

1 **Nanoindentation analysis of the micromechanical**
2 **anisotropy in mouse cortical bone**

3 Michele Casanova¹, Anna Balmelli¹, Davide Carnelli², Diana Courty³,
4 Philipp Schneider^{1,4}, Ralph Müller¹

5

6 ¹ Institute for Biomechanics, ETH Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

7 ² Complex Materials, Department of Materials, ETH Zürich, Zürich,
8 Switzerland.

9 ³ Laboratory for Nanometallurgy, Department of Materials, ETH Zürich,
10 Zürich, Switzerland

11 ⁴ Faculty of Engineering and the Environment, University of Southampton,
12 Southampton, UK

13 **Authors:**

Michele Casanova, Institute for Biomechanics, HCP H 22.1, Leopold-Ruzicka-Weg 4, ETH Zurich, 8093 Zurich, Switzerland, tel: +41 44 633 22 43, email: mcasanova@ethz.ch

Anna Balmelli, Institute for Biomechanics HCP H 22.1, Leopold-Ruzicka-Weg 4, ETH Zurich, 8093 Zurich, Switzerland, tel: +41 44 633 22 43, email: balmelli.anna@gmail.com

Davide Carnelli, Complex Materials, Department of Materials, HCI G 533, Vladimir-Prelog Weg 5, ETH Zürich, 8093 Zürich, Switzerland, tel: +41 44 633 0495, e-mail: davide.carnelli@mat.ethz.ch

Diana Courty, Laboratory for Nanometallurgy, Department of Materials, HCI F 513. Vladimir-Prelog Weg 5, ETH Zürich, 8093 Zürich, Switzerland, tel. +41 44 633 69 15, email: d.courty@gmx.de

Philipp Schneider, Building 7/Room 4031, Mailpoint M7, Bioengineering Science Research Group, Faculty of Engineering and the Environment, University of Southampton, Southampton. UK, tel +44 23 8059 4640, fax +44 23 8059 3016, email: p.schneider@soton.ac.uk

Corresponding author:

Ralph Müller, Institute for Biomechanics, HCP H 23.1, Leopold-Ruzicka-Weg 4, 8093 Zürich, Switzerland,

tel: +41 44 632 45 92, fax: +41 44 633 11 24, email: ram@ethz.ch

1 **Number of words:**

2 abstract = 211, manuscript = 3576

3

4 **Number of figures:**

5 color = 3, black/white = 1

6 **Keywords:**

7 Nanoindentation; mouse cortical bone; mechanical anisotropy; reduced
8 modulus; hardness.

9

10

1 **Abstract**

2 Studies investigating micromechanical properties in mouse cortical bone
3 often solely focus on the mechanical behaviour along the long axis of the
4 bone. Therefore, data on the anisotropy of mouse cortical bone is scarce.
5 The aim of this study is the first time evaluation of the anisotropy ratio
6 between the longitudinal and transverse directions of reduced modulus and
7 hardness in mouse femurs by using the nanoindentation technique. To this
8 purpose, nine 22-week-old mice (C57BL/6) were sacrificed and all femurs
9 extracted. A total of 648 indentations were performed with a Berkovich tip
10 in the proximal (P), central (C), and distal (D) regions of the femoral shaft
11 in the longitudinal and transverse direction. Higher values for reduced
12 modulus are obtained for indentations in the longitudinal direction, with
13 anisotropy ratios of 1.72 ± 0.40 (P), 1.75 ± 0.69 (C), and 1.34 ± 0.30 (D).
14 Hardness is also higher in the longitudinal direction, with anisotropic ratios
15 of 1.35 ± 0.27 (P), 1.35 ± 0.47 (C), and 1.17 ± 0.19 (D). We observed a
16 significant anisotropy in the micromechanical properties of the mouse
17 femur, but the correlation for reduced modulus and hardness between the
18 two directions is low ($r^2 < 0.3$) and not significant. Therefore, we highly
19 recommend performing independent indentation testing in both the
20 longitudinal and transverse directions when knowledge of the tissue
21 mechanical behaviour along multiple directions is required.

22

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Bone has a particular hierarchical structure and it is recognized that
3 changes occurring at lower hierarchical levels can affect the functionalities
4 of the whole bone[1, 2]. Many insights into the biology and biomechanics
5 of bone tissue at multiple hierarchical levels have emerged from animal
6 experiments. Rodent models are of prime importance as they are
7 inexpensive, easy to breed, and a relatively high number of animals can be
8 bred concurrently [3]. Moreover, inbred rodents have negligible genetic
9 variation, which drastically reduces biological variance [3]. Mouse models,
10 in particular, can be used for gene targeting technologies and antibody-
11 mediated suppression of protein functions [3], which are crucial for
12 investigating the genetic fingerprint of bone cells expression. Despite the
13 fact that rodents have become the preferred system for bone research [4],
14 there is still a lack of knowledge on the mechanical behaviour of mouse
15 bone. A deeper understanding of the mechanics in different directions is
16 required to better comprehend the effect of any treatments on the bone
17 tissue.

