

Bioactive superparamagnetic nanoparticles for multifunctional composite bone cements

Original

Bioactive superparamagnetic nanoparticles for multifunctional composite bone cements / Miola, M., Bellare, A., Laviano, F., Gerbaldo, R., Verne, E.. - In: CERAMICS INTERNATIONAL. - ISSN 0272-8842. - ELETTRONICO. - 45:12(2019), pp. 14533-14545. [10.1016/j.ceramint.2019.04.170]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2737175 since: 2019-06-25T12:48:21Z

Publisher:

Elsevier Ltd

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.ceramint.2019.04.170

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

Elsevier postprint/Author's Accepted Manuscript

© 2019. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. The final authenticated version is available online at:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ceramint.2019.04.170>

(Article begins on next page)

Manuscript Number: CERI-D-19-00671R1

Title: Bioactive superparamagnetic nanoparticles for multifunctional composite bone cements

Article Type: Full length article

Keywords: Superparamagnetic nanoparticles; bioactive nanoparticles; composite bone cement; tumor treatment.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Marta Miola, Ph.D

Corresponding Author's Institution: Politecnico di Torino

First Author: Marta Miola, Ph.D

Order of Authors: Marta Miola, Ph.D; Anuj Bellare; Francesco Laviano; Roberto Gerbaldo; Enrica Vernè

Abstract: Magnetite-based nanoparticles (NPs) were synthesized by co-precipitation process and coated with a thin layer of silica, eventually doped with calcium, by a modified Stöber method. The potential bioactive behavior of NPs was investigated by dipping samples in simulated body fluid (SBF) and analyzing them with Field-Emission Scanning Electron Microscope (FESEM) equipped with Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy (EDS). Silica-coated NPs displayed evidence of HAp grown on their surface and were then used as a filler for polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA)-based bone cement to impart bioactive and magnetic properties. The influence of the amount of magnetic NPs and the cement mixing method (manual or mechanical) were estimated in terms of NPs dispersion, compressive strength and bioactive behavior. The obtained data evidenced that both the NPs amount and the mixing method influenced the strength of the composites. A delay in the bioactivity was observed for manual mixed cement; moreover, mechanically mixed composites containing a low amount of NPs showed superparamagnetic behavior. These results suggest that the investigated composite bone cements are promising materials for the treatment of bone tumors and associated complications.



**POLITECNICO
DI TORINO**

Dipartimento
di Scienza Applicata
e Tecnologia

Turin, January 18, 2019

Dear Editor,

I would like to submit, for a possible publication on the Journal “Ceramics International”, the original paper:

“Bioactive superparamagnetic nanoparticles for multifunctional composite bone cements”

Submitted by:

Marta Miola¹, Anuj Bellare², Francesco Laviano¹, Roberto Gerbaldo¹, Enrica Verne¹

1 Institute of Materials Physics and Engineering, Department of Applied Science and Technology, Politecnico di Torino, C.so Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Torino, Italy

2 Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Brigham & Women’s Hospital, Harvard Medical School, 25 Shattuck Street, Boston, MA, 02115

In the authors’ opinion this article could improve the knowledge regarding the surface treatment of the superparamagnetic nanoparticles and the coating with silica. Moreover it can contribute to open new insights on the design of innovative PMMA-based bone cements.

Authors confirm that this manuscript is original and has not been previously published in other journals, nor is it submitted to other journals at this present time and we support that do not exist conflict of interest with no academic institution or company. Moreover, authors declare that, if the article will be accepted, it will not be published elsewhere in the same form and in any language, without the written consent of the publisher.

*** Corresponding author:**

Dr. Marta Miola

Politecnico di Torino

Department of Applied Science and Technology (DISAT)

Corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Torino, ITALY

Tel.: +39-0110904717

Fax: +39-0110904624

e-mail: marta.miola@polito.it

Marta Miola

Dipartimento di Scienza Applicata e Tecnologia

Politecnico di Torino Corso Duca degli Abruzzi, 24 – 10129 Torino – Italia

tel: +39 011.090.4717 fax: +39 011.090.4624

marta.miola@polito.it

<http://www.composites.polito.it>

Response to reviewer

We thank the Editor and the Reviewer for the useful suggestions to further improve the quality of our work. The response to reviewers and all the corrections or integrations performed in the revised manuscript are highlighted in the response to reviewers and in the text in red colour.

Reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1: This work provides results that may be of interest in biomedical applications , i.e. "a novel approach was used to develop a composite bone cement containing magnetic nanoparticles useful for hyperthermic treatment and at the same time be able to integrate with host tissue". Some extremes have to be taken into account to improve the MS:

1)In the discussion the sentence "the presence of silica coating appears to influence the mechanical strength, because probably it changes the properties at the interface. This reduction was not observed in the composites containing 10 wt% of NPs, in which the compression strength was most likely influenced by the amount of NPs" is not clear, need explanation.

A: The parameters that can influence the mechanical strength of the composite are: i) the method of mixing, ii) the amount of the NPs and the properties at the interface NPs/cement. For composites containing 5% of NPs, authors observed a decrease of strength for samples containing magnetite-silica (MS) NPs; while they noticed a comparable strength for samples containing 10% of magnetite (M) and MS NPs. Moreover the strength values of 10% containing samples are comparable with values obtained with 5% MS-containing composites (both manually and mechanically mixed). Therefore, authors supposed that up to 5% of NPs the presence of silica coating appears to be the key factor that influence the mechanical strength, while introducing 10% of NPs the mechanical strength seems to be more influenced by the amount of NPs rather than by the silica coating. The discussion has been implemented in the manuscript.

2)The number of FESEM-EDX figs. and micrographs can be reduced . Some of them are out of focus (Fig.1b,c)

A: The number of FESEM images in figures 1, 2 and 3 has been reduced as suggested; moreover, the micrograph of magnetite in figure 1 has been substituted.

3) The recent review paper : A.G.Roca,L.Gutiérrez,H.Gavilán,et al.,Design strategies for shape-controlled magnetic iron oxide nanoparticles, Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev., <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2018.12.008> , must be taking into account.

A: Authors would like to acknowledge the reviewer for the kind suggestion; even if the paper does not discuss about the design of the used nanoparticles, but it is focused on the role of silica shell in the bioactivity mechanism of magnetic NPs, the proposed review has been mentioned in the introduction.

Bioactive superparamagnetic nanoparticles for multifunctional composite bone cements

Marta Miola^{1*}, Anuj Bellare², Francesco Laviano¹, Roberto Gerbaldo¹, Enrica Verné¹

¹ Institute of Materials Physics and Engineering, Department of Applied Science and Technology, Politecnico di Torino, C.so Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Torino, Italy

² Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Brigham & Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, 25 Shattuck Street, Boston, MA, 02115

* Corresponding author

Abstract

Magnetite-based nanoparticles (NPs) were synthesized by co-precipitation process and coated with a thin layer of silica, eventually doped with calcium, by a modified Stöber method. The potential bioactive behavior of NPs was investigated by dipping samples in simulated body fluid (SBF) and analyzing them with Field-Emission Scanning Electron Microscope (FESEM) equipped with Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy (EDS). Silica-coated NPs displayed evidence of HAp grown on their surface and were then used as a filler for polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA)-based bone cement to impart bioactive and magnetic properties. The influence of the amount of magnetic NPs and the cement mixing method (manual or mechanical) were estimated in terms of NPs dispersion, compressive strength and bioactive behavior. The obtained data evidenced that both the NPs amount and the mixing method influenced the strength of the composites. A delay in the bioactivity was observed for manual mixed cement; moreover, mechanically mixed composites containing a low amount of NPs showed

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

superparamagnetic behavior. These results suggest that the investigated composite bone cements are promising materials for the treatment of bone tumors and associated complications.

