# **Supplementary Materials**

Marta Peña Fernández <sup>1</sup>, Enrico Dall'Ara <sup>2</sup>, Alexander P. Kao <sup>1</sup>, Andrew J. Bodey <sup>3</sup>, Aikaterina Karali <sup>1</sup>, Gordon W. Blunn <sup>4</sup>, Asa H. Barber <sup>1,5</sup> and Gianluca Tozzi <sup>1,\*</sup>

## **Evaluation of 'baseline' strains**

### 1. Methods

The evaluation of the baseline strains was performed in the first two consecutive datasets for the four specimens, where irradiation-induced damage was deemed as minimal. As the images were acquired in the same deformed state (i.e. 'zero-strain' repeated scans), null displacement and strain fields are expected. Therefore, any non-zero values of the measured displacement and derived strains using DVC were considered as error. Ten multi-pass schemes [1] with final sub-volume sizes ranging from 8 to 80, in steps of 8 voxels were investigated. For each sub-volume, three different parameters were computed.

- Random errors of the displacements: standard deviation of each displacement component, as in [2].
- Mean absolute strain value: average of the average of the absolute values of the six components of the differential strain, similar to MAER or "accuracy", as in [3].
- Standard deviation of the strain value: standard deviation of the average of the absolute values of the six components of the differential strain, similar to SDER or "precision", as in [3].

### 2. Results

The random errors of each component of the displacement never exceeded 0.30  $\mu$ m for the compact bone specimens and 0.33  $\mu$ m for the trabecular bone specimens (Table S1). The errors obtained for the displacements in the compact bone were higher than those for the trabecular bone in x and y directions, but lower in z direction. A trend could be observed for both bone type specimens where the higher the sub-volume size, the lower the random errors.

| Multi-pass scheme sub-volume<br>sizes (voxels) | Displacement random errors (µm) |      |      |                 |      |      |
|--|---------------------------------|------|------|-----------------|------|------|
|  | Compact bone                    |      |      | Trabecular bone |      |      |
|  | Х                               | Y    | Ζ    | Х               | Y    | Ζ    |
| 64-32-24-16-8                                  | 0.30                            | 0.27 | 0.12 | 0.32            | 0.33 | 0.26 |
| 80-40-32-24-16                                 | 0.25                            | 0.24 | 0.08 | 0.25            | 0.26 | 0.19 |
| 96-48-40-32-24                                 | 0.23                            | 0.23 | 0.07 | 0.23            | 0.24 | 0.18 |
| 112-56-48-40-32                                | 0.23                            | 0.23 | 0.07 | 0.20            | 0.21 | 0.17 |
| 128-64-56-48-40                                | 0.22                            | 0.22 | 0.07 | 0.17            | 0.18 | 0.17 |
| 144-72-64-56-48                                | 0.22                            | 0.22 | 0.06 | 0.16            | 0.16 | 0.17 |
| 160-80-72-64-56                                | 0.21                            | 0.22 | 0.06 | 0.13            | 0.16 | 0.15 |
| 178-88-80-72-64                                | 0.21                            | 0.22 | 0.06 | 0.13            | 0.16 | 0.15 |
| 192-96-88-80-72                                | 0.20                            | 0.21 | 0.06 | 0.13            | 0.15 | 0.14 |
| 192-112-96-88-80                               | 0.20                            | 0.21 | 0.06 | 0.12            | 0.15 | 0.14 |

**Table S1.** Random errors for the three displacement components for compact and trabecular bone specimens. Median values of the two specimens per group are shown.

As expected from previous studies on bone [3,4], the strain uncertainties of the DVC had decreasing trends with respect to the sub-volume size, and the values of the mean value of the strain (MAER) were larger than the standard deviation (SDER) (Figure S1). The MAER ranged between 3000  $\mu\epsilon$  and 100  $\mu\epsilon$  for the compact bone samples and between 5500  $\mu\epsilon$  and 300  $\mu\epsilon$  for the trabecular

bone samples, in sub-volumes of 8 to 80 voxels (6.5 to 65  $\mu m$ ). The SDER ranged between 1250  $\mu\epsilon$  and 30  $\mu\epsilon$  for the compact bone and between 5000  $\mu\epsilon$  and 140  $\mu\epsilon$  for the trabecular bone, in the same sub-volumes.



**Figure S1.** Relationship between (**a**) MAER and (**b**) SDER with the sub-volume size for the four bone specimens.

#### References

- Peña Fernández, M.; Barber, A.H.; Blunn, G.W.; Tozzi, G. Optimisation of digital volume correlation computation in SR-microCT images of trabecular bone and bone-biomaterial systems. *J. Microsc.* 2018, 00, 1–16, doi: 10.1111/jmi.12745.
- Palanca, M.; Tozzi, G.; Cristofolini, L.; Viceconti, M.; Dall'Ara, E. 3D Local Measurements of Bone Strain and Displacement: Comparison of Three Digital Volume Correlation Approaches. *J. Biomech. Eng.* 2015, 137, 1–14, doi:10.1115/1.4030174.
- Palanca, M.; Bodey, A.J.; Giorgi, M.; Viceconti, M.; Lacroix, D.; Cristofolini, L.; Dall'Ara, E. Local displacement and strain uncertainties in different bone types by digital volume correlation of synchrotron microtomograms. *J. Biomech.* 2017, 58, 27–36, doi:10.1016/j.jbiomech.2017.04.007.
- Dall'Ara, E.; Peña-Fernández, M.; Palanca, M.; Giorgi, M.; Cristofolini, L.; Tozzi, G. Precision of DVC approaches for strain analysis in bone imaged with μCT at different dimensional levels. *Front. Mater.* 2017, 4, 31, doi:10.3389/fmats.2017.00031.



**Figure S2.** Histograms of the residual strain distribution in compact bone tissue imaged at room temperature (top) and 0 °C (bottom). (a) Third principal strains ( $\epsilon_{p3}$ ) and (b) maximum shear strains ( $\gamma_{max}$ ) after each acquired tomogram are shown.