



HAL
open science

An analytical modeling with experimental validation of bone temperature rise in drilling process

Foli Amewoui, Gael Le Coz, Anne-Sophie Bonnet, Abdelhadi Moufki

► **To cite this version:**

Foli Amewoui, Gael Le Coz, Anne-Sophie Bonnet, Abdelhadi Moufki. An analytical modeling with experimental validation of bone temperature rise in drilling process. *Medical Engineering & Physics*, 2020, 84, pp.151-160. 10.1016/j.medengphy.2020.07.007 . hal-03040692

HAL Id: hal-03040692

<https://hal.univ-lorraine.fr/hal-03040692v1>

Submitted on 4 Dec 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **An analytical modelling with experimental validation of bone**
2 **temperature rise in drilling process**

3 Foli Amewoui, Gaël Le Coz, Anne-Sophie Bonnet*, Abdelhadi Moufki

4 Laboratoire d'Etude des Microstructures et de Mécanique des Matériaux, LEM3
5 Université de Lorraine, CNRS, Arts et Métiers Paris Tech, LEM3, F-57000 Metz,
6 France

7
8
9 foli-noel.amewoui-ekoue-adjoka@univ-lorraine.fr;

10 gael.lecoz@univ-lorraine.fr

11 abdelhadi.moufki@univ-lorraine.fr

12
13 *Corresponding author: Anne-Sophie Bonnet

14 e-mail: anne-sophie.bonnet@univ-lorraine.fr,

15 tel: +33 (0)3-72-74-86-47

16
17

18 **ABSTRACT**

19

20 Predicting the bone thermal response in a surgical operation remains a major
21 challenge. In the previous works, metal machining theory has frequently been used to
22 predict bone temperature in drilling process. However, several experimental studies
23 demonstrate that the chip formation process is very complex compared to metal
24 cutting. In the present study, a simplified analytical model based on the moving heat
25 source approach combined with the method of image sources is developed. The heat
26 source due to the drill-bit tip was supposed to be proportional to the cutting energy.
27 The friction at the tool-hole contact was also considered. An experimental study was
28 performed on fresh femur pig bone for cutting speeds from 2 to 20 m/min. Temperature
29 rise, drilling forces and bone volume fraction were measured. The experimental
30 validation showed that the model reproduces satisfactorily the increase in temperature
31 up to the maximum value while it overestimates the temperature during the cooling
32 stage. A parametric study (thermal boundary conditions, lateral friction) was also
33 performed. From the predicted results, it appears that the model can be improved by
34 considering the effects of the bone volume fraction which can present a significant
35 variation in the bone sample.

36 **Keywords**

37 Bone drilling, Bone necrosis, Bone temperature rise, Thermal model for bone drilling,
38 Moving heat source, Axial drilling force and torque, Bone volume fraction.

39

40 **1. INTRODUCTION**

41 Bone cutting is a common step in bone fracture treatment and implantology.
42 Notwithstanding that bone cutting method includes grooving, sawing, drilling, and
43 milling, the most discussed process in the literature is bone drilling [1]. The reason of

44 this increasing interest among researchers comes from the fact that drilling process
45 generates significant heat that may lead to thermal injury of bone [2-4]. Hillery and
46 Shuaib [5] report that, for exposure time greater than 30 s, the necrosis threshold in
47 human and bovine bones is 55 °C. According to Bertollo *et al.* [6], Pandey and Panda
48 [1], bone necrosis can appear for very small exposure time when the bone temperature
49 is 70 °C. In spite of the fact that there is no consensus concerning the critical values of
50 exposure duration and temperature magnitude, the typical value of 47 °C during at
51 least 60 s is often used as a reference threshold for the thermal injury apparition [3,7].
52 Pioneering works related to bone drilling deal about the prevention of osteonecrosis.
53 The key step of these investigations is the assessment of the cutting temperature by
54 using experimental and/or theoretical techniques [1,3,8-10]. Due to the variability of
55 bone samples properties and experimental conditions and to the large number of
56 drilling parameters, these investigations often do not converge towards general
57 conclusions about the temperature rise with respect to the drilling parameters. So, it
58 appears necessary to develop realistic thermo-mechanical models of bone drilling
59 operation to investigate the effect of each parameter, on temperature elevation.

60 Metal machining theory has frequently been used to calculate drilling heat generated
61 during bone drilling [8,11,12]. The authors assumed that bone behaves like metal when
62 it is machined. Therefore, the deformation in the chip was supposed to be
63 characterized by three zones; the primary deformation zone where the required energy
64 in material shearing is converted into heat; the secondary zone where heat is
65 generated by shearing along the tool rake face and the third zone where friction
66 between the tool clearance face and the new surface of bone produces heat. A similar
67 assumption has been taken by Lee *et al.* [8] to suggest a thermal model for bone
68 drilling. In their investigation, the heat generated in the third zone was assumed to be

69 negligible for a sharp cutting tool, exactly as in the case of metal cutting. This theory
70 has been extended further upon by Maani *et al.* [12] to develop a mathematical model
71 for predicting the thermal response in the surgical drilling of bone. To determine the
72 temperature rise during drilling, Kalidindi [13] also used the approach developed by
73 Oxley [14].