Keywords

Superparamagnetic nanoparticles, bioactive nanoparticles, composite bone cement, tumor treatment

1. Introduction

The surgical treatment of primary (i.e. osteosarcoma, chondrosarcoma, Ewing sarcoma) and secondary (metastases) malignant bone tumors, consists in the removal of the tumor mass followed by wide-excision of the surrounding tissue. Patients often undergo an amputation and prosthesis application. Benign tumors (osteoma, osteoblastoma, osteochondroma) usually need less bone tissue curettage but have a high relapse frequency: thus, even in these cases, prosthesis is one of the most common solutions of reconstruction. Most patients with bone cancer in a limb undergo surgery and, in turn, need reconstructive surgery to maximize limb function [1]. The traditional approaches for these types of tumors, including chemotherapy and radiotherapy associated with surgery, are not always completely satisfactory [2,4] and contemplate the occurrence of an invalidating prosthetic treatment.

During the past, physicians have tried to utilize artificial temperature elevations for the treatment of tumor diseases. Today, this approach uses a variety of temperature ranges (from 39 – 40 °C up to 80 – 90 °C) and, accordingly, a great number of techniques to induce those temperatures under controlled conditions. The European

1 Society for Hyperthermic Oncology (ESHO) [5] officially recognized the hyperthermia
2 treatment in oncology as *“the therapy which uses the generation of a higher*
3 *temperature at a tumor-involved region of the body”*. It has been widely recognized
4 that the most beneficial contribution of hyperthermia for oncological treatments is
5 based on the enhancement of the effectiveness of other treatments (radiotherapy,
6 chemotherapy, radiochemotherapy, gene therapy, immune therapy, etc.) without
7 additional toxicity. Actually, the prevalent clinical application of this therapy is the
8 hyper thermal perfusion chemotherapy, or the increase of temperature by means of
9 microwave or radiofrequency devices. A major limitation of these procedures is the
10 need to repeat the treatments by means of invasive approaches, if a single treatment
11 is not sufficient [6]. The use of implantable magnetic materials has also been
12 attempted to overcome the limits of hyper thermal perfusion, with a specific indication
13 for bone tumors [7-9]. These materials can be implanted into the cavity created by the
14 removal of the tumor, and can be heated by using an alternating magnetic field,
15 through hysteresis loss and induced eddy currents, causing the indirect heating of
16 nearby tissue. Up to now, the magnetic materials used for this purpose comprise metal
17 alloys (Fe, Co, Ni), oxides (Fe_2O_3 , Fe_3O_4), ferrites (LiFe_5O_8 , MgFe_2O_4) [10,11,12], often as
18 nano-sized particles dispersed in different matrices (albumin, polymers, ceramic
19 materials). The principal disadvantages are that, for their use, some of these materials
20 (such as the metal alloys) require the application of a very intense alternating field,
21 difficult to realize in a hospital. In addition, they often have very complex formulations
22 [8] and some of them are not always biocompatible. Furthermore, all these materials
23 are unlikely to integrate with the tissues, since they are based on bio-inert
24 formulations and, due to the unreliable rise in temperature, are not clinically used.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Moreover, they are not able to prevent the primary associated complications such as fractures, delayed union and pseudo-arthritis [7]. Acrylic cement is frequently used as a bone filler in the case of tumor, but it still has many shortcomings, such as low osteointegration. Several additives are proposed to address these shortcomings [13] like bioactive glasses, glass-ceramics and hydroxyapatite [14] to promote both bone bonding and mechanical properties. On the other hand, bone cements containing magnetic nanoparticles were also explored [15-17]; however, these materials are not osteointegrable. An approach to the development of bone fillers with both magnetic and bioactive properties has been reported by using materials of complex formulations (containing several phases, one for each needed feature) and without a systematic study of the proper frequency and intensity of the electromagnetic field needed for their activation [18]. In summary, none of these strategies is able to impart to an oncological bone implant all the above mentioned properties by the use of a unique multifunctional material, minimizing the influence of the different additives on its structural and handling properties. In previous papers [19-21] a bioactive and ferrimagnetic glass-ceramic containing magnetite as crystalline phase, has been developed by E. Verné and co-workers, as filler for PMMA based bone cements, with successful results in terms of mechanical properties, bioactivity, biocompatibility, ability to generate heat when activated by an alternating magnetic field, as well as selective tumoral cell death by apoptosis under exposure to magnetically induced hyperthermia. In the present paper we advanced the concept of multifunctional stimuli-responsive composite bone cements for the treatment of bone tumors and associated complications, by using silica coated magnetite superparamagnetic nanoparticles as a filler, which displayed for the first time in literature a bioactive

1 behavior. The development of bioactive and magnetic Fe-Ga nanoparticles were
2 reported by Sanchez et al., [22]; however, in this study a biomimetic method was
3
4 adopted to induce bioactivity. Instead, the magnetic nanoparticles developed in this
5
6 work possess an intrinsic bioactive behavior due to the presence of the silica shell and
7
8 thus of Si-OH groups, which act as sites for apatite nucleation.
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 **2. Experimental**

16 **2.1 Synthesis of magnetic nanoparticles**

17 *2.1.1 Iron Oxide nanoparticles synthesis (M)*

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
Magnetic nanoparticles (magnetite-based nanoparticles-M) were synthesized using
reactants purchased from Sigma-Aldrich© (St Louis, MO, USA) by employing a protocol
adapted from literature [23,24]. The co-precipitation method of nanoparticle
fabrication was used, by mixing 37.5 ml of 0.1 M ferrous chloride tetrahydrate
($\text{FeCl}_2 \cdot 4\text{H}_2\text{O}$) solution and 50 ml of 0.1 M ferric chloride hexahydrate $\text{FeCl}_3 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$
solution, under mechanical stirring (35 W Overhead mechanical stirrer, single shaft
300 rpm) while monitoring the pH of the solution. Ammonia was added dropwise until
a pH of 9.5 – 10 was attained and the solution became black due to co-precipitation of
nanoparticles. It is expected that a mixture of magnetite and maghemite should be
obtained since the synthesis was performed in air, as previously reported in the
literature [25,26]. The solution was then subjected to ultrasound for 20 min and it was
subsequently washed in two steps. Firstly, the suspension was separated under a
magnetic field using a magnet and the clear solvent was removed using a pipette. This
step was repeated three times while adding bi-distilled water to remove unreacted
chlorides and ammonia. A solution of citric acid (CA) 0.05 M was used to achieve

1 good dispersion and prevent further agglomeration [27]. The addition of citric acid to
2 the suspension lowered the pH to about 2.8 – 2.9.; then the pH was increased to 5.2 to
3
4 increase the adsorption rate. As expected, the citric acid with a pH of 5.2 showed two
5
6 carboxylic deprotonated groups that interacted with the -OH groups on the
7
8 nanoparticles. The suspension was then placed in orbital shaker (KS 4000i control,
9
10 IKA®) maintained at 80 °C and operating at 150 rpm for 90 minutes to allow
11
12 functionalization of the nanoparticles [24].
13
14
15
16

17
18 In the second washing step, a Millipore ultrafiltration device was used (Solvent
19
20 Resistant Stirred Cells – Merck Millipore). The nanoparticles suspension was washed
21
22 twice with twice-distilled water and re-suspended in twice-distilled water, while
23
24 maintaining the pH at about 11 using ammonia, to maximize the nanoparticles
25
26 dispersion. In a low basic environment the deprotonation of the third -COOH group of
27
28 citric acid is expected, enhancing electrostatic repulsion of the nanoparticles and
29
30 their dispersion in water [24].
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 *2.1.2 Coating of iron oxide nanoparticles with silica shell (MS)*

39
40 The iron oxide nanoparticles stabilized with CA were then coated with a silica shell
41
42 following the Stöber method [28]. Tetraethyl orthosilicate (TEOS) was used as silica
43
44 precursor in a mixture of ethanol and water (ethanol:water ratio was 4:1). Ammonia
45
46 was added to obtain a pH value of around 10 and the solution was kept in an orbital
47
48 shaker at 25 °C for 3 hours. Afterwards, a Millipore ultrafiltration device was used to
49
50 twice wash the suspension and remove unreacted reagents. Coated nanoparticles
51
52 were then re-suspended in water.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

2.1.3 Coating of iron oxide nanoparticles with calcium-doped silica shell (MSCa-C, MSCa-H)

For comparative purposes, with respect to the NPs bioactivity, iron oxide nanoparticles stabilized with citric acid were also coated with a calcium doped silica shell because calcium is well known for its role in the bioactivity mechanism of silica based bioactive glasses [29,30]. In fact, glasses in the CaO–SiO₂ binary system have been recognized as basic components for the most common bioactive glass compositions. It is reported that calcium ion dissolution from the glass network induces the formation of silanols (Si–OH) on the surface, due to ion exchange with H₃O⁺ ions, and increases the degree of supersaturation of the simulated body fluid with respect to hydroxyapatite. Thus, the presence of silanol groups on the surface of a bioactive glass and the release of Ca²⁺ ions are both important issues to induce nucleation of hydroxyapatite on a silica-based bioactive material.

