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\textbf{A B S T R A C T}

The objective of this study was to investigate the sensitivity of the nonlinear elastic properties of cortical bone to the presence of a single submillimetric crack. Nonlinear elasticity was measured by nonlinear resonant ultrasound spectroscopy (NRUS) in 14 human cortical bone specimens. The specimens were parallelepiped beams (50 × 2 × 2 mm\textsuperscript{3}). A central notch of 500 μm was made to control crack initiation and propagation during four-point bending. The nonlinear hysteretic elastic and dissipative parameters $\alpha_f$ and $\alpha_Q$, and Young’s modulus $E_{us}$ were measured in dry condition for undamaged (control) specimens and in dry and wet conditions for damaged specimens. The length of the crack was assessed using synchrotron radiation micro-computed tomography (SR-μCT) with a voxel size of 1.4 μm. The initial values of $\alpha_f$, measured on the intact specimens, were remarkably similar for all the specimens ($\alpha_f = -5.5 \pm 1.5$). After crack propagation, the nonlinear elastic coefficient $\alpha_f$ increased significantly ($p<0.006$), with values ranging from $-4.0$ to $-296.7$. Conversely, no significant variation was observed for $\alpha_Q$ and $E_{us}$. A more pronounced nonlinear elastic behavior was observed in hydrated specimens compared to dry specimens ($p<0.001$) after propagation of a single submillimetric crack. The nonlinear...
1. Introduction

This study focuses on bone microdamage and particularly on the microcracks that are thought to play an important role in bone strength (Burr et al., 1998; Diab and Vashishth, 2005; Hernandez et al., 2014; Yeni and Fyhrie, 2002), toughening mechanisms (Diab and Vashishth, 2005; Fletcher et al., 2014; Vashishth, 2004; Yeni and Fyhrie, 2002) and remodeling (Cardoso et al., 2009; Verborgt et al., 2000). The link between microcracks and bone fracture is not fully elucidated yet (Burr, 2011; Chapurat and Delmas, 2009; Gupta and Zioupos, 2008), though microdamage is suspected to be at the origin of some spontaneous fractures (Shane et al., 2010).

The quantitative assessment of damage characteristics remains challenging. Histomorphometry is the gold standard, although providing only 2-D damage characterization (Lee et al., 2003; O’Brien et al., 2007, 2002). New techniques are emerging, such as synchrotron radiation micro-computed tomography (SR-μCT) (Haupert et al., 2014; Larrue et al., 2011; Voide et al., 2009). However, none of these invasive techniques can be applied in vivo, nor is able to assess damage in a large bone volume. Consequently there is a clear need for alternative techniques to assess bone microdamage.

Nonlinear acoustics methods have been introduced recently for the investigation of bone microdamage. They include nonlinear resonant ultrasound spectroscopy (NRUS) (Haupert et al., 2014; Muller et al., 2008), nonlinear wave modulation spectroscopy (NWMS) (Ulrich et al., 2007) and dynamic acousto-elastic testing (DAET) (Moreschi et al., 2011; Renaud et al., 2008). These approaches, directly inspired from nonlinear elastic wave spectroscopy (NEWS) methods developed in the field of nondestructive testing of materials, have been reported to be sensitive to fatigue-induced damage in materials such as concrete (Antonaci et al., 2010; Chen et al., 2010; Van den Abeele and De Visscher, 2000), metals (Cantrell, 2006; Cantrell and Yost, 2001; Frouin et al., 1999; Kim et al., 2006, 2004; Nagy, 1998; Sagar et al., 2011; Zagrai et al., 2008) or composites (Aymerich and Staszewski, 2010; Bentahar and El Guerjouma, 2009; Meo et al., 2008; Van den Abeele et al., 2009, 2001b). However, so far, few studies have attempted to quantify microdamage, using nonlinear acoustic methods (Moreschi et al., 2011; Van den Abeele et al., 2009, 2001a). Haupert et al. (2014) have investigated the relationship between the nonlinear elastic behavior measured by NRUS and fatigue-induced microdamage of cortical bone specimens, taking advantage of micrometer resolution imaging by SR-μCT. With this approach, the study evidenced a significant correlation between the variation of bone microcrack density and the variation of nonlinear elasticity. These findings not only revealed the sensitivity of NRUS to early bone microdamage, but also established the first quantitative relationship between the variation of nonlinear elasticity of bone and variation of a microcrack characteristic.