74 Other authors investigated the cutting and chip formation mechanism of bone cutting
75 and suggested an alternative view. Jacob *et al.* [15] analysed, through microscopic and
76 SEM images, bone chips shape during orthogonal cutting. They showed that Merchant
77 [16] analysis of orthogonal cutting, commonly used in material cutting, has limited
78 applicability to bone material. Further investigations done by Wiggins and Malkin [17]
79 on the mechanics of orthogonal machining of bone showed that the chip formation
80 process occurred by a series of discrete fractures. Recently, Liao and Axinte [18]
81 identified three different chip formation modes related to the uncut chip thickness.
82 Feldman *et al.* [19] corroborated the observations of Liao and Axinte [18]. They found
83 the bone cutting behaviour changed from a ductile to a fracture cutting mode as cutting
84 depth increases. The threshold cutting depth inducing cracks with chips formation was
85 shown to be 20 μm [20].

86 Thus, within these experimental investigations, it appears that the chip formation
87 process is very complex compared to metal cutting and that during bone cutting
88 process, chips are formed more by fracture mode than shear mode, regardless of
89 cutting direction, as shown in Fig. 1. Consequently, it seems more realistic to assume
90 that bone behaves like a quasi-brittle material in drilling process. Therefore, whereas
91 for metal cutting the heat sources in the chip are clearly associated to the plastic
92 deformation in the shear zones, the temperature elevation inside bone can clearly not
93 be associated to the same physical mechanisms. As a consequence, analytical models

94 based on metal machining theory cannot be considered as an appropriate approach to
95 predict the bone temperature rise in drilling. In addition, the source of the heat
96 generated during bone drilling is not clearly defined for a wide range of drilling
97 conditions and needs further investigation.

98 Recently, new thermal models for bone drilling, based on the moving heat source
99 approach of Jaeger [21], have been introduced by Feldmann *et al.* [19,22]. The
100 interactions between drill tip and bone are modeled by a moving heat source
101 assimilated to a disk source with the size of the drill bit diameter. The authors [19,22]
102 expressed the thermal energy as a function of bone density distribution. With the
103 Green's function of time-dependent moving point source, they determined the
104 temperature distribution in function of time. It can however be noted that the model
105 [19,22] presents different limitations: (i) the bone has been assimilated to an infinite
106 medium (i.e. the bone material fills all the space). As it will be shown in the present
107 work, this assumption may induce an underestimation of bone temperature if the feed
108 rate is not large enough. (ii) during the drill bit penetration into the bone, the distance
109 between the heat source, which moves with the tool, and the measurement position of
110 temperature has been taken constant for a fixed time t , (iii) the heat sources induced
111 by the bone-tool interactions are restricted to the tool tip effect.

112 As indicated previously, the bone behaves as a quasi-brittle material during cutting
113 process. Therefore, friction between the drilled hole and the tool can affect the bone
114 temperature. In the present work, a simplified analytical model is developed using the
115 following assumptions: (i) bone temperature rise results from two main sources
116 corresponding to the interaction between the drill-bit tip and bone and the friction
117 between the drill-bit side and the drilled hole, (ii) the effect of the point angle is
118 neglected and the heat source associated to the tool tip is assimilated to a disk. The

119 model was used to analyze the influence of spindle speed which affects the heat
120 generation and the heat transfer through the exposure time. Experimental tests of bone
121 drilling have also been conducted on porcine samples. After a validation study of the
122 model with temperature experimental data, a parametric study has been performed
123 and compared with the results of the experimental campaign.

124

125 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

126 *2.1 Experimental study*

127 Bone samples used in these experiments were extracted from the diaphyseal part of a
128 porcine femoral bone aged of 6 months. The bone was obtained from a local
129 slaughterhouse just after the slaughter of the animal and directly frozen (-20°C). There
130 was no animal sacrifice specifically for this study. Experiments were conducted on
131 bones devoted to food industry. Before sample preparation, bone was thawed to a
132 temperature between 3 and 6 degrees during 24 hours. Bone samples were finally
133 machined at room temperature to get dimensions of approximately 70 mm-long and
134 10 mm-wide. Fig. 2(a) shows the final state of the sample to drill.

135

136 Each bone sample was scanned by X-ray micro-computed tomography (μ CT) machine
137 EasyTom (RX Solutions, Chavanod, France) before drillings tests. The scanning
138 parameters are the following ones: voltage 100 keV, current 50 μ A, exposure time 2.6
139 s and voxel size $15 \times 15 \times 15 \mu\text{m}^3$. Microtomography was conducted on several bone
140 samples but the most homogeneous sample in terms of microstructure (i.e. with a
141 cortical layer of quite constant thickness along the whole specimen) and presenting

142 the highest thickness of cortical bone was kept for the drilling process and the
143 comparison with the analytical model.

144 After image acquisition of the bone sample, the drilling experiments were performed
145 on it. A feed per tooth of 0.02 mm was chosen and cutting velocities varying between
146 2 to 20 m/min were tested. The drilling tests were performed on a three axes CNC
147 milling machine Roeders RP600. A Nobel Biocare twist drill of 3.2 mm diameter with a
148 point angle of 118° and an helix angle of 30° was used. The drilling depth was 4 mm.
149 Drill is made of stainless steel with a diamond-like carbon (DLC) coating. The whole
150 machine, sample, and tool are considered perfectly rigid so that the cutting vibrations
151 are negligible.