For this purpose, iron oxide nanoparticles with a calcium-doped silica shell were also synthesized, by adapting the sol-gel process used for bioactive glasses, as reported in Borroni et al. [24]. Although calcium nitrate is usually adopted for the synthesis of sol-gel glasses, in the present work it was not used, since it requires high temperature thermal treatment (more than 600 °C) to include calcium ions in the silica network. At these temperatures the structure and properties of magnetite nanoparticles can be altered [31]. Thus, calcium citrate and calcium hydroxide (Sigma Aldrich) were selected as precursors, to prepare calcium doped silica coated magnetite (named MSCa-C and MSCa-H, respectively). Calcium ions were introduced into the iron oxide nanoparticles synthesis solution in the Si:Ca ration of 99:1. Aqueous solutions of calcium citrate (0.85 g/l) and calcium hydroxide (0.015 M) were prepared and added to TEOS, ethanol and

1 water. The suspension was maintained at 25 °C for 3 h, the obtained nanoparticles
2 were then washed using the ultrafiltration device and re-dispersed in twice-distilled
3 water.
4
5
6
7
8
9

10 **2.2 Morphological and compositional characterization of nanoparticles**

11 The nanoparticles morphology, their size distribution and the presence of silica shell
12 were investigated using FESEM (Field-Emission Scanning Electron Microscope -
13 SUPRATM 40, Zeiss, Germany) equipped with Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy (EDS).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

66 **2.3 Bioactivity test on nanoparticles**

67 The bioactivity test was performed in two different ways: in the first experiment, all
68 synthesized nanoparticles (M, MS, MSCa-C, MSCa-H) were dried in an oven at 60°C,
69 subsequently 5 mg of powder was re-dispersed in 50 ml of simulated body fluid (SBF –
70 Kokubo [32]), maintained in an orbital shaker at 37 °C for 2 weeks. At the end of the
71 test, the powders were dried and fixed on adhesive carbon tape on stub supports for
72 the FESEM and EDS analysis.

73 In the second experiment, only MS and MSCa-H were tested based on the results
74 obtained from the first experiment. In this case, in order to avoid particles
75 agglomeration during the drying process, 100 µl of nanoparticles suspension were
76 mixed with 50 ml of SBF and placed in the orbital shaker at 37 °C for 2 weeks. At the
77 end of the experiment, the SBF was removed, the nanoparticles were gently washed
78 with twice-distilled water and a drop of solution containing the nanoparticles was

1 deposited on a copper TEM grid with carbon film (SPI Supplies® Brand Lacey Carbon
2 Coated 200 Mesh Copper Grids – JEOL S.p.A.) for FESEM-EDS analyses.
3
4
5
6

7 **2.4 Synthesis of magnetic NPs/PMMA nanocomposite bone cements**

8
9

10 Composite bone cement samples were prepared incorporating only iron oxide (M) and
11 silica-coated iron oxide nanoparticles (MS) on the basis of the results obtained from
12 nanoparticle characterization, particularly from the bioactivity evaluation.
13
14
15

16 Commercial bone cements, like the Surgical Simplex® P (Stryker Orthopaedics Inc,
17 Mahwah, NJ) used in this work, are provided in two-components in the form of a
18 powder and a liquid, respectively. The two components are mixed directly in the
19 operating room and a free-radical polymerization of the monomer occurs when the
20 initiator contained in the powder is mixed with the accelerator contained in the liquid
21 monomer. The bone cement viscosity changes over time from a slurry into dough like
22 state that can be safely applied and then finally hardens into solid material [33].
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 The Simplex® bone cement powder consists in 15% (by weight) of PMMA, 75% of
35 MMA-styrene copolymer (named simply *PMMA powder* from now on), 1.5 % BPO
36 (benzoyl peroxide initiator) and 10% barium sulfate as radio-opaque phase. The liquid
37 component consists of 97.4 % MMA, 2.6 % DMPT (N,N-Dimethyl-p-toluidine activator)
38 and 89 ppm of hydroquinone stabilizer. The preparation of the plain bone cements
39 consisted of the following steps:
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

- 51 i. PMMA powder was placed in the mixing cartridge (40 g)
- 52 ii. The monomer was added (20 ml).
- 53
54
55
56
57 iii. The slurry was stirred for 1 minute. During mixing, after 20 seconds, total
58 wetting of the powder by the monomer was achieved.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

iv. The obtained dough was extruded using a Stryker cement gun into molds to fabricate mechanical test specimens. Hardening was complete after 7 – 9 minutes.

2.4.1 Investigation of the sequence for bone cement synthesis

The nanocomposite bone cement was prepared by following different strategies. Three methods of mixing were investigated in order to determine the best mixing sequence to be followed in the production of the samples. In each case, the amount of nanoparticles was estimated to be 10% by weight relative to the polymeric powder. For these tests only pure magnetite powder was used (Composite samples named S+M).

Method # 1: the magnetic suspension of nanoparticles functionalized with citric acid was dried at 60 °C and dispersed in the liquid MMA in an ultrasound bath for 10 min. Then MMA + NPs and PMMA powder were mixed together.

Method # 2: the magnetic suspension of nanoparticles functionalized with citric acid was mixed with ethanol directly in the PMMA powder. The mixture obtained was dried overnight at 37 °C. Subsequently MMA was added to for the synthesis of cement.

Method # 3: In this method, pure magnetic nanoparticles were separated from the liquid and re-dispersed in MMA by decanting the water after separation of the suspension using a magnet (without drying the particles). The liquid monomer was added to the wet particles and thereafter mixed with PMMA powder. The presence of water, which remains adsorbed on NPs, reduced the duration of the polymerization.

The first mixing sequence (*Method # 1*) appeared to be the most appropriate as determined by preliminary SEM characterization, and was adopted for all the

1 subsequent preparations. The liquid suspension of magnetic nanoparticles was
2 dehydrated in an oven at 60 °C prior to preparation of composite cements. During the
3
4 dehydration process, it is possible to lose the nano-metric structure, so the dried
5
6 powders were fragmented using mortar and pestle and subsequently its suspension in
7
8 monomer was subjected to 30 minutes of ultrasound to reacquire the initial nanoscale
9
10 dispersion.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 *2.4.2 Synthesis of composite bone cements: mixing methods*

19
20 The mixing step was then further optimized, in order to evaluate the efficacy of hand
21
22 and mechanical mixing, as follows. Both 10 wt% and 5 wt% of nanoparticles by weight
23
24 of cement powder was evaluated.
25
26
27

28 *Hand mixing*

29
30 A normal cartridge mixer was employed, using the following procedure:
31
32

- 33 i. the powder was placed in the cartridge
- 34
- 35 ii. the liquid monomer containing the dispersed nanoparticles were added
- 36
- 37
- 38 iii. the cartridge mixer was closed
- 39
- 40
- 41 iv. the vacuum pump was turned on
- 42
- 43
- 44 v. the cement was agitated and mixed by moving up and down the upper ring of
45
46 the device
- 47
- 48
- 49 vi. the cement was shaken for one minute
- 50
- 51
- 52 vii. the vacuum pump was turned off and the cartridge was inserted into the
53
54 cement gun
- 55

