


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

function of implant surface group and rank modulus as a function of different positions (1-4). (E) Rank modulus as a function of implant surface group and different positions (1-4).

For Peer Review




(A) Drill sequence used for the implantation. (B) Load in vivo time quasi-static testing profile, and a representative load displacement graph of the nanoindentation analysis. (C) The region of interest created for the study. The area within the thread of was subdivided into four quadrants in order to determine whether there is a area differences in the bone nanomechanical properties.
211x89mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Surface morphologic properties investigated by scanning electron microscopy. Lower magnification images for (A) heat treated (HT), and (B) nano hydroxyapatite-coated (HA) implant surface. At this magnification (error bars: 1 μm), the rough surface structure of the base substrate can be seen and is difficult to see detailed differences between the two groups. The higher magnification images (marker bars: 200 nm) clearly indicate differences between the (C) HT, and the (D) HA surface. It is evident that the needle-like structure of about 100 nm in length fully covers the surface for the HA surface. (E) Surface topography measurements conducted by the optical interferometer. No statistical differences were detected in the micro-level.

254x98mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Descriptive histologic images of the HT and HA implants placed in the rabbit tibia. For both groups, it was evident that new bone formed from the existing bone, and was in contact to the implant surface. No differences were noted between the two groups.
106x64mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Review



(A) Graph representing the mean hardness (GPa) and elastic modulus (GPa) for the HA and HT groups. (B) Summary statistics (rank of each property \pm 95% confidence interval) for rank hardness as a function of implant surface group and rank hardness as a function of different positions (1-4). (C) Rank hardness as a function of implant surface group and different positions (1-4). (D) Summary statistics (rank of each property \pm 95% confidence interval) for rank modulus as a function of implant surface group and rank modulus as a function of different positions (1-4). (E) Rank modulus as a function of implant surface group and different positions (1-4).
338x213mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Review