152 Samples were clamped and mounted on a Kistler 9256C2 piezoelectric dynamometer
153 to measure the feed force F and the cutting torque M , see Fig. 2(b). The signal was
154 amplified by a Kistler 5017B charge amplifier and recorded by a National Instrument
155 data acquisition system coupled with a Labview software. Signals obtained were
156 filtered by a Butterworth type filter, traditionally used during the machining data
157 processing.

158 Temperature data were recorded by two K-type thermocouples OMEGA KMTSS-
159 IM025U-150 with a wire diameter of 0.25 mm implanted in pre-drilled holes. The
160 measuring junctions were positioned precisely at 1.5 mm depth and 0.5 and 0.9 mm
161 from the wall, see Fig. 2(c). A conductor paste was injected through the holes to
162 optimise the conduction from bone to thermocouples.

163 After drilling tests, microtomography of drilled bone was performed with the parameters
164 presented previously. The reconstruction process of bone sample volume was
165 conducted via RX Solutions X-ACT software. The resetting of drilled and undrilled bone

166 tomograms was done on Avizo 9 software. By subtracting tomographic images before
 167 and after drilling tests, the 3D volume of the drilling zones of bone was obtained to
 168 represent our volume of interest. To facilitate the post-treatment, these zones were
 169 approximated by the addition of a cylinder and a cone, Fig. 3(a). Bone volume fractions
 170 (BV/TV) were then determined within these zones. BV/TV is extracted from each slice
 171 through drilling direction of the whole stack of the volume of interest.

172
 173

174 2.2 Analytical modelling of bone temperature rise

175 The temperature distribution in the bone can be obtained from the approach
 176 developed by Carslaw and Jaeger [23]. A fixed coordinate system (x, y, z) is associated
 177 to the bone sample where the beginning of the drilled hole is located at position $x=0$
 178 , Fig. 4. Heat is liberated at time t' , from 0 to t ($0 \leq t' \leq t$), at point $Q(x', y', z')$ where the
 179 heat rate $q_c ds$ (q_c (w/m^2)) is associated to an elementary surface ds and due to the
 180 cutting process. During drilling, the heat source moves with a constant speed V in x -
 181 direction so that $x' = Vt'$ as shown in Fig. 4. When the bone sample is assimilated to
 182 an infinite medium (i.e. the bone is supposed to occupy all the space
 183 $-\infty < x, y$ and $z < +\infty$) and according to Carslaw and Jaeger [23], the temperature
 184 elevation ΔT at a point $M(x, y, z)$ for time t is given by:

$$185 \quad \Delta T(x, y, z, t) = \frac{q_c ds}{8\rho c(\pi a)^{3/2}} \int_0^t (t-t')^{-3/2} e^{-\{(x-Vt')^2+(y-y')^2+(z-z')^2\}/4a(t-t')} dt' \quad (1)$$

186 where ρ , k , c , and a represent respectively the density, the thermal conductivity,
 187 the specific heat and the thermal diffusivity. Note that in (1), q_c is time independent.

188 According to Tu *et al.* [24], the thermal properties and the density of pig bone are given
 189 by: $k = 0.45 \text{ W/Km}$, $c = 1640 \text{ J/kg K}$ and $\rho = 1640 \text{ kg/m}^3$.

190 A similar approach has been proposed by Feldmann *et al.* for the tool tip contribution
 191 [19,22]. However, there is a difference between the two models. Indeed, during the
 192 heat source displacement for $0 \leq t' \leq t$, its vertical position x' was supposed to be equal
 193 to Vt in Feldmann *et al.* work [19,22]. This is equivalent to consider that the distance
 194 between the heat source $Q(x', y', z')$ and the measurement position $M(x, y, z)$ is
 195 constant for $0 \leq t' \leq t$.

196 Eq. (1) means that elevation temperature distribution at time t is obtained by adding
 197 the rise temperature caused by the amount of heat liberated during the source
 198 displacement namely when it was at the positions $(x' = Vt', y', z')$ with $0 \leq t' \leq t$.

199 By introducing the variable $\tau = t - t'$, (1) is reduced to

$$200 \quad \Delta T(x, y, z, t) = \frac{q_c ds}{8\rho c(\pi a)^{3/2}} e^{-V(x-Vt)/2a} \int_0^t \tau^{-3/2} e^{-\left(\frac{d^2}{4a\tau} + \frac{V^2\tau}{4a}\right)} d\tau \quad (2)$$

201 where $d = \sqrt{(x-Vt)^2 + (y-y')^2 + (z-z')^2}$ is the distance from the heat source as reported
 202 in Fig. 4.

203

204 From the close form of the time integral term, we get:

$$205 \quad \Delta T(x, y, z, t) = \frac{q_c ds}{8\rho c \pi a} e^{-V(x-Vt)/2a} f(d, t) \quad (3)$$

206 with

$$207 \quad f(d, t) = \frac{1}{d} \left\{ e^{Vd/2a} \operatorname{erfc}\left(d/2\sqrt{at} + V\sqrt{at}/2a\right) + e^{-Vd/2a} \operatorname{erfc}\left(d/2\sqrt{at} - V\sqrt{at}/2a\right) \right\} \quad (4)$$

208 The temperature distribution, due to the drill-bit tip contribution, is obtained by adding
 209 the temperature rise caused by each elementary heat source $q_c ds$ (q [w/m^2]) over the
 210 disk surface, see Fig. 4(a):

211
$$T_{tip}(x, y, z, t) = \frac{1}{8\rho c \pi a} e^{-V(x-Vt)/2a} \int_0^R \int_0^{2\pi} q_c f(d, t) d\theta r dr \quad (5)$$

212 where R is the drill bit radius and d is expressed in polar coordinates
 213 $d = \sqrt{(x-Vt)^2 + (y-r\cos\theta)^2 + (z-r\sin\theta)^2}$. In (5), the bone is considered as an infinite
 214 medium.

