



The webcast will start in a few minutes....

Validation of a new AnyBody mandible model



Outline

- Introduction by the Host
- Validation of a mandible model
 - Different models for TMJ
 - Validation of model predictions
- Final words from the host
- Questions and answers



Michael Skipper Andersen Associate professor Aalborg University (Presenter)



Ananth Gopalakrishnan (Host)



Control Panel

The Control Panel appears on the right side of your screen.

Submit questions and comments via the Questions panel.

Questions will be addressed at the end of the presentation. If your question is not addressed we will do so by email.





AnyBody Modeling System

Musculoskeletal analysis

AnyBody Managed Model Repository

Wide range of simulation options

- Motion capture
- Ground reaction force prediction
- Imaging \rightarrow Patient-specific anatomy
- Man-machine simulations



Rasmussen et. al. (2011), ORS Annual Meeting









Load Cases for Finite Element Analysis

Surgical Planning and **Outcome Evaluation**





AnyBody Modelling System





Michael Skipper Andersen, Ph.D Associate professor Aalborg University (Presenter)



Validation of a new AnyBody mandible model

Validation of a new AnyBody mandible model









Motivation



Understanding the complex biomechanics of the mandible has multiple applications













Planar constraint model

- Point-on-plane model.
- Unilateral reaction force
- Inverse dynamics model

de Zee et al., J. Biomech, 40 (2007) 1192–1201.









Koolstra and Eijden *J. Biomech*, 30 (1997) 943–950.

Tuijt et al *J. Biomech*, 43 (2010) 1048–1054.

Penetration of approximate surface

- Forward dynamics-based models.
- Assumed muscle activations.







Hirose et al. Eur J Oral Sci, 114 (2006) 441–448.

Finite element models

- Detailed joint and disc model
- Requires loading conditions





Envisioned analysis workflow



M-Tech

Aim

Develop and validate an inverse dynamics-based subject-specific musculoskeletal mandible model

Enable prediction of

- Muscle forces
- Joint reaction forces
- Joint kinematics







Methods





Cone beam CT scan NewTom 5G, QR Verona, Italy

Segmentation done in Mimics 14.12. Materialise, Leuven, Belgium

-





Musculoskeletal model

Muscles

• 24 Hill-type muscles (de Zee et al, 2007, Koolstra and Van Eijden, 2005)

TMJ

- Point-on-Plane model (de Zee et al, 2007).
- Force-dependent Kinematics (FDK) model
 - Surface contact-based TMJ.
 - TMJ ligaments.

Anatomical skull reference frame (Frankfurt horisontal

plane)







Point-on-Plane TMJ model

Inverse dynamics

Constraints

- Left and right TMJ point-on-plane
- Medial/Lateral movement constrained

Required movement input

• 3 DOF between mandible and skull







Force-dependent kinematics (FDK)



FDK (Andersen et al, 2011)

- Simultaneously computes muscle, joint and ligament forces and internal joint kinematics.
- Uses *inverse dynamics* and *quasi-static force equilibrium* in selected DOFs.





FDK model



TMJ ligaments

TMJ contact









FDK model



FDK dofs

Required movement input

• 3 DOF between mandible and skull





Custom brace











Eight camera Qualysis system Qualysis, Gothenburg, Sweden

Nine skin markers

Eight markers on the braces









Dynamic tasks

Tasks (5 repetitions used for the analysis):

- 1. A cycling opening/closing of the mouth to a half-open position.
- 2. A cyclic movement from side to side.
- 3. Empty chewing movement, without producing a bite force (~1 Hz).
- 4. A cyclic protrusion movement (~0.5 Hz).











NextEngine Ultra HD 3D scanner NextEngine, Inc, Santa Monica, California







Brace and scan registration









Parameter study





TMJ ligament properties

M-Tech

- Stiffness: 136.2, 272.4, 544.8 [N/m].
- Reference strain: -0.04, -0.02, 0.0, 0.02, 0.04





Results





Open-close: Kinematics





Brace Point-on-plane FDK Ligament variation



Open-close: Reaction forces



Point-on-plane FDK Ligament variation





Side-to-side: Kinematics



M-Tech

Brace Point-on-plane FDK Ligament variation



Side-to-side: Reaction forces



Point-on-plane FDK Ligament variation





Conclusion

- We developed a subject-specific musculoskeletal model of the mandible.
- In general, good estimates of joint kinematics were obtained with both TMJ models.
- Differences in joint reaction force estimates were seen between the models.
- The joint kinematics and reaction forces were not more sensitive to variation in ligament properties than repeating the task five times.







- Improve the TMJ model in the FDK model.
- Develop a method to automically estimate muscle origin and insertions.
- Validate the model for more subjects.
- Apply the model to study the biomechanics of pathological cases.





Thank you!

Michael Skipper Andersen, Ph.D. Associate Professor Department of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering Aalborg University msa@m-tech.aau.dk







Webcasts

• Next webcast 15th March 2016

- "Simulating man-machine symbiosis: Improved design solutions, from ergonomics to assistive technology"
- Check our YouTube channel for previous webcast
 - Search channels for 'AnyBody Technology'
- Relevant webcasts from 2011
 - Modeling and analysis of non-conforming joints in AnyBody (I and II)
 - Analyzing non-conforming anatomical and prosthetic joints in the AnyBody Modeling System

www.anybodytech.com

• Events, dates, publication list, ...

www.anyscript.org

• Wiki, Forum







Time for questions:

