

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to the Department of Defense, Executive Service Directorate (0704-0188). Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ORGANIZATION.

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 08/28/2017		2. REPORT TYPE Poster		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) 08/28/2017-08/31/2017	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE MIIMRS 2017				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Maj Adam Willis				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) 59th Clinical Research Division 1100 Willford Hall Loop, Bldg 4430 JBSA-Lackland, TX 78236-9908 210-292-7141				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER 17337	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) 59th Clinical Research Division 1100 Willford Hall Loop, Bldg 4430 JBSA-Lackland, TX 78236-9908 210-292-7141				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Clarice Longoria
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) 210-292-7141



Materials Characterization of Cranial Simulants for Blast Induced Traumatic Brain Injury

Michaelann Tartis¹, Ph.D., Joseph Kerwin¹, Anna Wermer¹, Kelsea Welsh¹, Ivan Fuller², Robert Morgan, Ph.D.², Ricardo Mejia-Alvarez, Ph.D.³, Adam Willis M.D., Ph.D., Maj, USAF^{3,4}
 1. Department of Chemical Engineering, New Mexico Tech 2. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL)
 3. Department of Mechanical Engineering, Michigan State University 4. 59th Medical Wing



Cranial Simulants for Reproducibility

In the quest to understand the mechanisms involved in blast-induced traumatic brain injuries that plague our returning military servicemen, materials to simulate tissues of the cranium are needed to produce models that are readily reproducible in blast studies. Object to object variation and interspecies differences are current limitations in animal and cadaver studies. Test objects that are both biofidelic and reproducible provide the opportunity to investigate dominant mechanisms at varying blast parameters. Selecting materials that are transparent allow for optical diagnostics during the blast event. Using tissue simulants, it may be possible to reproduce post-mortem diagnostics used in the clinic for adequate comparison of the observed injuries. The mechanisms elucidated from these studies may be used to inform the design of protective gear to mitigate blast injuries. Here we present the mechanical and material characterization of several materials intended for use as potential biofidelic simulants in shock tube and open field blasts for high speed optical imaging, gross observations, and post-blast analysis.

Cavitation Markers

The mechanisms for primary-bTBI, where injury is the direct result from exposure to a shock wave, have not been independently identified. Small animal studies demonstrated vascular damage is present and it is believed that this is primarily caused by intracranial cavitation⁴. Since fluid cavitation is suspected to be partially responsible for the damage, the tissue phantoms will be imaged to look for bubble formation. Microbubbles embedded in the gel serve as cavitation nuclei and as a positive control for studying cavitation effects.




Figure 1: Expansion of microbubbles due to heat during casting at 20X



Figure 2: 200µL of microbubbles in gelatin at 20X

Characterization Methods



Figure 3: Stretched gel on a Mark-10 Tensile Tester



Figure 4: Gel sample on the SR5 Rheometer



Figure 5: Ballistic Gelatin



Figure 6: Bovine Gelatin

Cranial Simulants Under Tensile, Compressive, and Shear Stresses

Tensile Testing




Figure 7: Average stress-strain curves for bovine skin derived gelatin at three strain rates




Figure 8: Average stress-strain curve for bovine bone-derived gelatin at three strain rates

Compression Testing




Figure 9: Average stress-strain curves for bovine bone derived gelatin at three strain rates




Figure 10: Average stress-strain curves for bovine skin derived gelatin at three strain rates

Table 1: Mechanical Characterization Summary				
Strain Rate [1/s]	Avg Density [g/cm ³]	Avg Young Modulus [kPa]	Avg Fracture Stress [kPa]	
Compression Results: Polycrylamide (PAA)				
0.05	1.05	56.08	374.60	
0.20	1.04	39.19	570.18	
0.50	1.03	217.86	580.08	
Tension Results: Polycrylamide (PAA)				
0.05	1.05	31.94	23.64	
0.20	1.04	26.01	22.85	
0.50	1.03	26.95	35.23	
Compression Results: Bovine Skin Derived Gel				
0.05	1.05	56.41	12.04	
0.20	1.09	78.51	628.22	
0.50	1.09	45.79	576.17	
Tension Results: Bovine Skin Derived Gel				
0.05	1.16	34.43	28.81	
0.20	1.13	30.91	39.37	
0.50	1.01	30.10	19.64	
Compression Results: Bovine Bone Derived Gel				
0.05	1.11	78.84	15.35	
0.20	1.11	87.73	647.96	
0.50	1.09	56.19	635.44	
Tension Results: Bovine Bone Derived Gel				
0.05	1.09	46.44	58.83	
0.20	1.10	34.62	99.67	
0.50	1.08	46.16	98.68	
Tension Results: Ballistic 20%				
0.05	0.89	39.90	46.38	
0.20	0.87	38.09	75.56	
0.50	0.88	19.36	56.75	
Tension Results: Ballistic 20%				
0.05	0.91	67.63	69.63	
0.20	0.90	45.84	315.97	
0.50	0.90	27.48	125.19	