18 In recent years, nanoindentation has emerged as a powerful technique
19 for investigating the micromechanical properties of bone [5]. In
20 nanoindentation measurements, a tip penetrates the material while the
21 reaction forces and the depth of penetration are recorded. From this data,
22 parameters related to the stiffness and strength of the indented region can be

1 determined [5]. This technique allows the decoupling at the microscopic
2 scale of the mechanical properties in multiple directions. In particular, the
3 transverse direction may be strongly correlated to bone strength. It is known
4 that most fractures in long bones are rarely due to mere flexion, but also due
5 to compressive and torsional forces [6, 7]. Moreover, torsion of long bones
6 generates circumferentially-oriented shear stresses inside the structure.
7 These stresses can consequently create longitudinal microcracks in the
8 osteons, which can contribute to fatigue failure in cortical bone [6]. It was
9 already observed that shear stresses can induce microcracks generated by
10 shear displacements in bovine cortical bone [8]. Although mouse cortical
11 bone does not present an osteonal structure, microcracks have also been
12 shown to occur in rodents [8, 9], and that they form preferentially along
13 longitudinal canals [10]. Furthermore, the femoral numerical crack density
14 in rats was found to be considerably greater than in the bovine tibia [8].

15 Despite the fact that there are many studies on human or bovine cortical
16 bone focused on the mechanical properties in both longitudinal and
17 transverse directions [11-21], investigations into the mouse bone transversal
18 direction have been fewer in number [22-24]. However, a deeper
19 comprehension of bone anisotropy could help understand the basic
20 mechanical properties of mouse cortical bone.

21 The aim of this study is to shed light on the micromechanical properties
22 along the longitudinal and transverse directions in the mouse femoral shaft

1 and to determine a relationship between them. We expect to find significant
2 differences between properties in these directions due to the anisotropic
3 organization of the bone matrix. In order to understand the structure-
4 property relationship of mouse bone, micromechanical properties were
5 measured on the same mice, as it is well known that micromechanical
6 properties between two different animals can greatly differ [5]. In particular,
7 three region of the femoral shaft of mice with completely matured cortical
8 bone were selected and the reduced modulus and hardness were measured
9 by arrays of indentations. Our findings could help to design future studies,
10 because if a constant anisotropy ratio is found, the properties in the
11 orthogonal direction could possibly be inferred from data in a single
12 direction only.

13

14 **2. Materials and methods**

15

16 **2.1 Specimen preparation**

17 Nine C57BL/B6 mice were sacrificed with cervical dislocation at the
18 age of 22 weeks and immediately stored in a freezer at -20°C. All animal
19 procedures were approved by the local veterinary authorities (Kantonales
20 Vetrinaeramt Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland). The mice were subsequently
21 thawed and both femurs extracted (Figure 1a.i). The proximal part of the
22 femur was disconnected at the end of the third trochanter and the distal part

1 was removed at the end of the condyle with a wire saw (WELL Diamond
2 Wire Saw, LeLocle, Switzerland) to facilitate handling of the femoral shaft
3 (Figure 1a.ii). To cool down the wire during the cut, the wire saw liquid
4 tank was filled with PBS solution. Epoxy resin (EpoxiCure, Buehler, Lake
5 Bluff, IL, USA) was then used to embed the shafts (Figure 1a.iii). This
6 embedding medium was selected to avoid infiltration of the polymer in the
7 bone porosity, which is greatly limited due to its high viscosity and fast
8 solidification. The bones were then cut longitudinally in order to expose
9 their posterior part, 100 μm before the central coronal plane. The surfaces
10 were polished using increasing grades of carbide papers (P1200, P2500 and
11 P4000), using abundant quantities of PBS as a cooling agent. An alumina
12 solution of grain size 50 nm mixed with PBS was used for the final
13 polishing. After this procedure, the central coronal plane was exposed
14 (Figure 1a.iv). Finally, an ultrasonic bath with PBS was performed for 120 s
15 to remove all residues.

16 After testing along the transverse direction (Figure 1b), samples were
17 ground and polished to expose femur cross sections. To ensure the
18 perpendicularity of the surface to the bone long axis, a special custom-made
19 holder was used during grinding and polishing procedures. Carbide papers
20 P320 and P500 were used to remove material. When approaching the
21 surface of interest, carbide paper P1200, P2500, P4000 and alumina solution
22 were used for the final polishing as explained above. Three femoral shaft

1 cross sections per sample corresponding to the proximal, central, and distal
2 positions along the long axis of the bone were exposed for testing in the
3 longitudinal direction (Figure 1b). These three testing locations were
4 selected in order to have distinct regions on the femur shaft, which were as
5 far apart as possible but still on the cylindrical portion of the shaft. All
6 samples were then washed in an ultrasonic bath as previously described.

7 Finally, samples were wrapped in PBS soaked gauze, snap frozen, and
8 stored at -20°C. Directly before testing, samples were thawed and
9 subsequently immersed in PBS at room temperature for 30 minutes to
10 assure hydration.

11 **2.2 Nanoindentation tests**

12 This subchapter starts by describing the characteristics of the
13 indentations we performed. The locations of the indents are subsequently
14 explained in Section 2.2.1 and 2.2.2. Before testing, the topography on
15 regions of at least 0.01 mm² of all polished surfaces was measured with an
16 optical profilometer (PLu neox, Sensofar-Tech, Terrassa, Spain). Linear
17 profilometries with a total length of 2 mm were traced on these surfaces,
18 avoiding canals and lacunae present on the lines. The profilometries were
19 analysed with SensoMap 6.1 (Sensofar-Tech, Terrassa, Spain). The average
20 sample surface roughness (Ra) was controlled in the region to be indented
21 and only surfaces with roughness less than 0.05 µm were accepted for
22 indentation [25].