56
57 Three kind of materials were prepared: pure Simplex[®] as already used in clinical
58
59 applications (S), Simplex[®] + pure magnetite nanoparticles (S+M) to evaluate the
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 dispersion of the magnetic material into the acrylic cement and Simplex[®] + silica
2 coated magnetite nanoparticles (S+MS) as the final nanocomposite. As previously
3 mentioned, Ca-doped MS were not used as filler based on the results obtained from
4
5 bioactivity test.
6
7

8 9 *Mechanical mixing*

10 For mechanical mixing, the cartridge mixer was modified in order to fix the stirring
11 shaft into a standard chuck. The upper ring was cut and the plastic collar was
12 contoured to fasten it through the jaws without introducing eccentricity in the rotation
13 of the shaft. In this manner, it was possible to control the mixing speed using the
14 overhead mechanical stirrer controls (IKA[®], the EUROSTAR power control-visc), like the
15 one used in the nanoparticle preparation. Vacuum mixing was also employed in this
16 method using a vacuum pump. The maximum possible output recorded on the shaft
17 was 105 W with a chuck torque of 60 N·cm and a speed between 50 and 2.000 rpm.
18
19

20 There were two methods employed in the preparation of the nanocomposite samples.
21 One uses the same hand mixing with the mixing cartridge under vacuum; the second
22 uses the overhead mechanical stirrer to perform a high speed agitation. Four different
23 speeds were investigated (250, 500, 1000, 1500 rpm) in order to compare the
24 compressive strength of the cement compared to that of hand mixed cements. Pure
25 Surgical Simplex[®] P was used for this test. Each trial was conducted following the ISO
26 5833 standard [34]. During this test, the working time of cements was evaluated, in
27 order to verify any correlation with the mixing speed.
28
29

30 The best two preparation methods were finally used to cast all samples needed for the
31 complete mechanical, morphological and *in vitro* characterizations. All samples were
32 machined for a better grade of finish. Seven groups of cements were prepared:
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

2.5 Morphological-compositional and physical characterization

Morphological-compositional characterization of the composite bone cements was performed by means of field emission scanning electron microscopy (FESEM, SUPRATM 40, Zeiss) equipped with energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS).

Density measurement was carried out on the commercial cements using the *Mohr's balance* in order to estimate eventual differences between manually and mechanically mixed cements.

2.6 Mechanical characterization of nanocomposite bone cements: compression test

Following the ISO standard 5833-2002 [34], compression tests were performed in order to assess the mechanical behavior under compression load. Cements with all concentrations of nanoparticles were investigated and compared with the pure PMMA-based Surgical Simplex[®] P.

A Single Column Frame eXpert 5601 Modular Universal Testing Systems with the eP2 Digital closed loop servo controller and CPC-116-B-AL platens (Admet Inc, Waltham, MA) was used to determine the compressive strength of the samples. In according with the standard, samples were mixed for 1 min and cast into a stainless steel mold with five cylindrical holes (inner diameter 6 mm, inner depth 12 mm) for 24 hours.

The samples were taken out from the mold after they had fully set and using emery paper to reduce the stress concentration at the edges of the cements. In some cases, the superior and inferior faces were machined with a laser cut edge in order to create two parallel surfaces. The compression test was, then, performed according to Annex E

1 of the ISO standard [34]. This test was performed on at least 5 specimens for each type
2 of material.
3
4
5
6

7 **2.7 Bioactivity evaluation of the nanocomposite cements**

8
9
10 The study was planned to evaluate different stages of bioactivity of composite samples
11 (Simplex[®] P + magnetite-silica, 5 and 10%wt) immersed in SBF [31] for different lengths
12 of time (7, 14 and 30 days) in an incubator at 37 °C ± 1,5 °C, as conducted on pure
13 nanoparticles
14
15
16
17
18

19 The solution was refreshed every 2-3 days. During refreshes pH values were recorded
20 in order to monitor if ions release could change the pH of solution appreciably.
21
22

23 The amount of SBF solution (25 ml) was defined in accordance to Kokubo's protocol.
24
25 When the samples were removed from the SBF they were gently rinsed in twice-
26 distilled water and left to dry at room temperature [32]. Characterization after soaking
27 in SBF was performed by FESEM-EDS analyses.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **2.8 Magnetic characterization of composite bone cements**

40
41 The magnetic properties of composite cements (containing 5 wt% NPs and
42 mechanically mixed) were investigated with a DC magnetometer/ AC susceptometer
43 (Lakeshore 7225) equipped with a Cryogen-Freemagnet at room temperature in quasi
44 static condition.
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Magnetic hysteresis cycle measurements were performed using a magnetic field up to
52 800 kA/m, in order to estimate the main magnetic parameters of the materials and the
53 influence of the silica coating.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

3. Results

3.1 Magnetic nanoparticles characterization

All the prepared NPs exhibited a magnetic response (Figure 1a). As reported in a previous study [24] all the synthesized NPs revealed superparamagnetic behavior, with saturation values in a range of 30-60 emu/g and no coercivity. Figure 1a reports the magnetic attraction of the dried magnetite (M) powders.

SEM image (Figure 1b) of M nanoparticles showed evidence of a pseudo spherical shape with diameter between 5 and 15 nm. The EDS compositional analysis (Figure 1c) revealed peaks of iron (Fe) and oxygen (O). All other elements, such as copper (Cu) or carbon (C) that appeared on the spectrum came from the stub and the grid.

The silica-coated magnetite nanoparticles (MS) and Ca-containing magnetic nanoparticles did not revealed any substantial differences in comparison with pure magnetite (M) in terms of size and morphology (data not reported). EDS analysis of MS showed evidence of the presence of a silicon peak (Figure 1d) in addition to iron and oxygen; while EDS analysis of MSC-H (Figure 1e, as example) showed evidence of a Ca peak. The TEM analyses of all synthesized nanoparticles are reported in a previous work [24], this study showed evidence of a pseudo-spherical shape of all nanoparticles and the presence of a silica shell of about 1-2 nm around the magnetic core of MS, MSCa-C and MSCa-H.

3.2 In vitro bioactivity of nanoparticles

First experiment

Pure magnetite (M) samples did not show any morphology ascribable to hydroxyapatite (HAp) precipitates (Figure 2a). Only in some areas of the sample

1 (evidenced with an arrow in figure 2) EDS analysis (Figure 2b) revealed the presence of
2 Ca and P peaks but in a small amount, which can be due to a few calcium phosphate
3 precipitates.
4

5
6
7 Silica-coated NPs (MS), after immersion in SBF, showed the typical morphology of *in*
8 *vitro* grown HAp (Figure 2c). Compositional analysis demonstrated the presence of
9 sharp Ca and P peaks, with a ratio Ca/P of about 1.6, very similar to that of HAp (Figure
10 2d). MSCa-C NPs did not show the presence of HAp (Figure 2e); compositional analysis
11 of restricted areas (evidenced with arrows) showed evidence of a moderate presence
12 of P, while the Si and Ca peaks originated from the starting material (Figure 2f). The
13 same behavior was observed for MSCa-H NPs; they showed a moderate P peak, but at
14 a morphological level, the presence of similar hydroxyapatite precipitates was not
15 observed (Figure 2g and h).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 *Second experiment*

32
33
34 In the second experiment, powders weren't dried before their immersion in SBF
35 solution to avoid particle agglomeration. In this second experiment, only MS NPs and
36 MSCa-H NPs were investigated on the basis of results obtained in the first study.