215 For drilling operation, the bone can be assimilated to a half space (i.e. the bone sample
 216 occupies the half space $x \geq 0$ and its top surface is located at position $x=0$). To obtain
 217 the temperature distribution in a semi-infinite medium with adiabatic surface, the image
 218 sources $q_{im} ds$ (with $q_{im} = q_c$) are introduced as in Komanduri and Hou [25-27]. These
 219 fictive sources move with a constant speed $-V$ in x -direction such as $q_{im} ds$ is located
 220 at $Q_{im}(x' = -Vt', y', z')$ where heat is liberated at time t' , from 0 to t ($0 \leq t' \leq t$), see Fig.
 221 4(a). The temperature distribution due to Q_{im} is deduced from (5) by replacing d with
 222 $d_{im} = \sqrt{(x+Vt)^2 + (y-r\cos\theta)^2 + (z-r\sin\theta)^2}$ and V with $-V$. Finally, for the bone
 223 assimilated to a half space, we obtain:

224
$$T_{tip}(x, y, z, t) = \frac{1}{8\rho c \pi a} \left\{ e^{-V(x-Vt)/2a} \int_0^R \int_0^{2\pi} q f(d, t) d\theta r dr + e^{V(x+Vt)/2a} \int_0^R \int_0^{2\pi} q f(d_{im}, t) d\theta r dr \right\} \quad (6)$$

225 The integral terms in (6) are calculated numerically by using Gauss quadrature method.
 226 To account for the friction between the drill-bit side and the drilled hole, the depth H of
 227 the hole is divided into N small differential elements having ring shape. The height of
 228 each element j ($1 \leq j \leq N$) is given by $\Delta h = H/N$, Fig. 4(b).

229 When the drill bit penetrates deeper into the bone, frictional heat is liberated at time t'
 230 , from t_{0j} to t ($t_{0j} \leq t' \leq t$), at point $Q_f(x', y', z')$ where the heat rate $q_f ds$ ($q_f (w/m^2)$) is
 231 associated to an elementary surface $ds = R d\theta \Delta h$, see Fig. 4(b). The heat source moves
 232 with a constant speed V in x -direction so that $x' = Vt'$ as shown in Fig. 4(b). Following

233 the drill bit penetration, each source at Q_f is activated at $t' = t_{0j}$ with
 234 $t_{0j} = j\Delta h/V + R/V \tan(\psi/2)$. In this equation, the term $R/\tan(\psi/2)$ represents the height
 235 of the drill-bit tip and ψ is the point angle, see Fig. 4(a). Thus, at time t , the number of
 236 differential elements (elementary rings of Fig. 4(b)) forming the total friction zone is
 237 given by the integer part of the ratio $Vt/\Delta h$.

238 Applying the foregoing approach, the temperature distribution in the bone (modeled as
 239 a half space), due to the side drill bit contribution (frictional heat), is as follows:

$$240 \quad T_{side}(x, y, z, t) = \frac{R \Delta h}{8\rho c \pi a} \sum_j^N \left\{ e^{-V(x+h_j-Vt)/2a} \int_0^{2\pi} q_f f(d, t-t_{0j}) d\theta + e^{V(x-h_j+Vt)/2a} \int_0^{2\pi} q_f f(d_{im}, t-t_{0j}) d\theta \right\}$$

241 (7)

242 with

$$243 \quad \begin{cases} h_j = (j-1/2)\Delta h \\ d = \sqrt{(x+h_j-Vt)^2 + (y-R\cos\theta)^2 + (z-R\sin\theta)^2} \\ d_{im} = \sqrt{(x-h_j+Vt)^2 + (y-R\cos\theta)^2 + (z-R\sin\theta)^2} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

244 The length h_j is defined in Fig. 4(b) and the integral terms in (7) are calculated
 245 numerically by using Gauss quadrature method. Note that in (7), q_f is time
 246 independent.

247 The temperature distribution in the bone, resulting from the two contributions, is given
 248 by:

$$249 \quad T(x, y, z, t) = T_0 + T_{tip}(x, y, z, t) + T_{side}(x, y, z, t) \quad (9)$$

250 where T_0 is the initial bone temperature.

251 During cutting operation, the tool-bone interaction changes due to the variation of the
 252 bone behavior from the cortical part to the cancellous bone. Consequently to estimate
 253 the heat source, we propose to use the average of the maximum and minimum values

254 of feed force F and cutting torque M denoted by \bar{F} and \bar{M} respectively, see the
255 Results section. Following this approach, the heat source relative to the tool tip is
256 assumed to be constant during drilling, and equal to a fraction $0 < \eta < 1$ of the mean
257 value of the mechanical energy :

$$258 \quad q_c = \eta (\bar{F} V + \bar{M} \omega) / (\pi R^2) \quad (10)$$

259 where V and ω represent respectively the feed rate and the rotational speed (rad/s).
260 Eq. (10) corresponds to a heat source which is time independent as in the present
261 thermal model.