1 Nanoindentation tests on the femoral shafts were performed with a TI
2 900 Triboindenter (Hysitron Inc., Minneapolis, MN, USA) with a
3 Berkovich tip. A fused silica reference sample was used to calibrate the tip
4 area function and machine compliance by performing one hundred
5 indentations between 100 and 10 000 μN maximum force [26]. A ramp-and-
6 hold protocol with a maximal load of 6000 μN was applied. A loading rate
7 of 300 $\mu\text{N/s}$, a holding time of 30 s at maximal load, and an unloading rate
8 of 900 $\mu\text{N/s}$ were chosen to perform the measurements. The 30 s holding
9 time was adopted to eliminate creep effects [27]. Sets of six indentations
10 each were performed for the three regions in each sample. At the beginning
11 of each set, an optical calibration was performed on an aluminium reference
12 sample to ensure the correct positioning of the tip on the sample. All
13 indentations were located in the cortical bone at equal distance from
14 periosteum and endosteum (Figure 1c). A 100 μm distance from the edge of
15 the orthogonal surface was taken for avoiding regions where grinding or
16 cutting might have generated microfractures in the bone. Rows of
17 indentations with 30 μm spacing were taken at each site. Since the area of
18 imprint was approximately 10 μm^3 , which corresponds to a contact diameter
19 of about 7 μm , no overlap between indents occurred [21]. A total of 648
20 indentations were performed.

21 The Oliver-Pharr method [28] was applied to evaluate the reduced
22 modulus and hardness of the tissue from the unloading branch of the load-

1 depth indentation curve. This method assumes that the unloading part of the
2 load-displacement graph is linear elastic which explains the elastic contact
3 stiffness (S) and the reduced elastic modulus (E_r) as:

$$E_r = \frac{1}{\beta} \frac{S \sqrt{\pi}}{2 \sqrt{A}} \quad (1)$$

4
5
6
7 where β is the geometrical parameter and A is the contact area. The value
8 for S was evaluated by fitting the unloading segment from 95% to 40% of
9 the maximum load. The hardness (H) can be found as the maximum load
10 (P_{max}) divided by the contact area (A):

$$H = \frac{P_{max}}{A} \quad (2)$$

14 **2.2.1 Experiments in the transverse direction**

15 The proximal indentations in the transverse direction were located
16 distally from the third trochanter of the femurs on their lateral side. This
17 corresponds to 45% of the whole femoral length. The central indentations in
18 the longitudinal direction were performed at 65% of the total femoral
19 length; whereas, the distal indentations were performed at 80% of the whole
20 femoral length (Figure 1b). Before every set of six indentations, the sample
21 was re-immersed in PBS for 5 minutes for rehydration and the surface was

1 wiped with Kimtech tissue paper (Kimberly-Clark, Irving, TX, USA) to
2 remove excessive water.

3 **2.2.2 Experiments in the longitudinal direction**

4 Indentations in the longitudinal direction were located in accordance to
5 the indentation location in the transverse direction. The cross-sections were
6 indented at 45% (proximal), 65% (central), and 80% (distal) of the femoral
7 length, starting proximally. The indentations were performed in a curved
8 line to keep indentations in the central portion of the cortical bone (Figure
9 1b).

10 **2.3 Statistical analysis**

11 Statistical analysis was performed using R Statistical Software
12 (Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). Student t-tests
13 were performed between the longitudinal and transverse directions in the
14 three regions of interest (proximal, central, and distal locations), on reduced
15 modulus and hardness for both orientations (e.g.: reduced moduli of
16 indentations in transverse direction in proximal location vs. reduced moduli
17 of indentations in longitudinal direction in proximal direction). A one-way
18 ANOVA with Bonferroni *post-hoc* test was performed between the three
19 regions of interest on reduced modulus of indentations in the same
20 orientation. It was therefore performed between the proximal, central, and
21 distal locations. The same statistical analysis was also performed for
22 hardness in the mentioned regions. Moreover, a paired sample t-test was

1 performed between the results obtained on left femurs and right femurs.
2 Mean reduced moduli and hardness between the respective regions (e.g.
3 reduced moduli in the transverse central region of left vs. right femurs) were
4 tested for bilateral differences. For investigating possible correlations
5 between the longitudinal and transverse direction for reduced modulus and
6 hardness, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed.

7

8 **3. Results**

9 Figure 2 depicts examples of load-displacement curves obtained in this
10 study. Figure 2a shows representative curves for longitudinal (red curve)
11 and transverse (blue curve) directions in the central region of sample M1L
12 (mouse 1, left leg). A difference in penetration depth is evident. Figure 2b
13 presents load-displacement curves obtained for the six indents along the
14 longitudinal direction in the proximal region of sample M1L. Indents within
15 the same region tend to have similar penetration depth.

16 Two set of indentations were discarded due to a misplacement of the
17 indents (transverse indentation of samples M4L central and M5L distal).
18 Mean results for reduced modulus of the set of six indents for transverse and
19 longitudinal directions range between a minimum mean of 6.75 ± 0.50 GPa
20 (sample M2R, transverse direction, proximal region) and a maximum mean
21 of 23.81 ± 2.47 GPa (sample M5R, longitudinal direction, proximal region).
22 Mean hardness for the set of six indents along transverse and longitudinal

1 directions range between a minimum of 0.38±0.068 GPa (sample M5R,
2 transverse direction, central region) and a maximum of 0.82±0.092 GPa
3 (sample M6R longitudinal, proximal region). The results of reduced
4 modulus and hardness for each set of indentation in form of bar charts can
5 be found in the supplementary material (Figure S.1).