37
38
39 The morphology of both tested nanoparticles appeared to have changed after the SBF
40 immersion. A reaction layer that covered the NPs (Figure 3a and d) with the typical
41 structure of the *in vitro* grown HAp was observed (Figure 3b and e). The EDS analysis
42 showed evidence of a large presence of P and Ca together with the material
43 components (Fe, Si, and O). Na and Cl peaks were due to the precipitation of NaCl salt,
44 while Mg and K (SBF components) derived probably from their introduction into the
45 apatite layer (Figure 3c and f). Unlike the first experiment, in this case, calcium
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 functionalized particles (MSC-H) showed the same behavior as silica-coated NPs; they
2 were covered by a reaction layer, composed mainly of P and Ca (EDS analysis),
3
4 indicating the bioactive behavior of the sample. This test confirmed the influence of
5
6 the agglomeration, due to samples preparation, and the exposed surface area in the
7
8 bioactive mechanism.
9
10

11
12 On the basis of obtained results, it was decided to include only the silica-coated
13
14 nanoparticles in the PMMA, since they showed a very promising bioactive behavior,
15
16 and the addition of calcium in the silica shell did not induce a significant improvement
17
18 of the bioactivity.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **3.3 Nanocomposites characterization**

26
27
28 *3.3.1 Morphological and compositional characterization of the (S+M) composites*
29
30 *obtained with the three different mixing methods.*

31
32
33 Morphological and compositional characterization was performed in order to find the
34
35 best method to synthesize the nanocomposite cement. The mixing sequence was
36
37 selected on the basis of FESEM-EDS analysis performed on magnetite-containing
38
39 composite samples (S+M), obtained by the three different mixing sequence methods,
40
41 as reported in “materials and methods” section.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 *Method # 1:* FESEM and compositional EDS measurements demonstrated the presence
50
51 of magnetite NPs well dispersed in the polymeric matrix and exposed on cement
52
53 surface (Figure 4a, b and c).
54
55
56

57 *Method # 2*
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 FESEM characterization showed evidence of only a partial exposure of magnetic
2 nanoparticles (Figure 4d, e and f). At high magnification, the surface of the composite
3 appeared smoother than those obtained with *Method # 1* (Figure 4f) and magnetic NPs
4 were not clearly visible, even if EDS analysis showed evidence of the presence of Fe
5 peak. (Figure 4e).
6
7
8
9
10
11

12 *Method # 3*

13 FESEM-EDS analyses showed evidence of the presence of NPs agglomerates
14 underneath the surface of the cement (Figure 4g, h and i).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 *3.3.2 Morphological and compositional characterization of the bone cements obtained* 24 *with the mixing Method # 1 (hand mixing).* 25 26 27 28 29 30

31 The mixing Method # 1 revealed the best results in terms of NPs dispersion and
32 appearance at the surface. So, the comparison between plain Simplex® (S) and the two
33 composites (S+M and S+MS) was performed on specimens obtained with this mixing
34 method containing 10 wt% of NPs.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Figure 5 reports the results obtained using the manual mixing method. The
42 backscattered image of pure Simplex® showed evidence of the PMMA spheres (the
43 black circles in figure 5a). The light emitting white particles refer to the barium sulfate
44 dispersed as the radiopacifier particles in the micrometer size range. A few small
45 barium sulfate agglomerates (marked with circle in figure 5a) were also observed.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 The backscattered FESEM image of the composite containing magnetite powder
54 (Figure 5b) revealed almost the same material's structure as that of pure Simplex®.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

1 agglomerates of magnetite NPs. However, EDS analysis (Figure 5c and d) showed
2 evidence of the presence of magnetite well dispersed NPs along with the
3 agglomerates.
4
5
6

7 The samples containing silica coated NPs, also revealed the presence of NPs
8 agglomerates (Figure 5e). These samples however also revealed the presence of well
9 dispersed silica coated NPs, confirmed by the EDS analysis, which showed the presence
10 of Si and Fe peaks (Figure 5f, g and h).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 *3.3.3 Mechanical mixing and its correlation with compressive strength and working* 21 *time* 22

23 The correct range of blending speed had to be established since in the literature there
24 was no data on the investigation of the speed of mechanical mixing.
25
26
27

28 As shown in figure 6, mixing speed had a strong influence on the compression behavior
29 of the material (the line at 70 MPa indicates the limit imposed by the ISO 5833
30 standard). As can be observed, a low mechanical mixing speed did not allow an
31 adequate compressive strength to be achieved; instead, by mixing at speed ≥ 1000
32 rpm the compressive strength reached optimal values higher than the limit imposed by
33 the ISO standard.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The speed was chosen to be 1500 rpm on the basis of the obtained results, which
46 allowed a compressive strength similar to the manual mixed cement of about 80 MPa
47 to be attained.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 *3.3.4 FESEM-EDS characterization of S+M and S+MS composites obtained with* 57 *mechanical mixing* 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
5 wt% NPs, 1500 rpm mixing

Composite bone cements containing 5 % in weight of NPs and mechanically mixed at 1500 rpm were investigated by means of FESEM-EDS analysis to evaluate the NPs dispersion.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
As it can be observed in figure 7, the mechanical stirring and the reduction of the weight percentage of NPs provide a better dispersions of the nanoparticles in the polymer matrix. NP agglomerates were observed in only a few regions of the samples (Figure 7b, c); however, these agglomerates were much smaller than clusters observed using 10 wt% of NPs and manually mixed. Compositional analysis of a wide area without agglomerates (Figure 10d and f) showed the presence of peaks characteristics of NPs, showing evidence of a uniform dispersion of NPs in the polymeric matrix.

31
32
33
10 wt% NPs, 1500 rpm mixing

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
Composite bone cements containing 10 wt% of magnetite and silica coated magnetite nanoparticles, prepared using a mixing speed of 1500 rpm, were characterized with FESEM-EDS (Figure 8).

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
As previously observed the high speed method improves the dispersion of the nanoparticles and a reduction in the size of clusters. Also, in this case, very few NPs agglomerates were observed and EDS analysis showed the presence of NPs and their uniform dispersion in the PMMA matrix.

54
55
56
3.3.5. Density measurements

57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
The obtained specimens were investigated after three days and the relative density was calculated by *Mohr's balance*. This test revealed no differences in cement's density

1 (Table 2), so the optimized mechanical mixing allowed cement with adequate
2 mechanical properties to be prepared.
3
4
5
6

7 *3.3.6 Compression test results*

8
9
10 As reported in literature [35], the addition of hard particles, such as magnetite, in a
11 glassy polymer can decrease the mechanical properties of the composite creating a
12 larger number of crack initiation sites. Yield and ultimate load were determined as
13 previously described for Surgical Simplex[®] P (S), S+M hand mixed 5 wt%, S+M
14 mechanically mixed 5 and 10 wt% S+MS hand mixed 5 and S+MS mechanically mixed 5
15 and 10 wt%,
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 As can be observed in figure 9, the increase of NPs fraction lead to a further reduction
26 of the mechanical properties.
27
28

29 Moreover, figure 9 demonstrated that the introduction of the silica shell decreased the
30 mechanical strength of the composite.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 *3.3.7 Composite cement bioactivity*

- 39
40
41 - 5 wt% and 10 wt% hand mixed
42

43 FESEM-EDS analyses of composite bone cements containing 5 and 10 wt % of NPs
44 manually mixed after 7 and 28 days of SBF immersion are reported in figure 10.
45
46
47

48 On all sample surfaces, it was possible to observe the presence of some precipitates;
49 EDS analyses performed on these precipitates showed evidence of (in comparison with
50 the unsoaked samples) a clear decrease of Si peak and an increase of Ca and P peaks,
51 probably due to the nucleation of hydroxyapatite precursors or its precursor. After 28
52 days of SBF treatment on composite cement surface containing 10 wt% of silica coated
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 magnetic NPs some precipitates were observed with the characteristic morphology of
2 HAp (Figure 10l-n)
3

- 4
5
6
7 - 5 wt% and 10 wt% mechanical mixed at 1500 rpm
8
9

10 Figure 11 shows the morphological and compositional analyses performed after 7, 14
11 and 28 days of SBF immersion of composite bone cements mechanically mixed
12 containing 5 and 10 wt% of silica-coated magnetite NPs. After 7 days of SBF treatment
13 a few precipitates rich in Ca were visible in figures 11a-c and 11l-n, both for 5 and 10
14 wt% of magnetic nanoparticles containing cements. After 14 and 28 days (Figure 11d-f
15 and g-l 5 wt%, Figure 11o-q and r-t 10 wt%), it was possible to distinguish the typical
16 structure of hydroxyapatite nucleated on the surface of samples. As confirmation, the
17 compositional analysis of the “cauliflower” area presents a sharp peak of calcium and
18 phosphorous. Moreover, after 28 days of immersion the ratio Ca/P (1.77 for 5 wt %
19 and 1.68 for 10 wt %) was comparable with the theoretical ratio of HAp (1.71).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 For all samples (5 and 10 wt%, mechanical and hand mixed) the pH remained within
37 the physiological range of 7 to 7.8.
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 *3.3.8 Magnetic characterization of composite bone cements*

45


46 The hysteresis cycles for composite cements containing magnetite NPs and magnetite-
47 silica NPs up to 800 kA/m are shown in figure 12. The obtained curves exhibited the
48 typical behavior of a superparamagnetic material: the coercive field and remanence
49 magnetization are negligible at room temperature. The saturation magnetization (Ms)
50 of S+M sample reached about 30 Am²/Kg, while Ms of S+MS sample was around 20
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Am²/Kg. As previously reported²¹, there was no change in the magnetic properties of both composites regardless of the weight of the silica coating.