262 The frictional heat induced by the contact between the drill-bit side and the drilled hole
263 is given by:

$$264 \quad q_f = \mu_f p V_c \quad (11)$$

265 with μ_f the friction coefficient, p the contact pressure and V_c the cutting velocity
266 ($V_c = \omega R$).

267 It should be noted that before applying the analytical model to analyse the thermal
268 problem in the bone, we have to calibrate the parameters η and p . The calibration
269 procedure will be presented and discussed in the Discussion section.

270

271 **3. RESULTS**

272 Fig. 3(a) shows an example of obtained 3D volume rendering. Each curve reported in
273 Fig. 3(b) joins bone volume fractions determined on each slice of the drilled zones in
274 the drilling direction. The typical evolution of bone volume fractions confirms the drilling
275 of two different types of bone. The relatively flat part of the curve denotes drilling
276 through cortical bone whose bone volume fraction is relatively stable (greater than 0.9).
277 The highly sloped part of bone volume fraction curve represents the entrance into

278 spongy bone where BV/TV can drop to 0.4 at the end of the drilling process. It is also
279 visible that the bone volume fraction highly varies from a drilled site to another, even
280 inside the cortical part of the bone.

281 The variation of the feed force and cutting torque during drilling is observed in parallel.
282 The curves obtained are reported in Figs. 5(a) and 5(b). The force rapidly increases at
283 the entrance into bone samples to reach a maximum value. Then, the values slightly
284 decrease until the end of the drilling process where the values drop to zero. This
285 diminution trend is similar to the one observed on the BV/TV curves (Fig. 3b).
286 Therefore, it can be deduced that a relationship exists between the evolution of feed
287 force and bone density. Concerning the torques, their evolution with the drilling depth
288 depends on the cutting speed considered. No general trend can be observed.

289 In order to evaluate the heat source at the drill tip, given by Eq. (9), the average values
290 of feed force \bar{F} and cutting torque \bar{M} are extracted on the curve profiles from the
291 drilling maximal and minimum values, see Figs. 5(a) to 5(d). These figures reveal that
292 \bar{F} varies only slightly with cutting speed v_c while \bar{M} is larger for $v_c \geq 10 \text{ m/min}$ than
293 for $v_c \leq 5 \text{ m/min}$. The obtained values $\bar{F} = 18 \text{ N}$ and $\bar{M} = 0.08 \text{ N.m}$ (mean value for v_c
294 from 2 to 20 m/min) have been used to estimate the heat source (9).

295

296 After model calibration (described and discussed in the Discussion section), the
297 predicted temperature of the model and measurement are compared. Fig. 6 shows the
298 comparison for both positions of thermocouples and for each cutting velocity. All curves
299 present two phases with a first one where the bone temperature increases because of
300 the drilling process and a second one illustrating the cooling phase. The culmination of
301 the curve coincides with the end of the drilling stage.

302

303

304 The influence of the heat source due to the lateral friction is reported in Fig. 7(a). As
305 expected, the lateral friction induces an increase in the temperature rise. A modification
306 of the position of the maximum temperature is also observed mainly for the small value
307 of cutting velocity 2 m/min. Thus, the duration of the temperature increase becomes
308 larger. Fig. 7(b) shows how the predicted temperature changes when the bone is
309 assimilated to an infinite or semi-infinite medium. When a semi-infinite medium with an
310 adiabatic surface is considered (i.e. the bone sample occupies the half space $x \geq 0$
311 and its top surface is located at position $x=0$), the temperature rises obtained are
312 higher but the global profiles of the temperature curves remain unchanged. Concerning
313 the comparison of the maximal temperature rises, the increase with v_c from 2 to 10
314 m/min is reproduced by the model, Fig. 7(c). From 10 to 20 m/min, the predicted values
315 tend to saturate while the temperature measurements show a decrease, Fig. 7(c).

316

317

318 **4. DISCUSSION**

319 Heat generation, due to the conversion of fraction of cutting energy into thermal energy,
320 is a critical parameter for thermal modelling of bone drilling. As discussed before, the
321 application of the metal machining theory assumes that the cutting mechanisms are
322 similar in bone and metal: in particular, the shear angle can be estimated from the
323 Merchant law [16]. For instance, Davidson and James [11], Maani *et al.* [12], Lee *et al.*
324 [8] have supposed that a fraction of shearing energy, due to the primary shear zone,
325 goes into the bone. In Maani *et al.* [12], Lee *et al.* [8], this fraction was deduced from

326 the metal machining theory of Oxley [14] and Davidson and James [11] supposed that
327 it is equal to 0.5.