6 The mean values and standard deviations of reduced modulus and
7 hardness for the three analysed regions (proximal, central, and distal) are
8 reported in Figure 3 (numerical values provided in the supplementary
9 material; Table S.1). The anisotropy ratio is defined as ratio between the
10 longitudinal and transverse value of the mechanical property of interest.
11 Mean anisotropy ratios for both measurements are also shown in Figure 3.
12 Anisotropy ratios for the reduced modulus are of 1.72±0.40 (proximal),
13 1.75±0.69 (central), and 1.34±0.30 (distal), whereas ratios for the hardness
14 are of 1.35±0.27 (proximal), 1.35±0.47 (central), and 1.17±0.19 (distal). We
15 observed significant differences between the longitudinal and the transverse
16 direction for both reduced modulus and hardness. P-value is lower than
17 0.001 in all cases except for the hardness between the two directions in the
18 distal position ($p < 0.01$). Moreover, significantly lower values of reduced
19 modulus in the longitudinal direction are detected in the distal region as
20 compared to the proximal and central regions ($p < 0.01$), whereas for
21 hardness in the longitudinal direction only the proximal region significantly
22 differs from the distal region ($p < 0.01$). No statistical difference was

1 observed in mean reduced modulus and hardness between the results from
2 left and right femurs in transverse and longitudinal directions.

3 A scatter plot of the reduced modulus and hardness values in the two
4 orthogonal directions is depicted in Figure 4. No correlation is observed
5 between longitudinal and transverse directions for either reduced modulus
6 or hardness.

7 Reduced modulus and hardness for each single indentation can be found
8 in the supplementary material in .xls and .sav format.

9

10 **4. Discussion**

11 This study aims at the investigation of the anisotropic mechanical
12 properties of the mouse femur by performing indentation tests in transverse
13 and longitudinal directions in three locations of the femoral shaft. The
14 mechanical properties of mouse cortical bone were already evaluated at the
15 microscale in various studies [29-32]. The values of reduced modulus and
16 hardness found in this work are lower compared to the literature data on
17 mouse bone. Differences in the indentation protocol and method used for
18 data analysis can influence the results [5]. Nevertheless, the main factor
19 leading to these higher values is tissue dehydration. In our study,
20 experiments were performed on wet bone, whereas most studies are
21 performed on dry tissue, which causes an increase of both reduced modulus
22 and hardness by 20-30% [33]. This holds true also for studies on human or

1 bovine bone [33-35]. Other studies with experiments performed in a wet
2 environment and along orthogonal directions found results in line with our
3 data [36-38].

4 Large animals present structures which encompass many hierarchical
5 levels and make a comparison with the simpler circumferential lamellar
6 structure of the mouse femur rather difficult. Collagen fibres' orientation
7 within the osteon is believed to be the principal reason for differences in the
8 micromechanical properties in cortical bone along different directions in
9 large animals and humans [20, 39-41]. Rodent bone does not present an
10 osteonal structural organization, but their collagen fibres are also mainly
11 oriented in an axial direction in their long bones [42]. Literature studies on
12 human and bovine bone found an anisotropy ratio of around 1.5 for the
13 elastic properties at the microscale [13, 14, 17, 18, 43-45]. Hardness was
14 investigated in significantly less studies with anisotropy ratios varying from
15 1.1 to 1.3 [17, 18, 44]. The mentioned ratios are similar to what is obtained
16 in our study on mouse femurs (see Results section and Figure 3). A
17 difference in the anisotropy ratio between reduced modulus and hardness is
18 also found. While the reduced modulus represents the elastic behaviour of
19 the tissue, the hardness is related to failure mechanisms such as slippage at
20 the collagen-mineral interface [46], phase transformation of the mineral
21 phase [47], and sacrificial bond disruption between fibrils [48] that
22 determine its inelastic deformation. As the hardness of the tissue is less

1 anisotropic than its reduced modulus, there is evidence that these inelastic
2 phenomena contribute to a reduction in the anisotropy in the failure
3 behaviour compared to the elastic behaviour.

4 The mean anisotropy ratios of the reduced modulus and hardness found
5 in this study (Figure 3) are similar in the proximal and central regions.
6 However, lower values are obtained in the distal region. This difference can
7 be attributed to the micromechanical properties in longitudinal direction,
8 which differ from proximal and central regions. Indeed, the mean value of
9 the distal longitudinal indentations is significantly lower to at least one of
10 the other two groups of longitudinal indentations for both the reduced
11 modulus and hardness ($p < 0.001$). It is challenging to find a reason for the
12 behaviour in this region of the femoral shaft, as differences in mechanical
13 properties compared to the other two regions are not found in the transverse
14 direction. It is possible that the change in geometry in this part of the
15 femoral shaft leads to these lower values, since the distal part of the femur
16 tends to gradually increase its diameter toward the condyle. This could
17 cause the collagen fibres to no longer be parallel to the indentations in the
18 longitudinal direction. On the other hand, transverse indentations could still
19 be perpendicular to the collagen fibres, a fact that would justify the
20 similarity of the results in the proximal and the central region.

21 In studies focusing on the microscopic properties of bone, a higher
22 variance in modulus and hardness of the indentations in transverse direction

1 is often observed [13, 14, 17, 18, 49]. This is also the case for our
2 experiments, where the relative standard deviation in the transverse
3 direction is always higher compared to the longitudinal direction. This
4 general behaviour could possibly be explained by the structure of the
5 collagen bundle. It is hypothesized that the collagen fibres tends to structure
6 themselves in bundles which might be cemented together thanks to non-
7 collagenous proteins [50, 51]. Therefore, the larger variability in mechanical
8 responses when indenting perpendicularly to them might be due to the
9 presence of a less heterogeneous structure in the transverse compared to the
10 longitudinal direction due to the preferred axial directionality of the
11 bundles. However, these remain hypotheses since the existence of bundles
12 is still debated. It is also worth noticing that the higher variation of elastic
13 properties in the transverse direction was observed at the mesoscale in
14 cortical portions of long bones in larger animals [13, 19, 49, 52] and it also
15 seems that the larger variability when indenting perpendicularly is reflected
16 at the whole bone level.