A complementary vision to the fatigue test is to produce damage locally by initiating and propagating a single crack in a controlled manner. In this study, calibrated specimens of human cortical bone undergoing a toughness test were measured by NRUS and then imaged by SR-μCT. Our main objective was to investigate whether the nonlinear elastic behavior or the elastic modulus are changed after propagation of a localized single crack and to specifically assess the relationship between the nonlinear elastic behavior and the length and the orientation of the crack. This was achieved by comparing NRUS measurements on native and cracked specimens in dry condition. An ancillary objective was to investigate the influence of hydration on the nonlinear response. To this goal, NRUS testing was performed on cracked specimens in dry and wet conditions.

2. Methods

2.1. Specimen preparation

Fourteen human cortical bone specimens were prepared from the femoral mid-diaphysis of four donors (age = 79.4 ± 3.9). Ethical approval for the collection of samples was granted by the Human Ethics Committee of the Département Universitaire d’Anatomie de Rockfeller (Lyon, France). The tissue donors or their legal guardians provided informed written consent to give their tissue for investigation, in accord with legal clauses stated in the French Code of Public Health. Parallelepiped beams-shaped specimens (50 × 2 × 2 mm³) were wet machined (Isomet 4000, Buehler GmbH, Düsseldorf, Germany) oriented along the proximal to distal direction of the femur. Then they were notched by a diamond wire saw (ESCL W3000, Chassieu, France) in their middle to form a notch of roughly a quarter of the specimen width (i.e. 500 μm). The notch orientation was such that the nominal crack-growth direction for subsequent toughness testing was transverse to the long axis of the specimen, in a direction perpendicular to the osteon alignment. All specimens were defatted for 12 h in a chemical bath of
diethylether and methanol (1:1) and stored at −20 °C until experiments.

Apparent dry density (ρ_{dry}) was evaluated by measuring the specimen volume and weight. Bone specimens were dried at 37 °C during 12 h in a climate chamber (Memmert GmbH HCP 108, Schwabach, Germany) at relative humidity below 20% in the presence of desiccators. According to several authors, collagen molecular structure remains intact during drying and rewetting procedures, so that this protocol is believed not to affect bone properties (Currey, 1988; Rho and Pharr, 1999).

2.2. Measurement protocol

The experimental protocol began with the NRUS measurements to determine the initial elastic nonlinearity of the dry notched specimens. Previous NRUS measurements on cortical bone (Haupert et al., 2014, 2011; Muller et al., 2008) were all performed on dry specimens. In the present study, we kept measuring bone specimens in dry condition in order to compare the results with previous reports. The specimens were then taken through a toughness test in wet conditions. Crack initiation and growing was carefully controlled to avoid the rupture of the specimens. NRUS measurements were repeated after the toughness test for all the cracked specimens in dry condition (i.e. relative humidity <20%). Because some studies have evidenced that the nonlinear elastic response of materials such as concrete and rocks is influenced by the level of hydration (Johnson et al., 2004; Payan et al., 2010; Van den Abeele et al., 2002), NRUS measurements were repeated on the cracked specimens in wet condition (i.e. relative humidity >80%). Finally, the crack length was estimated using SR-μCT. The sequence of measurement steps is illustrated on Fig. 1.

2.3. NRUS measurements

When damaged materials are subjected to a dynamic loading, the elastic modulus decreases as strain amplitude increases. A typical manifestation of this phenomenon, the so-called “softening effect”, is the decreasing of the resonance frequency of the first compression modes (Haupert et al., 2011) when the excitation amplitude increases. In addition, the Q-factor of the resonance peak, defined as the ratio of the resonance frequency to the resonant peak width at half-maximum, also decreases for increasing excitation amplitudes. This behavior, which is typical of the non-linear non-classical elastic behavior (Guyer and Johnson, 2009), also known as hysteretic elasticity, of damaged materials appears for strains above approximately 10^{-5} (Johnson and Sutin, 2005). It conveys information about the amount of hysteretic nonlinear units representing the damaged zones in the material.