328 In the present approach, bone temperature rise results from two main sources: the
329 drill-bit tip (cutting process) and the friction between the drill-bit side and the drilled
330 hole. The values of both sources q_c and q_f are obtained thanks to relationships (10)

331 and (11). Expression (10) requires the determination of average values of feed force

332 \bar{F} and cutting torque \bar{M} which are provided in Fig. 5. As shown in Fig. 5(c), the drilling

333 force \bar{F} is almost constant as a function of the cutting speed. Fig. 5(d) shows two

334 distinct levels for the torque \bar{M} : one for the smallest cutting velocities 2 and 5 m/min

335 and a higher value for velocities 10 and 20 m/min. The values used in this work are:

336 $\bar{F} = 18 N$ and $\bar{M} = 0.08 N.m$ (average value of \bar{M} for v_c from 2 to 20 m/min). Further

337 investigations with higher values of cutting velocities would have to be conducted in

338 order to complete these first results. Finally, the determination of q_c and q_f requires

339 the values of parameters μ_f , η and p . The value of μ_f was fixed to 0.3 according to

340 data from the literature. Indeed, Rancourt *et al.* report that $\mu_f = 0.3$ for tibial cancellous

341 bone sliding against stainless steel surface [28]. Davim and Marques [29] analyzed the

342 influence of sliding velocity on μ_f for bovine bone-steel contact pair. They indicate that

343 $\mu_f = 0.25$ for sliding velocities from 0.02 m/s to 0.1 m/s. More recently, Zhu *et al.* [30]

344 examined the variation of μ_f in function of contact pressure and sliding velocity with

345 water lubrication for bovine femoral cortical bone-316 L stainless steel contact pair. For

346 sliding velocity of 0.44 m/s and contact pressure of 0.42 MPa, Zhu *et al.* [30] showed

347 that $\mu_f = 0.25$.

348 Concerning parameters η (fraction of mechanical energy resulting from the tool tip-
 349 bone interaction converted into heat) and p (contact pressure between the drill-bit side
 350 and the drilled hole), a calibration procedure was carried out. From the parametric
 351 study reported in Fig. 7(a), it appears that the time t_c , corresponding to the maximum
 352 temperature rise ΔT_{\max} (t_c is time during which temperature increases), is mainly
 353 dependent on the side heat source (11) (via the contact pressure p) especially for
 354 small cutting velocities. Based on this trend, the calibration of p and η was performed
 355 with respect to the time t_c and ΔT_{\max} respectively. Thus, the calibration procedure is
 356 based on the following iterative approach. First, the two parameters were varied within
 357 a defined range (for instance $\eta \in [0.1, 0.7]$ and $p[MPa] \in [0, 20]$). Secondly, for each value
 358 of η , pressure p is selected so that the condition $t_c^{model} \approx t_c^{exp}$ is satisfied. Finally, among
 359 all values of η and for each calibrated pressure, the chosen value of η must satisfy
 360 the condition $\Delta T_{\max}^{model} \approx \Delta T_{\max}^{exp}$ (t_c^{exp} and ΔT_{\max}^{exp} represent the experimental measurements).
 361 According to this approach, η and p were calibrated such as the experimental
 362 temperature and the model prediction are as close as possible for the smallest cutting
 363 speed $v_c = 2 \text{ m/min}$ as reported in Fig. 6(a) (temperature was measured at 0.5 mm from
 364 the drilled hole, see Fig. 2). The values of parameters η and p obtained with this
 365 calibration are $\eta = 0.35$ and $p = 1 \text{ MPa}$. Besides, Fig. 7(c) indicates that the difference
 366 between the temperature elevation when the bone is assimilated to a semi-infinite
 367 medium with adiabatic surface or considered as an infinite medium is more significant
 368 for $v_c = 2 \text{ m/min}$ than for $v_c = 20 \text{ m/min}$. This can be explained by the fact that the feed
 369 rate V increases with the cutting speed v_c and, at low feed rate, conduction

370 overcomes the convection of heat (thanks to the heat source displacement) so that
371 heat diffusion will extend deep into the infinite medium.

372 In order to dissociate the effect of the feed rate per tooth f_t from the influence of v_c ,
373 f_t is kept constant $f_t = 0.02 \text{ mm/tooth}$. Fig. 6. shows the effect of cutting speed v_c on
374 the bone temperature elevation over time at depth 1.5 mm and for the two
375 thermocouples placed at 0.5 and 0.9 mm from the hole (denoted respectively by 'T_{h1}'
376 and 'T_{h2}', see Fig. 2). As expected, the model results indicate that the temperature is
377 an increasing function of v_c (i.e. the rotational speed ω) while the exposure time
378 decreases with v_c . This temperature growth is more significant for 'T_{h1}' than for 'T_{h2}'.

379 Overall, the model correctly reproduces the evolution of temperature rise with time t
380 from 0 to t_c (i.e. $0 \leq \Delta T \leq \Delta T_{\max}$). The low heat conductivity and the high heat capacity
381 of the bone result in lower temperatures at the location of the second thermocouple
382 'T_{h2}', Figs. 6(e)-6(h). Because of keeping f_t constant ($f_t = 0.02 \text{ mm/tooth}$), the feed
383 rate V increases with cutting speed v_c ($V = f_t v_c / (\pi R)$). Consequently, the heat
384 sources increase with v_c while the duration of heat exchange (exposure time) with the
385 bone is reduced. These two opposite effects result in a slowing down in the increase
386 of the maximum temperature with v_c as reported in Fig. 7(c) (the heat sources q_c and
387 q_f are proportional to v_c , see Eq. (10) and (11), but the evolution of the maximum
388 temperature results from the two opposite effects). The model predictions reveal that
389 the growth of cutting speed v_c from 2 to 5 m/min induces an increase of temperature
390 of thermocouple 'T_{h1}' of about 16 °C (8 °C for 'T_{h2}') while it is about 2°C for a variation
391 from 10 to 20 m/min (2 °C for 'T_{h2}'). These tendencies are close to the temperature
392 measurements, Fig. 7(c). It can also be observed from Fig. 7 that the analytical model
393 predicts the maximum temperature rise with a maximum error of 18% for 'T_{h1}' whereas