4. Discussion

The main goal of the project was to impart bioactive and magnetic properties to the PMMA-based bone cement, generally used as filler after bone tumor removal. In the literature, a few studies reported the use of magnetic nanoparticles embedded in a polymeric matrix to treat metastatic bone tumor [15,36,37] by means of hyperthermia. While, on the basis of the authors knowledge, only a few papers considered composite bone cements, which were simultaneously bioactive and magnetic [19-21] and most of them incorporated glass-ceramic microparticles in the polymeric matrix. In this paper, a novel approach was used to develop a composite bone cement containing magnetic nanoparticles useful for hyperthermic treatment and at the same time be able to integrate with host tissue. Magnetite-based NPs, synthesized by means of co-precipitation process, were coated with a thin layer (1-2 nm) of silica, normally used to protect NPs and improve NPs dispersion. In this case, for the first time on the basis of authors knowledge, the role of silica shell in the bioactivity mechanism was investigated and compared with a silica shell-doped with Ca ions. A few authors studied the ability of silica to promote the formation and precipitation of hydroxyapatite [38]; Nayak et al., for example, showed the hydroxyapatite precipitation on amorphous silica after a few days in SBF; they reported that the mechanism of HAp formation involves the presence of Si-OH group on silica surface, which in SBF solution (pH 7.4) form a negatively charges surface:



1
2 Subsequently, the Ca^{+2} and the PO_4^{3-} group migrates to the surface, forming Ca-PO_4^{3-}
3
4 amorphous precipitates, which crystallize and form a HAp layer. Moreover, it was
5 reported that Si-OH groups provide favorable sites for apatite nucleation since they
6
7 promote the adsorption of Ca^{2+} ion and phosphate ion on the surface [39]. Moreover,
8
9 Sanchez et al. [22], investigated the bioactivity of Fe-Ga nanoparticles produced by sol-
10
11 gel. However, they induce the NPs bioactivity by immersing samples in SBF solution in
12
13 the presence of a wollastonite disk, thus realizing a biomimetic method.
14
15

16
17 The bioactivity test in SBF solution of MS and MSC NPs confirmed the ability of
18
19 hydrated silica to induce the precipitation of HAp. In the first test, only MS
20
21 nanoparticles were able to significantly promote the formation of calcium-phosphate
22
23 precipitates on their surface, while M and MSC NPs did not show the presence of HAp.
24
25 The second test, performed by preventing NP agglomeration, showed evidence that
26
27 the agglomeration state also influenced the particles reactivity, since MSC NPs were
28
29 also able to promote HAp formation. However, the presence of Ca seemed to not
30
31 influence or accelerate HAp formation. On the basis of these results, only MS NPs were
32
33 used to synthesize composite PMMA-based bone cement.
34
35

36
37 Then, the work focused on the method to disperse magnetic nanoparticles in the
38
39 cement without change their features and to verify the composite cement properties.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

From a mechanical point of view, both the mixing methods and the filler percentage can influence the strength of composite [35]. In this work, a comparison between the

1 mechanical and manual mixing (both using vacuum) was estimated: in terms of
2 compression strength. An appropriate speed of mechanical mixing allows a slightly
3 higher compression strength to be attained, using a filler load of 5 wt%. As expected,
4 the mechanical properties decreased just below the limit imposed by ISO standard (70
5 MPa) by increasing the amount of NPs. The graph of figure 9 also shows that by
6 introducing 5 wt% of NPs, the presence of silica coating appears to influence the
7 mechanical strength, because probably it changes the properties at the interface. This
8 reduction was not observed in the composites containing 10 wt% of NPs, in which the
9 compression strength seems most likely influenced by the amount of NPs. In fact, the
10 parameters that can influence the mechanical strength of the composite are: i) the
11 method of mixing, ii) the amount of the NPs and the properties at the interface
12 NPs/cement. For composites containing 5% of NPs, a decrease of strength for samples
13 containing magnetite-silica (MS) NPs was observed; while they noticed a comparable
14 strength for samples containing 10% of magnetite (M) and MS NPs. Moreover, the
15 strength values of 10% containing samples are comparable with values obtained with
16 5% MS-containing composites (both manually and mechanically mixed). Therefore, it
17 can be supposed that up to 5% of NPs the presence of silica coating appears to be the
18 key factor that influence the mechanical strength, while introducing 10% of NPs the
19 mechanical strength seems to be more influenced by the amount of NPs rather than by
20 the silica coating.

21 The *in vitro* bioactivity test of composites showed a delay of HAp formation for
22 cements containing manually mixed NPs, since precipitates rich in Ca and P with the
23 typical morphology of *in vitro* grown HAp were observed only after 28 days of
24 immersion in SBF. Whereas, the surface of composite bone cement showed

1 precipitates of Ca and P having the HAp morphology within 14 days of SBF treatment
2 (especially for cements containing 10 wt% of NPs) when the mechanical mixing
3 method was used.
4
5

6
7 This indicates that mechanical mixing effectively improves the dispersion of NPs and so
8 increase NPs surface exposed to biological fluid, thus improving the bioactive behavior
9 of the composite bone cement. Simultaneously, mechanically mixed composite bone
10 cements containing 5 wt% NPs showed a superparamagnetic behavior and
11 magnetization useful for use in hyperthermia treatment, in agreement with
12 observations by other authors [40]. Therefore, the mechanical incorporation of
13 bioactive silica-coated magnetic NPs (MS – 5 wt%) in the PMMA-based bone cement is
14 a promising composite bone cement, both magnetic and bioactive, and useful for the
15 hyperthermia treatment of cancer while simultaneously be able to integrate with peri-
16 cement bone tissue.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Conclusions**

33
34 This work demonstrated for the first time the ability of silica-coated magnetite-based
35 NPs to induce the precipitation of HAp when immersed in SBF solution. These bioactive
36 and magnetic NPs were then used as a filler for PMMA-based bone cements.
37 Composite bone cements were synthesized using different amounts (5 and 10 wt%) of
38 bioactive and magnetic NPs and using both manual and mechanical mixing methods.
39 The obtained results showed that the mechanical mixing allowed a better dispersion of
40 NPs to be achieved in the polymeric matrix than the manual method. In general, an
41 increase of the NPs amount reduced the mechanical properties, while the bioactivity
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 and the superparamagnetic properties of the composites were maintained also
2 introducing 5 wt% of NPs.
3

4
5 In conclusion, silica coated-magnetic NPs proved to be a promising filler to impart
6
7 bioactive and magnetic properties to PMMA-based bone cements, thus obtaining
8
9 multifunctional stimuli-responsive composite bone cements for the treatment of bone
10
11 tumors and associated complications.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Funding**

19
20 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,
21
22 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.
23
24
25
26
27

28 **References**

- 29
30 [1] Malawer, M.M. Helman, L.J. O'Sullivan, B. Sarcomas of bone. In: DeVita, V.T. Jr;
31
32 Lawrence, T.S.; Rosenberg, S.A. Cancer: Principles and Practice of Oncology. 9th ed.
33
34 Philadelphia, Pa: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2011; p 1578-1609.
35
36
37 [2] Siegel, R. Naishadham, D. Jemal, A. Cancer statistics, 2012. CA Cancer J Clin. 62(1)
38
39 (2012) 10-29. doi: 10.3322/caac.20138.
40
41
42 [3] Dougan, M. Dranoff, G. Immune Therapy for Cancer. Annu. Rev. Immunol. 27
43
44 (2009) 83-117. doi: 10.1146/annurev.immunol.021908.132544.
45
46
47 [4] Firczuk, M. Winiarska, M. Szokalska, A. Jodlowska, M. Swiech, M. Bojarczuk, K.
48
49 Salwa, P. Nowis D. Approaches to improve photodynamic therapy of cancer. Front.
50
51 Biosci. 16 (2011) 208-224, DOI: 10.2741/3684.
52
53
54 [5] <http://www.esho.info/professionals/hyperthermia/description/index.html>, visited
55
56
57
58
59 02/07/2018.
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 [6] Cheung, A.Y. Neyzari, A. Deep local hyperthermia for cancer therapy: external
2 electromagnetic and ultrasound techniques. *Cancer Res* 44 (1984) 4736s-4744s.