The principles of NRUS measurements have been extensively described elsewhere (Van den Abeele et al., 2000). The protocol was adapted to achieve high sensitivity to detect small variations of bone nonlinear parameters (Haupert et al., 2011). Briefly, a piezoceramic emitter (Fuji Ceramics Corporation, Yamamiya, Japan) glued on a back-load was bonded at one end of the specimen to ensure it is in free–fix boundary condition for NRUS measurements. Such boundary conditions impose a null displacement (i.e. maximum strain) at the fixed end of the specimen and a maximum displacement (i.e. null strain) at its free end. Each specimen was probed by a swept-sine (M2i.6612, Spectrum GmbH, Grosshansdorf, Germany) encompassing the first resonant mode of the cortical beam (assumed to be pure compression mode under asymmetric boundary conditions). The peak resonance frequency f and energy loss Q^{-1} were measured as a function of strain applying increasing voltage drive level. Two hysteretic nonlinear elastic (α_f) and dissipative (α_Q) parameters, related to the frequency shift Δf and to the energy loss variation (ΔQ^{-1}) as a function of strain, respectively, were extracted as follows (Van den Abeele et al., 2000):

\[ \frac{f - f_0}{f_0} = \frac{\alpha_f}{2} \Delta \varepsilon \]  
\[ \frac{1}{Q} - \frac{1}{Q_0} = \frac{\alpha_Q}{2} \Delta \varepsilon \]  

where f and Q are the resonance frequency and Q-factor at increased strain level, f_0 and Q_0 are the reference values (assumed to be linear) at the lowest drive amplitude, Δε is the maximal dynamic strain level over a period. The dynamic strain amplitude ε was calculated from the longitudinal particle displacement U at the free end of the specimen measured by a laser vibrometer (LSV 1 MHz, SIOS, Ilmenau, Germany):

\[ \varepsilon = \frac{\Delta U}{\Delta \varepsilon} = \frac{U}{kL} \]  

where k is the wave number and L is the specimen length.
Both nonlinear elastic $\alpha_f$ and dissipative $\alpha_Q$ parameters were evaluated on intact and cracked specimens in dry condition. During NRUS measurements, specimens were kept at fixed temperature ($37 \pm 0.1 ^\circ C$).

Given the free–fix boundary conditions for NRUS measurements, the resonance mode is such that the length of the specimen $L$ equals a quarter of the wavelength at the corresponding resonance frequency ($\lambda = 4L$). Thus, the sound velocity $c_0$ can be estimated by:

$$c_0 = 4Lf_0$$  \tag{4}

As the wavelength $\lambda$ is much larger than the characteristic dimension of the cross section of the specimens, the wave propagates in the specimens according to the bar mode. Thus, the ultrasonic Young’s modulus ($E_{us}$) can be estimated by (Achenbach, 1984; Grimal et al., 2009):

$$E_{us} = \rho_{dry}c_0^2$$  \tag{5}

### 2.4. Toughness testing

The piezoceramic emitter attached to the specimen was removed before mechanical testing. To be closer to realistic in-vivo cracking conditions, the notched specimens were hydrated into saline during 12 h. The wet specimens were monotonically loaded at a displacement rate of 0.05 mm/s with a preload of $-4 \, N$, using a crack opening (mode I) four-point bending setup. The test was stopped before failure at different crack lengths. The test was conducted on wet specimens in the air, at ambient temperature, using a hydraulic testing machine (INSTRON, 8802, High Wycombe, England) with a 1 kN loading cell (accuracy 0.5%) and the internal displacement transducer (accuracy 1%). The specific four-point bending assembly is composed of 6.35 mm diameter roller-bearings with a 40 mm outer span and a pivoting 20 mm inner span. In this configuration, the formation of grooves under the rollers is minimized (Griffin et al., 1997).

### 2.5. 3-D synchrotron radiation $\mu$CT (SR-$\mu$CT)

After NRUS measurements and mechanical testing, the samples were measured by SR-$\mu$CT at the European Synchrotron Radiation Facility (Grenoble, France) on beam-line ID19 following the data acquisition protocol extensively presented in previous studies (Haupert et al., 2014; Larrue et al., 2011). The photon energy was 25 keV and the size of the measured volume was $2.8 \times 2.8 \times 1.96 \, \text{mm}^3$ with a voxel size of $1.4 \, \mu\text{m}^3$.

For crack characterization, a sub volume of interest (VOI) of $2.15 \times 1.75 \times 1.75 \, \text{mm}^3$, encompassing the notch and the crack over the entire width of the sample, was analyzed. The VOI was sampled by 2-D longitudinal cross-sections regularly spaced with an interval of $350 \, \mu\text{m}$ (Fig. 2). Each cross-section was obtained by averaging a stack of 10 adjacent $1.4 \, \mu\text{m}$-thick slices in order to decrease the noise level and improve the contrast between the crack and the bone matrix (Fig. 2).