17 It is known from literature that a strong correlation exists between the
18 reduced modulus and hardness in the same direction [53]. High correlation
19 was found in our data as well (transverse $R^2=0.81$, $p<0.01$; longitudinal
20 $R^2=0.68$, $p<0.01$). On the other hand, it is interesting to observe that no
21 correlation was found between the transverse and longitudinal direction
22 within single regions either for the reduced modulus or for hardness (Figure

1 4). Apparently, the micromechanical properties of the bone in longitudinal
2 directions seem not to be a strong predictor of the properties in the
3 transverse direction and vice versa.

4 Some limitations of this study warrant discussion. The microscope
5 positioning system was calibrated relative to the nanoindenter before every
6 set of indentations to assure that the indent location was effectively distant
7 from lacunae. However, it is uncertain whether a lacuna might be positioned
8 under the indentation point and hence jeopardize the results. Our set
9 encompassing 6 indentations should partially correct this potential bias. Due
10 to the high number of indentations, multiple freezing and thawing of the
11 samples was necessary. This procedure has the potential to partly alter
12 mechanical properties. However, we paid attention to creating conditions
13 for a rapid transition from 0°C to -10°C, as this is known to be critical for
14 avoiding destructive ice crystals [5]. In this study, we did not perform whole
15 bone mechanical testing (e.g. torsion testing or 3-point-bending) due to the
16 limited amount of samples at our disposal. However, this might have been
17 beneficial in order to better understand the implications of the
18 micromechanical properties at a whole bone level.

19

20 **5. Conclusions**

21 In this manuscript, we investigate the anisotropic micromechanical
22 properties of the mouse femur by nanoindentation. The reduced modulus

1 and hardness of femoral mouse cortical bone were measured in three
2 distinct regions both in the longitudinal and transverse directions.
3 Anisotropy ratios were found in proximal, central, and distal regions of the
4 mouse femur shaft. However, a clear intrasample correlation between
5 transverse and longitudinal planes in term of elastic properties and hardness
6 is missing. This leads to a high standard deviation of the anisotropy ratios in
7 all three of the analysed regions. Therefore, it seems that relevant
8 mechanical properties on orthogonal planes cannot be inferred from
9 measurements in a single direction in individual samples. This finding
10 suggests that the measurement of micromechanical properties in the femoral
11 shaft in multiple directions is necessary in order to obtain a precise
12 phenotyping.

13

14 **Ethics**

15 Necessary licence and approval to perform the experiments were
16 granted by the local animal ethics committee of our veterinary authorities
17 (Kantonales Vetrinaeramt Zuerich, Zurich, Switzerland; licence number
18 194/2011).

19

20 **Data accessibility**

1 The datasets supporting this article have been uploaded as part of the
2 supplementary material and on the Dryad Digital Repository:
3 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.h5p79> [54].
4

5 **Authors' contributions**

6 Michele Casanova conceived, designed and coordinated the study; he
7 completed the data analysis and drafted the manuscript. Anna Balmelli
8 carried out sample preparation and indentations. Davide Carnelli helped
9 with the design of the experiments and the draft of the manuscript. Diana
10 Courty helped with the indentation protocol and supervised the indentations.
11 Philipp Schneider revised the manuscript. Ralph Müller helped with the
12 design of the study and the draft of the manuscript. All authors gave final
13 approval for publication.
14

15 **Competing interests**

16 We have no competing interests.
17

18 **Funding**

19 This project has been assisted by funding from the Institute for
20 Biomechanics, ETH Zurich.
21

22 **Acknowledgements**

- 1 The authors would like to thank Beatrice Wegmann and Michael
- 2 Pedroni for their technical assistance.
- 3

