

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are numerous individuals who contributed greatly to this work and I am deeply indebted to their efforts. I am of course grateful to my dissertation committee: my co-chairs Drs. Hollister and Fowlkes and committee members, Drs. Hollman, Feinberg, and Stegemann for their invaluable mentoring, feedback, and support in the preparation and construction of this dissertation.

I am grateful to the members of the University of Michigan's Department of Biomedical Engineering, particularly those in the Bioultrasonics Laboratory ("Bullies") and the University of Michigan Health System's Basic Radiological Sciences Department.

This work was supported through the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Regenerative Sciences Training Grant Number 5T90DK070071 and NIH Grant Numbers R21EY018727, R01 DE13417, and NIH center core (P30) grant, EY007003. National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD. 20892.

I gratefully acknowledge the NIH Resource Center for Medical Ultrasonic Transducer Technology at the University of Southern California (Los Angeles, CA. 90089) for designing and building the high frequency transducers used in this study. Finally, I am grateful to my family and friends for their continued love and support, particularly my dear wife Melody. Without her, none of this work would have ever become a reality and it is to her that I lovingly dedicate this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	ii
List of Figures.....	vii
Abstract.....	ix
Chapter I Introduction.....	1
1.1 Development of an Engineered Soft Tissue.....	1
1.2 Histological and Chemical Compositions of Skin and Oral Mucosal Tissues.....	3
1.2.1 Background on Skin and Oral Mucosa.....	3
1.2.1.1 Background on Oral Mucosal Anatomy.....	5
1.2.1.2 Background on the Human Dermis and it's Comparison to AlloDerm®.....	6
1.2.1.3 Background on EVPOME.....	7
1.3 The Necessity of Reconstruction and Engineered Tissue Matrices.....	8
1.4 Background on Ultrasound: Instrument in Non-Destructive Testing....	9
1.4.1 Characteristics of Ultrasonic Waves.....	10
1.4.2 Focusing the Transducer.....	11
1.4.3 Background: Utilization of the SAM.....	12
1.5 Background on Ultrasonic Methods to Estimate Elasticity.....	13
1.5.1 Additional Compression Testing.....	14
1.5.2 Measurement of Young's Modulus in Soft Tissues.....	15
1.6 Examination of Bioengineered Soft Tissues.....	15
1.6.1. Brief Overview on the Biomechanical Properties of the Skin and Mucosal Tissues.....	17
1.7 Overview of the Dissertation.....	19
References.....	22
Figures.....	24
Chapter II Examination and Characterization of Human Mucosal Tissue Differentiation Using Scanning Acoustic Microscopy.....	25
2.1 Introduction.....	24

2.1.1	Background on the Oral Mucosal Epidermis and Keratinization	26
2.1.2	Background on EVPOME	27
2.1.3	Background on SAM.....	29
2.1.3.1	Sound Reflection and Backscatter	30
2.2	Tissue Preparation – <i>Ex Vivo</i> Produced Oral Mucosal Equivalents (EVPOME).....	33
2.3	SAM Apparatus Set-up, Imaging, and Tissue Preparations.....	34
2.3.1	Signal Processing and Creating the 2D B-Scan Images.....	35
2.3.2	Histology	36
2.3.3	Statistical Analyses	36
2.4.	Examining Space-Filling Characteristics of EVPOME.....	37
2.4.1	Quantifying Surface Irregularities	40
2.5	Comparison of AlloDerm®/ EVPOME.....	40
2.5.1	Corrections and Improvements.....	44
2.5.2	Future Directions.....	44
	References	46
	Figures	50
	Table 1	60
	Chapter III Acoustic Microscopy Analyses to Determine Good Versus Failed Tissue Engineered Oral Mucosa Under Normal or Thermally Stressed Culture Conditions	61
3.1	Introduction	61
3.1.1	Background on EVPOME for Use in Repair and Replacement .	62
3.1.2	Background on SAM and the Use of Surface Profilometry	63
3.1.2.1	Profilometry	64
3.2	Materials and Methods in Developing and Examining Thermally Stressed EVPOME	65
3.2.1	EVPOME Preparation – Stressed and Unstressed.....	65
3.2.2	SAM Apparatus Set-up and Imaging, Tissue Preparations and Analyses.....	66
3.2.2.1	Histology.....	68