For crack length determination, only the main crack starting at the notch was considered, while all peripheral microcracks that were not connected to the main crack were removed to avoid including bias in the analysis. Crack length was manually determined by approximating the main crack as a succession of line segments. The total crack length was
estimated by summing the length of the line segments. A line segment \( n \) was represented by a vector of length \( L_n \) and angle \( \theta_n \). The total mean crack length \( \text{Cr.Le} = L_1 + L_2 + L_3 + L_4 + L_5 \). The mean crack angle is estimated in a coordinate system composed by the osteon direction (\( x \)-axis) and the notch direction (\( y \)-axis). It corresponds to the vector orientation between both extremities of the main crack. (b) The orthogonal projection of the main crack on the transverse axis corresponds to the sum of the 5 vectors projected on the same axis. \( \text{Cr.Le.Proj} = L_1.Proj + L_2.Proj + L_3.Proj + L_4.Proj + L_5.Proj \) (with \( L_n.Proj = L_n \sin(\theta_n) \)).

**Table 1** – Apparent density \( \rho_{\text{dry}} \), porosity, Young’s modulus \( E_{\text{US}} \), total mean crack length \( \text{Cr.Le} \), mean angle, projected mean crack length \( \text{Cr.Le.Proj} \), nonlinear elastic \( \alpha_f \) and dissipative \( \alpha_Q \) parameters before and after the toughness test and in dry and wet conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>( \rho_{\text{dry}} ) [g/cm(^3)]</th>
<th>Porosity [%]</th>
<th>Initial ( E_{\text{US}} ) [GPa]</th>
<th>Final ( E_{\text{US}} ) [GPa]</th>
<th>Cr.Le [( \mu \text{m} )]</th>
<th>Angle [(^\circ)]</th>
<th>Cr.Le.Proj [( \mu \text{m} )]</th>
<th>Initial dry ( \alpha_f )</th>
<th>Final dry ( \alpha_f )</th>
<th>Final wet ( \alpha_f )</th>
<th>Initial dry ( \alpha_Q )</th>
<th>Final dry ( \alpha_Q )</th>
<th>Final wet ( \alpha_Q )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>2277</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>–4.9</td>
<td>–296.7</td>
<td>–217.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>2277</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>–4.4</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>–5.5</td>
<td>–4.0</td>
<td>–6.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>–6.3</td>
<td>–10.8</td>
<td>–19.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>–5.0</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>–4.1</td>
<td>–21.3</td>
<td>–21.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>–4.4</td>
<td>–20.2</td>
<td>–37.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>–5.8</td>
<td>–120.5</td>
<td>–119.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>–4.5</td>
<td>–6.3</td>
<td>–14.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>–7.1</td>
<td>–11.5</td>
<td>–17.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–5.0</td>
<td>–5.6</td>
<td>–7.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>–4.4</td>
<td>–11.8</td>
<td>–28.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>–5.3</td>
<td>–16.0</td>
<td>–23.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>–10.0</td>
<td>–14.5</td>
<td>–17.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Evaluation of the crack length

The characteristics measured for all the specimens are displayed in Table 1. The total length of the cracks varies from 6 µm to 2277 µm while the mean angle of the cracks (θ) varies from 13° to 81° (0° means an alignment with osteon direction) with a mean value of 27±19°. The projected length (Cr.Le.Proj) of the cracks varies from 6 µm to 664 µm. Note that two specimens (#2 and #5) were fractured during the toughness test therefore data analysis was performed with 12 specimens.

3.2. NRUS

We remind that the measurement precision of NRUS was found to be 16.2% for αf and 14.2% for αQ in previously reported results (Haupert et al., 2011). The initial values of αf and αQ were remarkably similar for all the specimens and vary within a relatively narrow range: αf = −5.5±1.5 (min: −4.4; max: −10.0) and αQ = 1.8±0.6 (min: 0.7; max: 3.1). After crack propagation, the nonlinear elastic coefficient αf has increased significantly (p<0.006), with αf values ranging from −4.0 to −296.7 (Fig. 4a). Two specimens manifested a huge increase of αf (#1: αf varies from −4.9 to −296.7; #8: αf varies from −5.8 to −120.5). Two specimens (#3, #11) showed an insignificant change of αf, compared to the technique precision.

In contrast, the values of αQ after crack propagation, ranging between 1.1 and 3.5, remained close to the initial values and the variation did not reach a significant level. (Fig. 4b). The dissipative nonlinear αQ could not be extracted for two specimens (#1 and #8). Indeed, in these two cases, there was no linear dependence between the strain level ε and the energy loss variation ΔQ−1 as expected from Eq. (2). For high strain level above ε=10−4, the variation ΔQ−1 saturated. For these reasons, these two specimens were removed from the statistical analysis.

