The Next Generation of 3D-Printed Implants Leverages Computational Design

Matthew Shomper, Not a Robot Engineering

Sponsored by Paragon Medical



The Next Generation of 3D-Printed Implants Leverages Computational Design

OMTEC | Matt Shomper | Principal Engineer



distribute without permission

OUTLINE | AGENDA

- A Little About Me coffee and computational design
- △ What is Computational Design (*hint... not AutoCAD*)
- ☐ Balancing Act of Bone *fragile ecosystem with high stakes*
- A Reducing Stiffness a general strike on hunks of metal
- History of Additive Ortho a sprint to the next-gen
- Design Limitations *how printing got ahead of the curve*
- Computational Modeling *a new solution for unmet needs*
- △ Navigating the Design Landscape *so many options, so little time...*
- △ Case Study 1 *patient-specific geometry*
- △ Case Study 2 *simulation-informed structures*
- ᢙ Wrap-up Questions

A LITTLE ABOUT ME

△4 kiddos (+1 on the way...)

- Stasia, Mo, Arrow, Tobias
- (why do we do this to ourselves...)

∩musical family

- Over 50 years combined piano experience
- △coffee obsession
 - green bean > perfect espresso
 - 9 coffee brewing methods

△expert in biomimicry for human-use

products

- o orthopedic implants
- o filtration systems
- heat transfer systems
- consumer goods (earbuds, padding, wearables) FOUNDED COMPANIES







WHAT IS COMPUTATIONAL DESIGN?

△ Computational Design ≠ Computer Aided Design (sorry AutoCAD...)

- △ Computational Design ≠ Parametric Design
- ☐ Computational Design == Algorithmic Design
- ☐ Computational Design == Systems Design





How about an illustration!



WHAT IS COMPUTATIONAL DESIGN?



WHAT IS COMPUTATIONAL DESIGN?





WHAT IS COMPUTATIONAL DESIGN?



Let's take this to 3D!



WHAT IS COMPUTATIONAL DESIGN?



BALANCING ACT OF BONE

□ Julius Wolff (19th Century)

• Wolff's Law states that bones will adapt to the degree of mechanical loading, such that an increase in loading will cause the architecture of the internal, spongy bone to strengthen, followed by the strengthening of the cortical layer. Furthermore, a decrease in stress on the bone will cause these bone layers to weaken.

□ Harold Frost (1960s)

- There exists a mechanism that monitors bone metabolism (longitudinal growth, bone modeling, and remodeling activities) in relation to mechanical usage, the "mechanostat." [4]
- Modeling adapts bone to overloads, by enhancing additions of new bone and by changing bone architecture, and remodeling adapts bone to underloads by removing bone next to marrow and conserving normally used bone [4]
- Recent Literature has affirmed the mechanostat theory and the importance of targeted microstrain for bone remodeling



BALANCING ACT OF BONE

- When metals are used, the higher stiffness of the implant results in bone loss as a result of decreased physiologic loading of the bone ^[5]
- △ Changes in cyclic bone stresses of less than 1% of the ultimate strength can cause measurable differences in bone remodeling after a period of a few months ^[6]
- Low-stiffness stems alter this pattern, leading to reduced proximal bone loss, increased proximal medullary bone hypertrophy, and no distal cortical hypertrophy, suggesting that stem stiffness has a profound effect on stress shielding. ^[7]



REDUCING STIFFNESS

- ☐ The early 2000s saw the rise of PEEK (polyether ether ketone), a bioplastic with a much closer modulus to that of bone
- Stiffness reduction in Ti implants was limited by traditional CAD and machining techniques
- Although PEEK was biocompatible, it lacked the osteogenic capabilities of titanium
- This was rectified with a titanium plasma spray, with mixed success



HISTORY OF ADDITIVE ORTHOPEDICS

- Early 1980s Chuck Hull invents stereolithography [1]
- △ Late 1980s Joseph Beaman and Carl Decker invent SLS [3]
- 1999 Earliest description of the use of 3DP in spine surgery [1]
- 2007 Earliest Patient-Specific implants being manufactured via AM^[2]
- △ 2010 One of the First FDA approvals for an AM Implant ^[2]
- 2010 2015 Era of Research / Medical Modeling / PS Guides
- △ Insertion of Laminar Screws (2010)
- Cervical Pedicle Screw Placement (2011)
- △ Screw Jigs for Complex Deformities (2015)
- 2015 Stryker Tritanium / K2M Cascadia PLIF Cage 510k
- 2016 Stryker Tritanium Acetabular Shells
- 2017 Paragon 28 Titan 3D Wedge
- △ 2017 Centinel STALIF FLX Interbody Lines (Cerv / ALIF / LLIF)
- 2019 Genesys Spine Sacroiliac Joint Fixation Screw
- △ 2020 Carlsmed aprevo Patient-Specific Deformity System
- △ 2022 Redpoint Medical Patient Specific Titanium Guides (Full Foot)