3
4
5 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6467228>

6
7 [7] Mohamed, M. Borchard, G. Jordan, J. In situ forming implants for local
8 chemotherapy and hyperthermia of bone tumors. *J. Drug Del. Sci. Tech.* 22 (5) (2012)
9 393-408. <https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:24338>

10
11 [8] Vogt, S. Büchner, H. Polymethylmethacrylate bone cement composition for
12 controlled hyperthermia treatment. Patent US2010/0160483 A1.

13
14 [9] Kawashita, M. Kawamura, K. Li, Z. PMMA-based bone cements containing
15 magnetite particles for the hyperthermia of cancer. *Acta Biomater.* 6 (2010) 3187–
16 3192, doi: 10.1016/j.actbio.2010.02.047.

17
18 [10] Challa, S.S.R.K. Faruq, M. Magnetic nanomaterials for hyperthermia-based therapy
19 and controlled drug delivery. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews* 63 (2011) 789–808.
20
21 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2011.03.008>.

22
23 [11] Roca, A.G. Gutiérrez, L. Gavilán, H. Fortes Brollo, M.E. , Veintemillas-Verdaguer, S.
24 del Puerto Morales, M. Design strategies for shape-controlled magnetic iron oxide
25 nanoparticles, *Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev.* 138 (2019) 68-104.
26
27 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2018.12.008>.

28
29 [12] Miola, M. Pakzad, Y. Banijamali, S. Kargozar, S. Vitale-Brovarone, C. Yazdanpanah,
30 A. Bretcanu, O.Ramedani, A. Vernè, E. Mozafari, M. Glass-ceramics for cancer
31 treatment: So close, or yet so far? *Acta Biomaterialia* 83 (2019) 55-70.
32
33 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actbio.2018.11.013>.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 [13] Arora, M. Chan, E.K. Gupta, S. Diwan, A.D. Polymethylmethacrylate bone cements
2 and additives: A review of the literature. World J. Orthop. 4(2) (2013) 67-74, doi:
3
4
5 10.5312/wjo.v4.i2.67.
6

7 [14] Shinzato, S. Kobayashi, M. Mousa, W.F. Kamimura, M. Neo, M. Kitamura, Y.
8
9
10 Kokubo, T. Nakamura, T. Bioactive polymethyl methacrylate-based bone cement:
11
12 Comparison of glass beads, apatite- and wollastonite-containing glass-ceramic, and
13
14 hydroxyapatite fillers on mechanical and biological properties. 51(2) (2000) 258-272,
15
16 DOI:10.1002/(SICI)1097-4636(200008)51:2<258::AID-JBM15>3.0.CO;2-S
17

18 [15] Li, Z. Kawamura, K. Kawashita, M. Kudo, T. Kanetaka, H. Hiraoka, M. In vitro
19
20
21 assessment of poly(methylmethacrylate)-based bone cement containing magnetite
22
23
24 nanoparticles for hyperthermia treatment of bone tumor. J Biomed Mater Res A.
25
26
27 100(10) (2012) 2537-2345, doi: 10.1002/jbm.a.34185.
28
29

30 [16] Harabech, M. Kiselovs, N.R. Maenhoudt, W. Crevecoeur, G. Van Roost, D. Dupré,
31
32
33 L. Experimental ex-vivo validation of PMMA-based bone cements loaded with
34
35
36 magnetic nanoparticles enabling hyperthermia of metastatic bone tumors. AIP
37
38
39 Advances 7 (2016) 056704, DOI: 10.1063/1.4973499.
40

41 [17] Tanga, Z. Wang, X. Panc, L. Hu, Y. Wu, Y. Zhang, J. Cuid, S. Kang, K. Tang, J.
42
43
44 Preparation and Characterization of PMMA-based Cements Containing Magnetic
45
46
47 Nanoparticles for the Magnetic Hyperthermia. Advanced Materials Research Online
48
49 647 (2013) 155-159, doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.647.155
50

51 [18] Takegami, K. Sano, T. Wakabayashi, H. Sonoda, J. Yamazaki, T. Morita, S. Shibuya,
52
53
54 T. Uchida, A. New ferromagnetic bone cement for local hyperthermia. J Biomed Mater
55
56
57 Res (Appl Biomater) 43 (1998) 210–214, doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-
58
59 4636(199822)43:2<210::AID-JBM16>3.0.CO;2-L.
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 [19] Miola, M. Laviano, F. Gerbaldo, R. Bruno, M. Lombardi, A. Cochis, A. Rimondini, L.
2 Verné, E. Composite bone cements for hyperthermia: modeling and characterization of
3 magnetic, calorimetric and in vitro heating properties. *Ceramics International* 43
4
5
6
7 (2017) 4831–4840, doi:10.1016/j.ceramint.2016.12.049.
8
9
- 10 [20] Verné, E. Bruno, M. Miola, M. Maina, G. Bianco, C. Cochis, A. Rimondini, L.
11
12 Composite bone cements loaded with a bioactive and ferrimagnetic glass-ceramic:
13 Leaching, bioactivity and cytocompatibility. *Mat. Sci. Eng, C: Mat. for Biol. App.* 53
14
15
16 (2015) 95-103, doi: 10.1016/j.msec.2015.03.039.
17
18
19
- 20 [21] Bruno, M. Miola, M. Bretcanu, O. Vitale-Brovarone, C. Gerbaldo, R. Laviano, F.
21
22 Verné, E. Composite bone cements loaded with a bioactive and ferrimagnetic glass-
23 ceramic. Part I: morphological, mechanical and calorimetric characterization. *J.*
24
25
26 *Biomater. App.* 29(2) (2014) 254-267, DOI: 10.1177/0885328214521847.
27
28
29
- 30 [22] Sánchez, J. Cortés-Hernández, D.A. Escobedo-Bocardo, J.C. Jasso-Terán, R.A.
31
32 Zugasti-Cruz, A. Bioactive magnetic nanoparticles of Fe-Ga synthesized by sol-gel for
33 their potential use in hyperthermia treatment. *J Mater Sci Mater Med.* 25(10) (2014)
34
35
36 2237-2242. doi: 10.1007/s10856-014-5197-1.
37
38
39
- 40 [23] Li, Z. Kawashita, M. Araki, N. Mitsumori, M. Hiraokc, M. Doi, M. Magnetite
41
42 nanoparticles with high heating efficiencies for application in the hyperthermia of
43
44
45 cancer. *Mat. Sci. Eng. C* 30 (2010) 990–996, doi :10.1016/j.msec.2010.04.016.
46
47
48
- 49 [24] Borroni, E. Miola, M. Ferraris, S. Ricci, M. Žužek Rožman, K. Kostevšek, N. Catizone,
50
51 A. Rimondini, L. Prat, M. Verné E. Follenzi, A. Tumor Targeting by Lentiviral Vectors
52
53
54 Combined with Magnetic Nanoparticles in Mice, *Acta Biomaterialia* 59 (2017) 303-316.
55
56
57 doi: 10.1016/j.actbio.2017.07.007.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 [25] Maity, D. Agrawal, D.C. Synthesis of iron oxide nanoparticles under oxidizing
2 environment and their stabilization in aqueous and non-aqueous media. *J. Magnetism*
3 and *Magnetic Mat.* 308 (1) (2007) 46-55. doi:10.1016/j.jmmm.2006.05.001.
4
5
6
7 [26] Yallapu, M.M. Othman, S.F. Curtis, E.T. Gupta, B.K. Jaggi, M. Chauhan, S.C. Multi-
8 functional magnetic nanoparticles for magnetic resonance imaging and cancer therapy.
9 *Biomaterials* 32 (7) (2011) 1890-1905. doi: 10.1016/j.biomaterials.2010.11.028.
10
11
12 [27] Campelj, S. Makovec, D. Drogenik, M. Preparation and properties of water-based
13 magnetic fluids. *J Phys Condens Matter.* 20(20) (2008) 204101. doi: 10.1088/0953-
14 8984/20/20/204101.
15
16 [28] Deng, Y.H. Wang, C.C. Hu, J.H. Yang, W.L. Fu, S.K. Investigation of formation of
17 silica-coated magnetite nanoparticles via sol-gel approach. *Colloids Surfaces A*
18 *Physicochem Eng Asp.* 262(1-3) (2005) 87-93.
19
20 <http://www.meplab.fudan.edu.cn/infonet/assays/2005/Investigation%20of%20format>
21 [ion%20of%20silica-coated%20magnetite%20nanoparticles%20via%20sol-](http://www.meplab.fudan.edu.cn/infonet/assays/2005/Investigation%20of%20format)
22 [gel%20approach.pdf](http://www.meplab.fudan.edu.cn/infonet/assays/2005/Investigation%20of%20format)
23
24 [29] Ohtsuki, C. Kokubo, T. Yamamuro, T. Mechanism of apatite formation on cao-SiO₂-
25 P₂O₅ glasses in a simulated body-fluid. *J. Non- Cryst. Solids* 143 (1992) 84-92. DOI:
26 10.1016/S0022-3093(05)80556-3.
27
28 [30] Ohtsuki, C. Kamitakahara, M. Miyazaki, T. Bioactive ceramic-based materials with
29 designed reactivity for bone tissue regeneration, *J. R. Soc. Interface.* 6 (2009) S349-60.
30 doi:10.1098/rsif.2008.0419.focus.
31
32 [31] Kalska-Szostko, B. Wykowska, U.; Satula, D. *Nordblad Beilstein J.P.* Thermal
33 treatment of magnetite nanoparticles. *Nanotechnol.* 6 (2015)1385–1396.
34 doi:10.3762/bjnano.6.143
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 [32] Kokubo, T. Takadama, H. How useful is SBF in predicting in vivo bone bioactivity?