Finally, a statistically significant difference was found between both nonlinear coefficients (αf p = 0.002; αQ p = 0.01) between measurements achieved on cracked specimens under hydrated or dehydrated conditions, suggesting that hydration has an effect on nonlinear elasticity. Nonlinearity was higher under hydrated condition.

Both nonlinear hysteretic parameters measured after crack propagation, in dry and wet conditions, were significantly correlated (hydrated specimens: R = 0.78, p = 0.007; dehydrated specimens R = 0.85, p = 0.002) (Fig. 5).
Fig. 6 – Correlation between the crack length (total Cr.Le (a) or projected Cr.Le.Proj (b)) and the nonlinear elastic coefficient $\alpha_f$ measured in dry and wet cortical bone specimens.

The nonlinear elastic parameter $\alpha_f$ was significantly correlated to Cr.Le (dehydrated $R=0.79 \ p<0.01$; hydrated $R=0.84 \ p<0.005$) and to Cr.Le.Proj (dehydrated $R=0.88 \ p<10^{-3}$; hydrated $R=0.94 \ p<10^{-4}$) (Fig. 6). Similarly, the nonlinear dissipative parameter $\alpha_d$ was significantly correlated to Cr.Le (dehydrated $R=0.71 \ p=0.02$; hydrated $R=0.79 \ p<0.005$) and to Cr.Le.Proj (dehydrated $R=0.76 \ p=0.01$; hydrated $R=0.76 \ p=0.01$). There was no significant difference between the values of Young’s modulus ($E_\text{us}$) measured before or after crack propagation.

4. Discussion

To our best knowledge, this study represents the first investigation of the variations of linear ($E_\text{us}$) and nonlinear hysteretic elastic parameters ($\alpha_f$, $\alpha_d$) of human cortical bone specimens after a crack initiation and propagation experiment. Similar studies have been reported, but in metal or in concrete (Courtney et al., 2008; Donskoy et al., 2001; Duffour et al., 2006; Straka et al., 2008; Zardan et al., 2010). Linear and nonlinear measurements of elastic properties were achieved on each specimen before and after crack propagation, so that each specimen was its own control. The results evidence an increase of the nonlinear hysteretic elastic coefficient $\alpha_f$ of the bone specimens after crack propagation in agreement with the results reported on different materials (Courtney et al., 2008; Duffour et al., 2006). Furthermore, we found a significant correlation between crack length and the nonlinear parameters $\alpha_f$ and $\alpha_d$, which is consistent with the recent results reported by Zardan et al. (2010) in concrete and Donskoy et al. (2001) in steel.

In contrast, the crack propagation has no measureable effect on the elastic modulus $E_\text{us}$. This suggests that the nonlinear hysteretic elastic behavior is more sensitive to the presence of a single crack than linear elasticity corroborating the result found in concrete by Zardan et al. (2010).

The values of $\alpha_f$ and $\alpha_d$ measured in the specimens before crack initiation and propagation are in agreement with those observed in previous experiments conducted on human or bovine dry cortical bone (Haupert et al., 2014, 2011). However, the damaged specimens of the present study, with a single crack, exhibit values of $\alpha_f$ that are far higher than those measured in damaged specimens with an accumulation of non-localized microcracks occurring after a fatigue test (Haupert et al., 2014). During the fatigue test conducted in our previous study, the damage remained at an early stage of development resulting in the accumulation of tiny microcracks with a lower nonlinear responses compared to the current specimens. We hypothesize that the total volume of the accumulated microcracks, within which the nonlinear mechanisms may occur, is probably much less extended than the volume of a region damaged with a large crack. Future studies are required to gain insight into the role played by the volume occupied by cracks on the nonlinear elastic behavior.

We assume that the activation of the nonlinear elastic behavior by crack opening/closing processes is larger when the crack is perpendicular to the direction of propagation of the compression wave. As a consequence, the correlation of the nonlinear elastic behavior is expected to be stronger with the length of crack portions perpendicular to the wave direction than with the total crack length. Although our data showed a trend to a higher correlation of $\alpha_f$ with Cr.Le.Proj than with Cr.Le, the difference did not reach a statistically significant level ($Z<1.65$, Steiger’s Z-test for correlated correlations (Meng et al., 1992)), probably because of the weak statistical power of the test due to the limited number of specimens included in the study. A larger sample size is needed to confirm this assumption.