394 we have 28% for 'T_{h2}', which is logical as the model was calibrated for the closest
395 position of the thermocouple. The difference between model results and
396 measurements can be attributed to several parameters which are not considered in
397 the present model: (i) the evolution of the bone density during cutting, (ii) the
398 relationship between the bone thermal properties and its density, (iii) the influence of
399 the presence of both thermocouples on the bone temperature distribution, and (iv) the
400 effect of cutting conditions on the model parameters : η , p , \bar{M} and μ_f .

401 During bone drilling, the temperature rise depends on the bone density (through
402 BV/TV). Fig. 3(b) shows that the ratio BV/TV is much higher for the cutting tests with
403 $v_c = 2$ and 5 m/min than for $v_c = 10$ and 20 m/min . Note also that the thermal conductivity
404 depends on the bone density, see Feldmann *et al.* [31]. These variations are not taken
405 into account in the present approach where the heat sources are supposed to be
406 constant. To improve the model predictions, the effect of BV/TV on the heat generation
407 and on the thermal conductivity have to be considered. Additionally, the model does
408 not reproduce correctly the cooling stage. Indeed to reduce the computational time,
409 the cooling process was estimated from the moving heat source solution by keeping it
410 to zero during the cooling step (i.e. when $t_c \leq t$). To reproduce the bone cooling
411 process when $t_c < t$, we have to consider the numerical solution of the heat problem
412 where the initial temperature distribution corresponds to the solution given by the
413 present model at $t = t_c$.

414 The thermal damage of the bone is mainly dependent on two factors: exposure time
415 and temperature magnitude. Several parameters affect these two critical factors:
416 drilling conditions, drilling strategies, cooling and thermomechanical bone properties.
417 From the foregoing comparison between the model predictions and the experimental

418 results, it appears that despite the model simplicity, it can be helpful to examine the
419 bone necrosis in terms of drilling conditions for $0 \leq t \leq t_c$ (i.e. $0 \leq \Delta T \leq \Delta T_{\max}$).

420

421 **5. CONCLUSION**

422 In the present study, a simplified analytical model based on the moving heat source
423 approach is developed. Besides, to be closer to the boundary conditions of the thermal
424 problem, the method of image sources has been applied. Because of the complexity
425 of the chip formation mechanisms in bone cutting process, the heat source due to the
426 drill-bit tip has been supposed to be proportional to the cutting energy. The friction
427 between the drill-bit side and the drilled hole was also taken into account. Drilling
428 experiments were conducted on fresh femur pig bone. The distribution of bone volume
429 fraction through the drilled hole was determined by microtomography for the bone
430 samples. The present model requires the calibration of two parameters. The
431 experimental validation has shown the model reproduces satisfactorily the increase in
432 temperature up to the maximum value while it overestimates the temperature during
433 the cooling stage. A parametric study, concerning the thermal boundaries conditions
434 (infinite or finite medium) and the lateral friction, was also performed. The results show
435 that the difference of temperature rise between semi-infinite or infinite medium is more
436 pronounced for small cutting velocities. The lateral friction has a direct influence on the
437 duration of the temperature increase, especially for small cutting velocities. Finally, the
438 present simplified approach can be improved by considering the effects of the bone
439 volume fraction which can present a significant variation in the bone sample.

440

441 **COMPETING INTERESTS:** None declared

442

443

444 **ETHICAL APPROVAL:** Not required

445

446 **FUNDING**

447 This work was supported by the French Ministry of Higher Education and Research.

448

449 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

450 The authors would like to thank Alexis Jacquillard for its contribution to the
451 experimental work.

452

453 **REFERENCES**

- 454 1. Pandey RK, Panda SS. Drilling of bone: a comprehensive review. *Journal of*
455 *Clinical Orthopaedics and Trauma* 2013;4:15-30.
- 456 2. Bachus KN, Rondina MT, Hutchinson DT. The effects of drilling force on cortical
457 temperatures and their duration: an in vitro study. *Medical Engineering and*
458 *Physics* 2000;22:685-691.
- 459 3. Eriksson AR, Albrektsson M. Temperature threshold levels for heat-induced bone
460 tissue injury: a vital-microscopic study in the rabbit. *Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*
461 1983;50:101–107.
- 462 4. Lee J, Ozdoganlar OB, Rabin Y. An experimental investigation on thermal
463 exposure during bone drilling. *Medical Engineering and Physics* 2012;34:1510-
464 1520.
- 465 5. Hillery MT, Shuaib I. Temperature effects on the drilling of human and bovine bone.
466 *Journal of Materials Processing Technology* 1999;92-93:302-308.