2 Biomat. 27 (2006) 2907–2915. doi: 10.1016/j.biomaterials.2006.01.017.

3
4 [33] Vaishya, R. Chauhan, M. Vaish, A. Bone cement. J Clin Orthop Trauma. 4(4) (2013)

5
6
7 157–163. doi: 10.1016/j.jcot.2013.11.005.

8
9 [34] International standard ISO 5833 “Implants for surgery — Acrylic resin cements”

10
11
12 Second edition 2002-05-01.

13
14 [35] Rentería-Zamarrón, D. Cortés-Hernández, D.A. Bretado-Aragón, L. Ortega-Lara, W.

15
16
17 Mechanical properties and apatite-forming ability of PMMA bone cements. Materials

18
19
20 & Design. 30(8) (2009) 3318-3324. DOI: 10/1016/j.matdes.2008.11.024

21
22 [36] Harabech, M. Kiselovs, N.R. Maenhoudt, W. Crevecoeur, J. Van Roost, D.

23
24
25 Experimental ex-vivo validation of PMMA-based bone cements loaded with magnetic

26
27
28 nanoparticles enabling hyperthermia of metastatic bone tumors. AIP Advances 7

29
30
31 (2017) 056704. doi: 10.1063/1.4973499.

32
33 [37] Tang, Z. Wang, X. Pan, I. Hu, Y. Wu, Y. Zhang, J. Cui, S. Kang, J. Tang, J. Preparation

34
35
36 and Characterization of PMMA-based Cements Containing Magnetic Nanoparticles for

37
38
39 the Magnetic Hyperthermia. Advanced Materials Research Online: 647 (2013) 155-161,

40
41
42 doi:10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.647.155.

43
44 [38] Nayak, J. P. Bera, J. Bioactivity Characterization of Amorphous Silica Ceramics

45
46
47 Derived from Rice Husk Ash. Silicon, 4 (2012) 57. Doi:10.1007/s12633-010-9058-3

48
49 [39] Vallés Lluch, A. Gallego Ferrer, G. Monleón Pradas, M. Biomimetic apatite coating

50
51
52 on P(EMA-co-HEA)/SiO₂ hybrid nanocomposites. Polymer, 50 (2009) 2874–2884. DOI:

53
54
55 10.1016/j.polymer.2009.04.022.

56
57 [40] Li, Z. Kawamura, K. Kawashita, M. Kudo, T. Kanetaka, H. Hiraoka, M. In vitro

58
59
60 assessment of poly(methylmethacrylate)-based bone cement containing magnetite

61
62
63
64
65

nanoparticles for hyperthermia treatment of bone tumor. J Biomed Mater Res A.

100(10) 2012 2537-2545, doi: 10.1002/jbm.a.34185.

Captions

Figure 1: picture of magnetic nanoparticles (a), STEM and EDS analyses of M (b, d) and MS (c, e) and MSC-H (f) NPs.

Figure 2 FESEM-EDS analysis of M (a-c), MS (d-f), MSCa-C (g-i) and MSC-H (l-n) after SBF immersion, first experiment.

Figure 3: FESEM-EDS analyses of silica coated magnetite (MS, a, b, c, and d) and silica-calcium hydroxide (MSC-H) coated magnetite (e, f, g and h) after SBF immersion, second experiment.

Figure 4: FESEM-EDS analysis of composite bone cement prepared with three different methods: (a-c) method #1, (d-f) method #2, (g-i) method #3.

Figure 5: FESEM-EDS analysis of composite bone cements. Pure Simplex[®] P (a), magnetite containing cement (b, c and d), magnetite-silica containing cement (e, f, g and h)

Figure 6: compressive strength vs. speed of pure Simplex[®] P cement.

Figure 7: FESEM-EDS analysis of Simplex[®]+5 wt % magnetite (a-d) and Simplex[®]+5 wt % silica-coated magnetite (e, f) using a mixing speed of 1500rpm.

Figure 8: FESEM-EDS analysis of Simplex[®]+10 wt % magnetite (a, b) and Simplex[®]+10 wt % silica-coated magnetite (c, d) using a mixing speed of 1500rpm.

Figure 9: compressive strengths of composite bone cement (2% offset load)

Figure 10: FESEM-EDS analyses of composite bone cements containing 5 (a-f) and 10 (g-n) wt% of silica-coated magnetite NPs manually mixed after 7 (a-c, g-i) and 28 (e-f, l-n) days of SBF immersion

Figure 11: FESEM-EDS analyses of composite bone cements containing 5 and 10 wt% of silica-coated magnetite NPs mechanically mixed after 7, 14 and 28 days of SBF immersion

Figure 12: Hysteresis cycles of S+M and S+MS composite bone cement containing 5 wt% NPs

Tables

Table 1: samples acronyms, composition and mixing method.

Bone cement (acronym)	Hand mixing	Mechanical mixing	wt% of nanoparticles
Simplex [®] P (S)	X	X	0
Simplex [®] P + magnetite (S+M)	X	X	5, 10
Simplex [®] P+ magnetite-silica (S+MS)	X	X	5, 10

Table 2: average relative density evaluation of Simplex[®] P cement, hand and mechanically mixed.

Sample	Average relative density	St. deviation
--------	--------------------------	---------------

Hand mixed	49.2	2.7
Mechanical mixed	46.0	1.3

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60
- 61
- 62
- 63
- 64
- 65

Figure1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure4
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 5
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure6
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure7
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure8

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure9

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure10
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure11
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure12

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