1 **References**

- 2 [1] Weiner, S. & Wagner, H.D. 1998 THE MATERIAL BONE:
3 Structure-Mechanical Function Relations. *AnRMS* **28**, 271-298.
4 (doi:10.1146/annurev.matsci.28.1.271).
- 5 [2] Buehler, M.J. 2007 Nano- and micromechanical properties of
6 hierarchical biological materials and tissues. *JMatS* **42**, 8765-8770.
7 (doi:10.1007/s10853-007-1952-8).
- 8 [3] Holstein, J.H., Garcia, P., Histing, T., Klein, M., Becker, S.C.,
9 Menger, M.D. & Pohlemann, T. 2011 *Mouse Models for the Study of*
10 *Fracture Healing and Bone Regeneration*. London, Springer-Verlag;
11 175-191 p.
- 12 [4] Elefteriou, F. & Yang, X. 2011 Genetic mouse models for bone
13 studies--strengths and limitations. *Bone* **49**, 1242-1254.
14 (doi:10.1016/j.bone.2011.08.021).
- 15 [5] Oyen, M.L. 2010 *Handbook of Nanoindentation: with biological*
16 *applications*. Singapore, Pan Stanford Publishing.
- 17 [6] Vashishth, D., Tanner, K.E. & Bonfield, W. 2001 Fatigue of cortical
18 bone under combined axial-torsional loading. *J. Orthop. Res.* **19**,
19 414-420. (doi:10.1016/S0736-0266(00)00036-X).
- 20 [7] Einhorn, T.A. 1992 Bone strength: the bottom line. *Calcif. Tissue*
21 *Int.* **51**, 333-339. (doi:10.1359/JBMR.050211).
- 22 [8] O'Brien F, J., Hardiman, D.A., Hazenberg, J.G., Mercy, M.V.,
23 Mohsin, S., Taylor, D. & Lee, T.C. 2005 The behaviour of
24 microcracks in compact bone. *Eur. J. Morphol.* **42**, 71-79.
25 (doi:10.1080/09243860500096131).
- 26 [9] De Souza, R.L., Matsuura, M., Eckstein, F., Rawlinson, S.C.,
27 Lanyon, L.E. & Pitsillides, A.A. 2005 Non-invasive axial loading of
28 mouse tibiae increases cortical bone formation and modifies
29 trabecular organization: a new model to study cortical and
30 cancellous compartments in a single loaded element. *Bone* **37**, 810-
31 818. (doi:10.1016/j.bone.2005.07.022).
- 32 [10] Voide, R., Schneider, P., Stauber, M., Wyss, P., Stampanoni, M.,
33 Sennhauser, U., Van Lenthe, G. & Müller, R. 2009 Time-lapsed
34 assessment of microcrack initiation and propagation in murine
35 cortical bone at submicrometer resolution. *Bone* **45**, 164-173.
36 (doi:10.1016/j.bone.2009.04.248).
- 37 [11] Rho, J.Y., Tsui, T.Y. & Pharr, G.M. 1997 Elastic properties of
38 human cortical and trabecular lamellar bone measured by
39 nanoindentation. *Biomaterials* **18**, 1325-1330. (doi:10.1016/s0142-
40 9612(97)00073-2).
- 41 [12] Ferguson, V.L. & Olesiak, S.E. 2010 *Nanoindentation of bone*, Pan
42 Stanford Publishing; 185-237 p.

- 1 [13] Dong, X.N. & Guo, X.E. 2004 The dependence of transversely
2 isotropic elasticity of human femoral cortical bone on porosity. *J.*
3 *Biomech.* **37**, 1281-1287. (doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2003.12.011).
- 4 [14] Fan, Z., Swadener, J.G., Rho, J.Y., Roy, M.E. & Pharr, G.M. 2002
5 Anisotropic properties of human tibial cortical bone as measured by
6 nanoindentation. *J. Orthop. Res.* **20**, 806-810. (doi:10.1016/s0736-
7 0266(01)00186-3).
- 8 [15] Swadener, J.G., Rho, J.Y. & Pharr, G.M. 2001 Effects of anisotropy
9 on elastic moduli measured by nanoindentation in human tibial
10 cortical bone. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.* **57**, 108-112.
11 (doi:10.1002/1097-4636(200110)57:1<108::AID-
12 JBM1148>3.0.CO).
- 13 [16] Rho, J.Y., Currey, J.D., Zioupos, P. & Pharr, G.M. 2001 The
14 anisotropic Young's modulus of equine secondary osteons and
15 interstitial bone determined by nanoindentation. *J. Exp. Biol.* **204**,
16 1775-1781. (doi:10.1359/jbmr.070607).
- 17 [17] Rho, J.-Y., Roy, M.E., Tsui, T.Y. & Pharr, G.M. 1999 Elastic
18 properties of microstructural components of human bone tissue as
19 measured by nanoindentation. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.* **45**, 48-54.
20 (doi:10.1002/(sici)1097-4636(199904)45:1<48::aid-jbm7>3.0.co;2-
21 5).
- 22 [18] Carnelli, D., Lucchini, R., Ponzoni, M., Contro, R. & Vena, P. 2011
23 Nanoindentation testing and finite element simulations of cortical
24 bone allowing for anisotropic elastic and inelastic mechanical
25 response. *J. Biomech.* **44**, 1852-1858.
26 (doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2011.04.020).
- 27 [19] Iyo, T., Maki, Y., Sasaki, N. & Nakata, M. 2004 Anisotropic
28 viscoelastic properties of cortical bone. *J. Biomech.* **37**, 1433-1437.
29 (doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2003.12.023).
- 30 [20] Carnelli, D., Vena, P., Dao, M., Ortiz, C. & Contro, R. 2013
31 Orientation and size-dependent mechanical modulation within
32 individual secondary osteons in cortical bone tissue. *Journal of the*
33 *Royal Society, Interface / the Royal Society* **10**, 20120953.
34 (doi:10.1098/rsif.2012.0953).
- 35 [21] Lucchini, R., Carnelli, D., Ponzoni, M., Bertarelli, E., Gastaldi, D. &
36 Vena, P. 2011 Role of damage mechanics in nanoindentation of
37 lamellar bone at multiple sizes: experiments and numerical
38 modeling. *J Mech Behav Biomed Mater* **4**, 1852-1863.
39 (doi:10.1016/j.jmbbm.2011.06.002).
- 40 [22] Leong, P.L. & Morgan, E.F. 2008 Measurement of fracture callus
41 material properties via nanoindentation. *Acta Biomater.* **4**, 1569-
42 1575. (doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2008.02.030).