Shear Testing




Figure 11: Dynamic shear for Bovine Skin Gelatin, Bovine Bone Gelatin and Polycrylamide (PAA) at a given applied stress. Error bars represent calculated standard error.

Comparison to Tissue Measurements

Table 2: Young's modulus values compared with brain tissue values from literature¹¹

Strain Rate [1/s]	Avg Young Modulus PAA [kPa]	Avg Young Modulus Bovine Skin [kPa]	Avg Young Modulus Bovine Bone [kPa]	Avg Young Modulus Ballistic [kPa]	Avg Young Modulus Ballistic 20% [kPa]	Literature Value [kPa] (Rahidi 2014)	Strain Range
0.05	31.94	34.43	46.44	39.90	67.63	11.68 +/- 3.70	0.0-1
0.20	36.01	30.91	36.62	38.03	45.84	27.6 +/- 5.93	0.1-0.2
0.50	26.95	30.10	48.16	19.36	27.48	43.75 +/- 5.97	0.2-0.3

Table 3: Average shear modulus magnitude values at 25°C across a frequency range of 0-396 rad/s

Applied Stress [kPa]	20% Bone Gelatin [kPa]	18% Skin Gelatin [kPa]	Polycrylamide (PAA) Gel
1.033	4.238-5.773 ± 0.96-2.96	6.640-10.99 ± 6.88-8.27	3.083-5.251 ± 0.008-0.944
2027	3.833-6.378 ± 0.81-2.79	5.574-8.782 ± 3.55-5.55	3.510-6.308 ± 0.548-1.09

Table 4: Shear modulus values for brain tissue from literature^{11,12}

Brain Tissue	Source
1.6-2 ± 0.10-0.20 kPa	Elliott 2012
2.32-3.07 ± 0.40-0.49 kPa	Murphy 2011

Future Optimization and Blast-Testing

Optimize bone and skin derived gelatins to simulate (grey and white matter) by reducing elastic modulus while maintaining density values

Complete the material property testing for the alginate samples and determine appropriateness as a blood vessel simulant

Characterize additional materials for skull simulant

Complete cranial object fabrication for shock tube and open field blast testing



Figure 12: Bovine Skin Gelatin in Brain Mold



Figure 13: Test Object for Blast Testing

References

- Galarraga, M. et al., 2008. 950-957, 2008.
- DeFries and Veterans Brain Injury Center. <http://dibic.doe.mil/food-worldwide-numbers-tsu>
- Bider, G. et al (2010). Blast-induced Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 33(4), 753-783
- Reiner, D. et al (2011). *Journal of Neurotrauma*, 28(1), 95-104 doi:10.1089/neu.2010.1513
- Tensile Tester - Tensile Testers - MARR-10. (n.d.). www.mark-10.com/instruments/tensty/tensile10tester.html
- Cheng, S. et al. (2008). Rheological properties of the tissues of the central nervous system. *Medical Engineering & Physics*, 30(10).
- Miller, K., & Chinzei, K. (2002). Mechanical properties of brain tissue in tension. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 35(4), 489-490
- Chen, A. L. et al. (2016). Multilayered tissue-mimicking skin and vessel phantoms with tunable mechanical, optical, and acoustic properties. *Medical Physics*, 43(6), 3117-3131.
- Elliott, P. Z., et al. (2012). Viscoelastic characterization of rat cerebral cortex and type I collagen scaffolds for central nervous system tissue engineering. *Journal of the Mechanical Behavior of Biomedical Materials*, 12, 63-73.
- Murphy, M. C., et al. (2011). Decreased brain stiffness in Alzheimer's Disease Determined by Magnetic Resonance Elastography. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging*, 34(4).
- Rahidi et al. 2014. Mechanical characterization of brain tissue in tension at dynamic strain rates. *J Mech Behav Biomed*

New Mexico Institute of Mining Technology Sandia National Laboratories

- Candice Cooper
- Dr. Huang for instrument use
- Dr. McCoy for helpful discussion
- Chad Hovey
- Paul Taylor