- 467 6. Bertollo N, Walsh WR. Drilling of Bone: practicality, limitations and complications
468 associated with surgical drill-bits. In: Biomechanics in Applications 2011;53-83.
- 469 7. Augustin G, Davila S, Mihoci K, Udiljak T, Vedrina DS, Antabak A. Thermal
470 osteonecrosis and bone drilling parameters revisited. Archives of Orthopaedic and
471 Trauma Surgery 2007;128 :71-77.
- 472 8. Lee J, Rabin Y, Ozdoganlar OB. A new thermal model for bone drilling with
473 applications to orthopaedic surgery. Medical Engineering and Physics.
474 2011;33:1234-1244.
- 475 9. Gupta V, Pandey PM. Experimental investigation and statistical modeling of
476 temperature rise in rotary ultrasonic bone drilling. Medical Engineering and Physics
477 2016;38:1330-1338.
- 478 10. Matthews LS, Hirsch C. Temperatures Measured in Human Cortical Bone when
479 Drilling. Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery 1972;54:297 -308.
- 480 11. Davidson SRH, James DF. Drilling in Bone: Modeling Heat Generation and
481 Temperature Distribution. Journal of Biomechanical Engineering 2003;125:305-
482 314.
- 483 12. Maani N, Farhang K, Hodaei M. A Model for the Prediction of Thermal Response
484 of Bone in Surgical Drilling. Journal of Thermal science and Engineering
485 Applications 2014;6: 041005-1-041005-16.
- 486 13. Kalidindi V. Optimization of drill design and coolant systems during dental implant
487 surgery, Master's Thesis, University of Kentucky, 2004.
- 488 14. Oxley PLB. The Mechanics of Machining: an Analytical Approach to Assessing
489 Machinability. Chichester, E. Horwood ; New York : Halsted Press, 1989.
- 490 15. Jacobs CH, Pope MH, Berry JT, Hoaglund F. A study of the bone machining
491 process - Orthogonal cutting. Journal of Biomechanics 1974;7:131-136.

- 492 16. Merchant ME. Mechanics of the metal cutting process. II. Plasticity conditions in
493 orthogonal cutting. *Journal of Applied Physics* 1945;16:318-324.
- 494 17. Wiggins KL, Malkin S. Orthogonal Machining of Bone. *Journal of Biomechanical*
495 *Engineering* 1978;100: 122-130.
- 496 18. Liao Z, Axinte DA. On chip formation mechanism in orthogonal cutting of bone.
497 *International Journal of Machine Tools and Manufacture* 2016;102: 41-55.
- 498 19. Feldmann A, Ganser P, Nolte L, Zysset P. Orthogonal cutting of cortical bone:
499 Temperature elevation and fracture toughness. *International Journal of Machine*
500 *Tools and Manufacture* 2017;1:1-11.
- 501 20. Sugita N, Mitsuishi M. Specifications for machining the bovine cortical bone in
502 relations to its microstructure. *Journal of Biomechanics* 2009;42:2826-2829.
- 503 21. Jaeger JC. Moving source of heat and the temperature at sliding contacts. *Journal*
504 *and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales* 1942;76:203–224.
- 505 22. Feldmann A, Anso J, Bell B, Williamson T, Gavaghan K, Gerber N, Rohrbach H,
506 Weber S, Zysset P. Temperature prediction model for bone drilling based on
507 density distribution and in vivo experiments for minimally invasive robotic cochlear
508 implantation. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering* 2016;44:1576-1586.
- 509 23. Carslaw HS, Jaeger JC. *Conduction of heat in solids. Oxford University Press.*
510 1959.
- 511 24. Tu Y, Chen L, Ciou J, Hsiao C. Finite element simulation of bone temperature rise
512 during bone drilling based on a bone analog. *Journal of Medical and Biological*
513 *Engineering* 2012;33:269-274.
- 514 25. Komanduri R, Hou ZB. Thermal modeling of the metal cutting process. Part-III--
515 temperature-rise-distribution-due-to-the-combined-effects-of-shear-plane-heat-

- 516 source-and-the-tool-chip-interface-frictional-heat-source. International Journal of
517 Mechanical Sciences 2001;43:89-107.
- 518 26. Komanduri R, Hou ZB. Thermal modeling of the metal cutting process: part I—
519 temperature rise distribution due to shear plane heat source. International Journal
520 of Mechanical Sciences 2000;42:1715–1752.
- 521 27. Komanduri R, Hou ZB. Thermal modeling of the metal cutting process—Part II:
522 temperature rise distribution due to frictional heat source at the tool–chip interface.
523 International Journal of Mechanical Sciences 2001;43:57–88.
- 524 28. Rancourt D, Shirazi-Adl A, Drouin G, Paiement G. Friction properties of the
525 interface between porous-surfaced metals and tibial cancellous bone. Journal of
526 Biomedical Materials Research 1990;24:1503-1519.
- 527 29. Davim JP, Marques N. Dynamical experimental study of friction and wear behavior
528 of bovine cancellous bone sliding against a metallic counterface in a water
529 lubricated environment. Journal of Materials Processing Technology 2002;152:
530 389-394.
- 531 30. Zhu B, Xiaofeng H, Zhao T. Friction and wear characteristics of natural bovine
532 bone lubricated with water. *Wear* 2015;322:91-100.
- 533 31. Feldmann A, Wili P, Maquer G, Zysset P. The thermal conductivity of cortical and
534 cancellous bone. *European Cells & Materials* 2018;35:25-33.