- 1 [23] Leong, P.L. & Morgan, E.F. 2009 Correlations between indentation
2 modulus and mineral density in bone-fracture calluses. *Integr.*
3 *Comp. Biol.* **49**, 59-68. (doi:10.1093/icb/icp024).
- 4 [24] Hoerth, R.M., Seidt, B.M., Shah, M., Schwarz, C., Willie, B.M.,
5 Duda, G.N., Fratzl, P. & Wagermaier, W. 2014 Mechanical and
6 structural properties of bone in non-critical and critical healing in
7 rat. *Acta Biomater.* **10**, 4009-4019.
8 (doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2014.06.003).
- 9 [25] Fischer-Cripps, A.C. 2011 *Nanoindentation*. New York, Springer.
- 10 [26] Oliver, W.C. & Pharr, G.M. 2004 Measurement of hardness and
11 elastic modulus by instrumented indentation: Advances in
12 understanding and refinements to methodology. *J. Mater. Res.* **19**, 3-
13 20.
- 14 [27] Fan, Z.F. & Rho, J.Y. 2003 Effects of viscoelasticity and time-
15 dependent plasticity on nanoindentation measurements of human
16 cortical bone. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. Part A* **67A**, 208-214.
17 (doi:10.1002/jbm.a.10027).
- 18 [28] Oliver, W.C. & Pharr, G.M. 2011 An improved technique for
19 determining hardness and elastic modulus using load and
20 displacement sensing indentation experiments. *J. Mater. Res.* **7**,
21 1564-1583. (doi:10.1557/jmr.1992.1564).
- 22 [29] Akhter, M.P., Fan, Z. & Rho, J.Y. 2004 Bone intrinsic material
23 properties in three inbred mouse strains. *Calcif. Tissue Int.* **75**, 416-
24 420. (doi:10.1007/s00223-004-0241-7).
- 25 [30] Pathak, S., Swadener, J.G., Kalidindi, S.R., Courtland, H.W.,
26 Jepsen, K.J. & Goldman, H.M. 2011 Measuring the dynamic
27 mechanical response of hydrated mouse bone by nanoindentation. *J*
28 *Mech Behav Biomed Mater* **4**, 34-43.
29 (doi:10.1016/j.jmbbm.2010.09.002).
- 30 [31] Rodriguez-Florez, N., Oyen, M.L. & Shefelbine, S.J. 2013 Insight
31 into differences in nanoindentation properties of bone. *J Mech*
32 *Behav Biomed Mater* **18**, 90-99.
33 (doi:10.1016/j.jmbbm.2012.11.005).
- 34 [32] Silva, M.J., Brodt, M.D., Fan, Z. & Rho, J.Y. 2004 Nanoindentation
35 and whole-bone bending estimates of material properties in bones
36 from the senescence accelerated mouse SAMP6. *J. Biomech.* **37**,
37 1639-1646. (doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2004.02.018).
- 38 [33] Rho, J.Y. & Pharr, G.M. 1999 Effects of drying on the mechanical
39 properties of bovine femur measured by nanoindentation. *J. Mater.*
40 *Sci. Mater. Med.* **10**, 485-488. (doi:10.1359/jbmr.070607).
- 41 [34] Hofmann, T., Heyroth, F., Meinhard, H., Franzel, W. & Raum, K.
42 2006 Assessment of composition and anisotropic elastic properties
43 of secondary osteon lamellae. *J. Biomech.* **39**, 2282-2294.
44 (doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2005.07.009).

- 1 [35] Hoffler, C.E., Guo, X.E., Zysset, P.K. & Goldstein, S.A. 2005 An
2 application of nanoindentation technique to measure bone tissue
3 Lamellae properties. *J. Biomech. Eng.* **127**, 1046-1053.
4 (doi:10.1115/1.2073671).
- 5 [36] Zysset, P.K., Guo, X.E., Hoffler, C.E., Moore, K.E. & Goldstein,
6 S.A. 1999 Elastic modulus and hardness of cortical and trabecular
7 bone lamellae measured by nanoindentation in the human femur. *J.*
8 *Biomech.* **32**, 1005-1012. (doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(99)00111-6).
- 9 [37] Hoc, T., Henry, L., Verdier, M., Aubry, D., Sedel, L. & Meunier, A.
10 2006 Effect of microstructure on the mechanical properties of
11 Haversian cortical bone. *Bone* **38**, 466-474.
12 (doi:10.1016/j.bone.2005.09.017).
- 13 [38] Bushby, A.J., Ferguson, V.L. & Boyde, A. 2011 Nanoindentation of
14 bone: Comparison of specimens tested in liquid and embedded in
15 polymethylmethacrylate. *J. Mater. Res.* **19**, 249-259.
16 (doi:10.1557/jmr.2004.19.1.249).
- 17 [39] Gupta, H.S., Stachewicz, U., Wagermaier, W., Roschger, P.,
18 Wagner, H.D. & Fratzl, P. 2011 Mechanical modulation at the
19 lamellar level in osteonal bone. *J. Mater. Res.* **21**, 1913-1921.
20 (doi:10.1557/jmr.2006.0234).
- 21 [40] Currey, J.D. 1969 The relationship between the stiffness and the
22 mineral content of bone. *J. Biomech.* **2**, 477-480. (doi:10.1016/0021-
23 9290(69)90023-2).
- 24 [41] Seto, J., Gupta, H.S., Zaslansky, P., Wagner, H.D. & Fratzl, P. 2008
25 Tough Lessons From Bone: Extreme Mechanical Anisotropy at the
26 Mesoscale. *Adv. Funct. Mater.* **18**, 1905-1911.
27 (doi:10.1002/adfm.200800214).
- 28 [42] Francillon-Vieillot, H., De Buffrénil, V., Castanet, J.d., Géraudie, J.,
29 Meunier, F., Sire, J., Zylberberg, L. & De Ricqlès, A. 1990
30 Microstructure and mineralization of vertebrate skeletal tissues.
31 *Skeletal biomineralization: patterns, processes and evolutionary*
32 *trends*, 175-234.
- 33 [43] Franzoso, G. & Zysset, P.K. 2009 Elastic anisotropy of human
34 cortical bone secondary osteons measured by nanoindentation. *J.*
35 *Biomech. Eng.* **131**, 021001. (doi:10.1115/1.3005162).
- 36 [44] Wang, X.J., Chen, X.B., Hodgson, P.D. & Wen, C.E. 2006 Elastic
37 modulus and hardness of cortical and trabecular bovine bone
38 measured by nanoindentation. *Transactions of Nonferrous Metals*
39 *Society of China* **16**, s744-s748. (doi:10.1016/s1003-6326(06)60293-
40 8).
- 41 [45] Turner, C.H., Rho, J., Takano, Y., Tsui, T.Y. & Pharr, G.M. 1999
42 The elastic properties of trabecular and cortical bone tissues are
43 similar: results from two microscopic measurement techniques. *J.*
44 *Biomech.* **32**, 437-441. (doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(98)00177-8).