The nonlinear elastic behavior was investigated under different hydration conditions upon the same set of cracked specimens. Both nonlinear hysteretic parameters increase after bone hydration (Fig. 4). The influence of hydration was also studied in rocks (Johnson et al., 2004; Tutuncu et al., 1998; Van den Abeele et al., 2002; Zinszner et al., 1997), woods (Derome et al., 2011) and concrete (Payan et al., 2010). In rocks, the nonlinear elastic behavior increases as the water content increases (Johnson et al., 2004) contrary to concrete (Payan et al., 2010). These observations are interpreted based on different mechanisms, such as 1) capillarity forces due to water (non-viscous) (Van den Abeele et al., 2002), 2) adhesion forces due to a viscous liquid between grain boundaries or cracks lips (Nazarov, 2001), or 3) fluid flow that modify the diameter of tubes where the fluid moves (Nazarov and Radostin, 2008). Whether such mechanisms may exist in cortical bone which can be considered as a matrix pervaded by a porous network filled with viscous fluids, in the
specific case of bone, collagen with hydration-dependent elastic properties (Rho and Pharr, 1999) may be another factor that has to be considered. From an experimental point of view, this result has important consequence as it suggests that humidity must be strictly controlled during measurement.

The nonlinear dissipative parameter $a_Q$ was measured concurrently with the nonlinear elastic parameter $a_f$. We found a significant correlation between $a_f$ and $a_Q$ in the damaged specimens when they were measured in dry or in wet conditions. Such a correlation between $a_f$ and $a_Q$ has already been described in various damaged material (Van den Abeele et al., 2009, 2001a; Van den Abeele and De Visscher, 2000). Like Van den Abeele et al. (2009), we report a lower sensitivity of $a_Q$ to crack length, in comparison to $a_f$.

Nonlinear resonant ultrasound spectroscopy is suitable for a multimodal approach (Rivière et al., 2010) as each resonant mode generates a different strain field. In this report, we focus the analysis on the first compression mode. But other resonant modes can be measured. For example, we measured also the second and third compression modes. The results obtained with these modes were similar to the results obtained by processing the first compression mode (data not shown). These results are consistent with the theory (Liu et al., 2010; Van den Abeele, 2007). Indeed, the value of the measured nonlinear parameter depends on the local strain field: if the crack is located in a node of the strain field, the crack would not be excited by opening/closing and no nonlinear hysteretic behavior would be measured. In fixed–free boundary conditions, the strain field is identical for the three modes in the center of the specimens where the crack is localized. It means that the value of the nonlinear parameter must be the same for the three modes. Different nonlinear elastic behavior would be expected under symmetric boundary conditions (free–free or fixed–fixed) as the local strain fields may vary depending on the mode (Liu et al., 2010; Van den Abeele, 2007; Van den Abeele et al., 2004).

Although NRUS most often exploits the first compression mode (or Pochammer–Chree mode for cylinder), other modes have also been exploited, such as flexural mode (Van den Abeele et al., 2009, 2001b). In this study, the nonlinear hysteretic behavior of our specimens has also been investigated using the flexural mode (data not shown). The nonlinear hysteretic parameters extracted from this mode were similar to those derived from the compression mode. Indeed, in case of flexural modes, shear stresses exist but remain weak such that they are generally neglected. This may explain why the nonlinear elastic parameters measured in compression and flexural modes are similar, as we observed it in this study. They reflect mostly the nonlinear longitudinal elastic behavior of the specimens. For both compression and flexural modes, the activation of the nonlinear hysteretic behavior is mainly controlled by opening/closing mechanism due to the longitudinal traveling wave, while the friction mechanisms due to shear stresses remained too small. In order to investigate selectively the sensitivity of shear elastic coefficients to the nonlinear hysteretic behavior, one would have to perform NRUS measurements with torsion resonant modes for instance.

5. Conclusion

The results described in this study provide new insights into the nonlinear elastic behavior of human cortical bone. The proposed experimental protocol allowed the concurrent assessment of acoustic nonlinear parameters reflecting hysteretic elasticity of human cortical bone specimens subject to a crack initiation and propagation. SR-$\mu$CT was used to assess crack lengths and orientations at the end of the toughness test. Results showed a significant correlation between the nonlinear hysteretic elasticity of bone and crack length. NRUS is a promising minimally invasive approach for assessing microdamage in situ. Although the results relate primarily to the characterization of bone, they can be useful for other materials such as metals, composites or concrete.
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