3DP Papers in Orthopedics from 1999 to 2015



3DP Topics in Orthopedics from 1999 to 2015

DESIGN LIMITASOROMASE

- By 2014, AM Metal Technology output had outpaced what designers could easily create
- Design Tools Remained Largely Parametric Solidworks, PTC Creo, NX
- Early Softwares [Grasshopper (2014), Within Medical (2014), nTopology Element (2016)]
 - Basic Latticing
 - Limited Toolsets
 - Hindered by Interoperability / Meshing
- △ nTopology Platform [2018] was introduced with implicit modeling, a kernel based off of SDF (signed

distance fields), allowing for computational design to enter the "engineering" mainstream

DESIGN LIMITASOROWASE





DESIGN LIMITASOROMUSE



State of Market pre-2020

New Innovations



DESIGN LIMITAREDOMISRY

Test Values [Preliminary Guidance for Safety and Performance Based Criteria / Bottom 25th percentile of mechanical

characteristics chosen

- ASTM F2077 Test Methods for Intervertebral Body Fusion Devices
 - 2% Compressive Yield 5000 N
 - Dynamic Compression 2000 N @ 5 Million Cycles

• ASTM F2267 - Measurements of Load-Induced Subsidence of Intervertebral Body Fusion Device under Axial Compression

- System Stiffness 1500 N/mm (Foam Stiffness 1525 N/mm)
- Device Compressive Stiffness 45000 N/mm

☐ Regulatory Requirements

- Equivalence strength requirements predicated on some already existing devices devices that "were legally marketed prior to May 28, 1976
- **Guidance** FDA's Technical Considerations for Additive Manufactured Medical Devices
- Standards
 - ASTM F3001: Standard Specification for Additive Manufacturing Titanium-6 Aluminum-4 Vanadium ELI (Extra Low Interstitial) with Powder Bed Fusion

High stiffness devices are often given a "pass" as long as they meet the structural

reauirements

 ASTM F2924: Standard Specification for Additive Manufacturing Titanium-6 Aluminum-4 Vanadium with Powder Bed Fusion

DESIGN LIMITAREIONISRY

- Design of functional structures requires a careful balancing of strength and flexibility
- △ High stiffness is correlated with subsidence and failure of fusion
- □ Insufficient strength may cause device breakage, expulsion, or too high of micro-movement
- △ An appropriate implant stiffness range will reduce the implant's "biological footprint" inside the body





DESIGN LIMITAREDOMSRY

OLD









21,786 N - 50th percentile compressive force of 510k submitted devices reviewed by FDA ^[8]

500 N - Clinically-Relevant Lumbar Intervertebral Load ^[9]

NO TWO ANATOMIES ARE THE SAME, SO WHY SHOULD IMPLANTS BE?

 \bigcirc Solution:

- Computational Modeling allows for the creation of both ordered and random structures that weren't before possible.
- Computational Modeling allows for further manipulation of said structures with functional grading (density, morphology, etc.)
- Computational FEA allows for analysis of complex structures in ways not previously possible
- Computational Modeling allows for the use of large data sets from said analyses as a feedback mechanism into the structure





From ideation to initial analysis: Less than **10** minutes

COMPUTATIONAL MODELING









Oriented Perforated Strands



Radially-Mapped Sheet-Strut Hybrid

For Lattices with the same volume fractions, intentional structural design can almost halve the stiffness while maintaining the same loading

Stochastic Lattice: Vol. - 486 mm³ Displ. - 7.5 µm Stiffness - 66 kN/mm Avg. Stress - 8.06e+07 Peak Stress - 8.06e+07

Step 1: Intentional Structure Design

nm³ m Perfe 5 kN/mm Vol. ^{3.06e+07} Displ. ^{8.06e+07} Stiffn

Perforated TPMS: Vol. - 478 mm³ Displ. - 9.3 µm Stiffness - 54 kN/mm Avg. Stress - 9.65e+07

18% reduction in stiffness



Remapped Perf. TPMS Vol. - 476 mm³ Displ. - 36.53 µm Stiffness - 13.78 kN/mm Avg. Stress - 1.66e+08

45% reduction in stiffness

By functionally grading with the von Mises stress field, we can further thin low stress areas and bolster the high stress ones. This allows us to maintain the same load without yielding while also decreasing stiffness by **more than half** from our already architected structure!

Step 2: Structure Refinement



Remapped Perf. TPMS Vol. - 476 mm³ Displ. - 36.53 µm Stiffness - 13.78 kN/mm Avg. Stress - 1.66e+08 Peak Stress - 1.72e+09



Functionally Graded Vol. - 276 mm³ Displ. - 95.25 µm Stiffness - 5.25 kN/mm Avg. Stress - 3.30e+08 Peak Stress - 3.6e+09

61% additional reduction in stiffness





Material Addition in High-Stress Areas



Material Reduction in Low-Stress Areas







NAVGAIINGTHEDESIGNLANDSCAPE





THERMUTATIONS ARE MULTI-PLICATIVE AND EXPANDRAPIDLY



NAVIGATING THE DESIGN LANDSCAPE





NAVIGATING THE DESIGN LANDSCAPE





NAVIGATING THE DESIGN LANDSCAPE



CASE STUDAMENTSPECIFIC







CASE STUDIAP2IVESTRESS STRUCTURE



Thanks for Listening!

Presentation given by: MatthewShomper Presentation given on:12June2024 Contact:<u>matt@notarobot-eng.com</u>

latticerobot.com notarobot-eng.com



THANK YOU

Learn more about OMTEC at OMTECexpo.com