- 1 [46] Mercer, C., He, M.Y., Wang, R. & Evans, A.G. 2006 Mechanisms
2 governing the inelastic deformation of cortical bone and application
3 to trabecular bone. *Acta Biomater.* **2**, 59-68.
4 (doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2005.08.004).
- 5 [47] Carden, A., Rajachar, R.M., Morris, M.D. & Kohn, D.H. 2003
6 Ultrastructural changes accompanying the mechanical deformation
7 of bone tissue: a Raman imaging study. *Calcif. Tissue Int.* **72**, 166-
8 175. (doi:10.1007/s00223-002-1039-0).
- 9 [48] Fantner, G.E., Hassenkam, T., Kindt, J.H., Weaver, J.C., Birkedal,
10 H., Pechenik, L., Cutroni, J.A., Cidade, G.A., Stucky, G.D., Morse,
11 D.E., et al. 2005 Sacrificial bonds and hidden length dissipate
12 energy as mineralized fibrils separate during bone fracture. *Nat*
13 *Mater* **4**, 612-616. (doi:10.1038/nmat1428).
- 14 [49] Shahar, R., Zaslansky, P., Barak, M., Friesem, A.A., Currey, J.D. &
15 Weiner, S. 2007 Anisotropic Poisson's ratio and compression
16 modulus of cortical bone determined by speckle interferometry. *J.*
17 *Biomech.* **40**, 252-264. (doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2006.01.021).
- 18 [50] Fratzl, P., Gupta, H.S., Paschalis, E.P. & Roschger, P. 2004
19 Structure and mechanical quality of the collagen–mineral nano-
20 composite in bone. *J. Mater. Chem.* **14**, 2115-2123.
21 (doi:10.1039/b402005g).
- 22 [51] Dunlop, J.W. & Fratzl, P. 2013 Multilevel architectures in natural
23 materials. *Scripta Mater.* **68**, 8-12.
- 24 [52] Lipson, S.F. & Katz, J.L. 1984 The relationship between elastic
25 properties and microstructure of bovine cortical bone. *J. Biomech.*
26 **17**, 231-240. (doi:10.1016/0021-9290(84)90134-9).
- 27 [53] Yang, R., Zhang, T., Jiang, P. & Bai, Y. 2008 Experimental
28 verification and theoretical analysis of the relationships between
29 hardness, elastic modulus, and the work of indentation. *Appl. Phys.*
30 *Lett.* **92**, 231906. (doi:10.1063/1.2944138).
- 31 [54] Casanova, M., Balmelli, A., D., C., Courty, D., Schneider, P. &
32 Müller, R. Data from: Nanoindentation analysis of the
33 micromechanical anisotropy in mouse cortical bone. Dryad Digital
34 Repository. (doi:10.5061/dryad.h5p79).

35

36

1 **Figure captions**

2 **Figure 1** (a) Schematic representation of the sample preparation procedure.
3 (b) Location of the indentations on the mouse femur in the proximal (P)
4 central (C), and distal (D) regions. (c) Image reporting the location of the
5 indentations in the transverse direction (white triangles). Visible lacunae
6 were carefully avoided.

7 **Figure 2** (a) Representative indentation curves along the longitudinal and
8 transverse directions in the central regions of sample M1L (mouse 1, left
9 leg). (b) Load-depth curves obtained for the six indents along the
10 longitudinal direction in the proximal region of sample M1L.

11 **Figure 3** Bar charts showing the mean value and standard deviation of
12 reduced modulus (E_r , left plot) and hardness (H , right plot) in the
13 longitudinal and transverse directions in the three analysed regions. Mean
14 anisotropy ratio for each measurement is also reported.

15 **Figure 4** Scatter plot for the reduced modulus (E_r , left) and hardness (H ,
16 right) found in the two orthogonal directions in the proximal, central, and
17 distal locations. Each element in the plot represents a specific location
18 (proximal, central or distal) of the same femur (18 femurs in total). Two
19 points were removed (central and distal regions) due to a misplacement of
20 two set of indentations. No correlation was found.

21 **Figure S.1** Values of reduced modulus (E_r) and hardness (H) for each set of
22 indentations in both transverse (left) and longitudinal (right) directions. P:

1 proximal region; C: central region; D: distal region. Mxx: mouse number
2 and right or left femur (e.g. MIL: mouse no. 1, left femur).

3 **Table S. 1** Summary of the mean values and standard deviations of reduced
4 elastic modulus and hardness found in this study together with their
5 anisotropy ratios.