3.2.2.2 Statistical Analyses.....	68
3.3 Results.....	69
3.4 Analyzing Thermal Effects on EVPOME Space Filling Properties Based on SAM	72
References	75
Figures	78
Chapter IV Ultrasonic Analyses Algorithm on an <i>Ex Vivo</i> Produced Oral Mucosal Equivalent After Undergoing a Thermal Stress Test.....	85
4.1 Representation of Filtering and Analyses Algorithm on SAM EVPOME Images	85
4.2 SAM Scans on EVPOME and the Application of Analyses Algorithm and Noise Removal.....	87
References	89
Figures	90
Chapter V Ultrasonic Profilometry and Stress-Strain Analyses on Natural and Engineered Oral Tissues After Mechanical Deformation Testing	94
5.1 Introduction.....	94
5.1.1 Background on Oral Mucosal Anatomy.....	95
5.1.2 Background on the Human Dermis and its Comparison to AlloDerm®	95
5.1.3 Background on EVPOME	97
5.1.4 Background on SAM.....	97
5.1.5 Background on Small Tissue Compression Device and Testing.....	98
5.2 Materials and Methods.....	104
5.2.1 Preparation of Natural Tissues	104
5.2.2 Preparation of AlloDerm® and EVPOME Devices.....	104
5.2.3 SAM Set-up and Imaging	105
5.2.4 Mechanical Compression Using SAM.....	107
5.2.5 SAM 3D Deformation Image and Motion Processing.....	108
5.2.6 Mechanical Testing Using Cylindrical Compressor.....	108
5.2.7 Statistical Analyses	109

5.3 Results.....	109
5.3.1 3D Deformation Scans.....	110
5.3.2 Mechanical Compression Testing.....	110
5.3.3 Mechanical Testing and Examination of Stressed and Unstressed EVPOME and AlloDerm® Specimens.....	112
5.3.4 Examination of Stressed and Unstressed EVPOME and AlloDerm® Specimens using Fitting Program for 1-Term Ogden Models.....	113
5.4 Discussion.....	114
5.4.1 Analyses of Thermal Stressed/Unstressed Specimens.....	116
5.4.2 Further Comparisons between SAM and the Mechanical Compressor on Elastic Properties of Natural and Engineered Tissues.....	117
References.....	119
Figures.....	123
Chapter VI Conclusions and Future Directions.....	140
References.....	150

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1. Histological representations of a mature EVPOME and an unseeded AlloDerm [®] scaffold	24
Figure 1.2. Histology image of human palate tissue.	24
Figure 2.1. Illustrative schematic of the oral mucosa	50
Figure 2.2. Histology of natural oral mucosa tissue (a) and EVPOME device	51
Figure 2.3A. Illustrative set-up of the SAM.....	52
Figure 2.3B. Set-up: 61 MHz Transducer	53
Figure 2.4. Plot diagram of the SAM	54
Figure 2.5. Illustrative set-up used to quantify the surface irregularities... ..	55
Figure 2.6. Representative AlloDerm [®] and EVPOME images from the respective histology scans (a-d) and SAM images	56
Figure 2.7. 3D SAM representations of the AlloDerm [®] , EVPOME	57
Figure 2.8. Histology and SAM correlations between counts for AlloDerm [®] and EVPOME.....	58
Figure 2.9. Linear regression analyses for surface irregularity counts.....	59
Figure 3.1. Plot diagram of the SAM	78
Figure 3.2. 2D B-scan and histology images of the untreated AlloDerm [®] device and EVPOME.....	79
Figure 3.3. 2D B-scan and histology composites of the EVPOME devices for both the thermally unstressed and stressed groups.....	80
Figure 3.4. RMS profilometry images for each scan performed on the thermally non-stressed and stressed devices.....	81
Figure 3.5. SAM 2D B-scan, histology micrograph, and C-scan profile of an unseeded AlloDerm [®] device.....	82
Figure 3.6. 2D B-scans of non-stressed devices showing surface irregularities.....	83
Figure 3.7. Comparative RMS heights for EVPOME devices, both unstressed, stressed, and the unseeded AlloDerm [®]	84
Figure 4.1. SAM 2D B-Scans of EVPOMEs under unstressed (a) and stressed (b) conditions.	90
Figure 4.2. SAM C-scans of an unstressed EVPOME specimen	91

Figure 4.3. SAM 2D B-scan of the thermal stress scaffold showing an elevated surface irregularity produced in the C-scan	92
Figure 4.4. RMS variations in height for the stressed and unstressed EVPOME specimens.....	93
Figure 5.1. Illustration of the human dermis and AlloDerm[®] specimen....	123
Figure 5.2a. Schematic side view of the compression system.....	124
Figure 5.2b. Photograph of the compression system	124
Figure 5.3. Oral keratinocytes on the EVPOME plate at 24-hours and 96-hours post-seeding	125
Figure 5.4 SAM 2D B-Scans and histology images between the unseeded AlloDerm[®] scaffold and the EVPOME	126
Figure 5.5a. Photograph of the compressor set up for the SAM	127
Figure 5.5b. Illustrative set-up of the SAM for strain imaging	128
Figure 5.5c. Photograph of the compressor set up for the SAM with the compression platform.....	129
Figure 5.5d. Photograph of SAM set-up for strain imaging	130
Figure 5.6. General RMS values between the AlloDerm[®] and EVPOME ..	131
Figure 5.7a. SAM mechanical compression tests between AlloDerm[®] and EVPOME	132
Figure 5.7b. Collective SAM mechanical compression tests.....	132
Figure 5.8. Collective stress-strain relationships for all tissue types.....	133
Figure 5.9. 2D B-scans of porcine buccal tissue (a) and EVPOME	134
Figure 5.10. SAM RMS profiles for the EVPOME specimens, both stressed and unstressed.....	135
Figure 5.11 a-d. Comparative 2D B-scans and histology images of EVPOME	136
Figure 5.12a. Stress-strain relationships comparing stressed and unstressed EVPOME and AlloDerm[®]	137
Figure 5.12b. Elastic modulus relationships comparing stressed and unstressed EVPOME and AlloDerm[®]	138
Figure 5.13. 1-term Ogden fitting models comparing the stress-to-stretch ratios between stressed and unstressed EVPOME and AlloDerm[®]	139

ABSTRACT

Use of Scanning Acoustic Microscopy to Examine and Evaluate Physical Characteristics of Mucosal Tissues

By

Frank Winterroth

Co-Chairs: Scott J. Hollister, J. Brian Fowlkes

Elastic properties of mucosal tissues (namely within the oral cavity and the uterine lining) are poorly understood. Deformation, flow, and remodeling are fundamental to a variety of higher cell functions including cell contraction, adhesion, spreading, wound healing, and division, and have been implicated as well in mechanotransduction, regulation of protein and DNA synthesis, and programmed cell death. Our understanding of the physical elastic measurements are unclear, both for natural and synthetically engineered soft tissues. The characteristics of tissue engineered oral mucosal tissues have resulted in successful transplantation. These oral mucosal tissues have also been incorporated into vaginoplasty. The versatility of the oral mucosal tissues shows the potential to incorporate as a surrogate for other soft tissues to repair/replace damaged or missing tissues and organs. Of critical importance is whether engineered tissues, specifically a commercially available acellular cadaveric dermal tissue (AlloDerm[®]) and an *ex vivo* produced oral mucosal equivalent (EVPOME) match the mechanical properties of native tissues. If the oral tissues' structural and physical functions are similar, it is possible that they are

compatible for surgical implantation to replace/repair damaged or missing uterine and vaginal tissues. Scanning acoustic microscopy (SAM) has been shown to effectively image the surface characteristics and mechanical properties of tissues at the micrometer range. We used SAM to study morphologies and elastic properties of both natural and engineered tissues; the latter being the AlloDerm[®] and EVPOME. These studies include using SAM to measure and characterize whether AlloDerm's[®] and/or EVPOME's physical properties are similar to natural oral mucosal tissues; this is a significant step to determine whether such tissues are transplantable to other areas of the body. Further studies to characterize regulated changes in the EVPOME involved using both SAM and standard histology images to analyze the EVPOME after it underwent an elevated thermal stress test. Finally, using a compression mechanism in conjunction with SAM - a known method to test for elasticity in tissues - this study aims to determine the elastic properties of soft tissues: oral mucosa and skin. In addition, the same tests were performed on AlloDerm[®] and EVPOME to compare their elastic properties.