



Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand). This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the Library

[Thesis Consent Form](#)

Modelling Breast Tissue Mechanics Under Gravity Loading

by Vijayaraghavan Rajagopal.

Supervised by Assoc. Prof. Poul.M.F. Nielsen and Dr.
Martyn.P. Nash.

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Bioengineering,
The University of Auckland, 2007.



BIOENGINEERING INSTITUTE
THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND

Bioengineering Institute
The University of Auckland
New Zealand
January 2007

Abstract

This thesis presents research that was conducted to develop anatomically realistic finite element models of breast deformation under a variety of gravity loading conditions to assist clinicians in tracking suspicious tissues across multiple imaging modalities.

Firstly, the accuracy of the modelling framework in predicting deformations of a homogeneous body was measured using custom designed silicon gel phantoms. The model predicted surface deformations with an average RMS error of $1.5 \text{ mm} \pm 0.2 \text{ mm}$ and tracked internal marker locations with an average RMS error of $1.4 \text{ mm} \pm 0.7 \text{ mm}$.

A novel method was then developed to determine the reference configuration of a body, when given its mechanical properties, boundary conditions and a deformed configuration. The theoretical validity of the technique was confirmed with an analytic solution. The accuracy of the method was also measured using silicon gel experiments, predicting the reference configuration surface with an average RMS error of $1.3 \text{ mm} \pm 0.1 \text{ mm}$, and tracking internal marker locations with an average error of $1.5 \text{ mm} \pm 0.8 \text{ mm}$.

Silicon gel composites were then created to measure the accuracy of standard techniques to model heterogeneity. The models did not match the experimentally recorded deformations. This highlighted the need for further validation exercises on modelling heterogeneity before modelling them in the breast.

A semi-automated algorithm was developed to fit finite element models to the skin and muscle surfaces of each individual, which were segmented from breast MR images. The code represented the skin with an average RMS error of $1.46 \text{ mm} \pm 0.32 \text{ mm}$ and the muscle with an average RMS error of $1.52 \text{ mm} \pm 0.3 \text{ mm}$.

The framework was then tested using images of the breast obtained under different gravity loading conditions and neutral buoyancy. A homogeneous model was first developed using the neutral buoyancy images as a representation of the reference configuration. The model did not accurately capture the regional deformations of the breast under gravity loading. However, the gross shape of the breast was

reproduced, indicating that a biomechanical model of the breast could be useful to reliably track tissues across multiple images for cancer diagnosis.

Acknowledgments

This thesis would not have been possible without the generous funding from the Foundation of Research Science and Technology NZ (FRST) through the Top Achiever Doctoral Scheme and the University of Auckland through the Doctoral Scholarship. I would also like to thank the University Research Office for providing travel expenses for conferences via the Graduate Research Fund.

The MR images used in this thesis would not have been available without the hard work of Dr. Ruth Warren to obtain Local Regional Ethical Committee (LREC) approval for the use of her images from Cambridge, UK. Thanks to Sandra Wilson, Shelley Park and our volunteer for providing their time to obtain additional MR images at the Center for Advanced MRI (CAMRI), here in Auckland, NZ.

The advisory committee, consisting of Drs. Ralph Highnam, Elijah Van Houten, Associate Prof. Alistair Young and Prof. Peter Hunter has been excellent at giving me very valuable feedback throughout the duration of this thesis.

I would also like to thank the people at the Bioengineering Institute for their help and support throughout this thesis. The reverse method would not have been developed without Dr. David Bullivant's insights. I would like to thank Kevin Augenstein for his invaluable discussions on finite elasticity theory, nonlinear optimisation and everything else that is interesting in life, Rob Kirton for the time he gave to discuss any new experimental designs and ideas, Sharif Malak's experience with tools such as the CNC milling machine were very important for the progression of the silicon gel phantom studies and Peter Blythe's appointment at the Institute proved to be very valuable. I am also indebted to Yme Kvistedal, David Nickerson and Alice Boit for their open ears to discussions ranging from breast biomechanics to jazz, comedy and the spelling of badabing badabum. I should acknowledge my office mates for putting up with my noise. Thanks also go to the other large group of people who open their doors for me to disturb them with the minutiae of my life - Rita, Zoar, Leo, Travis, David, Annalisa to just name a few.

A separate paragraph is required to highlight the importance of the Admin and IT staff for their help. It has been a pleasure to see the smiling faces at the reception

during my daily strolls around the institute. Thanks to Andrew Cantell, Tiong Lim and Stephen Poon for maintaining I.T. order in such a rapidly growing research department.

My summer students, Kenneth Tran, Xiao Bo Liu and Angela Lee have played a very important in the completion of this work. I thank them for their assistance.

Special thanks goes to Jae Chung who has been a colleague and friend whom I have worked with closely during this PhD. It has been a pleasure working as a team with what could arguably be considered as the toughest challenge to mankind - silicon gel.

This thesis could not have reached this far without the guidance of my supervisors Associate Professor Poul Nielsen and Dr. Martyn Nash. Their objective critique of my work and trust in my abilities shall never be forgotten. I am grateful for their open door policy and the support they have provided me in these years gone by.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this thesis to four people who mean more to me than my own life - My parents and two brothers. Their patience, love, support and guidance throughout my life has made me the person I am today and therefore I am forever indebted to them.

Srimannarayana

Contents

I	Motivation and Background	1
1	Introduction	3
1.1	Motivation	3
1.2	Non-rigid Registration of Breast Images	7
1.3	Thesis Overview and Contributions	10
2	Background	15
2.1	Anatomy of the Breast	15
2.1.1	External parts of the breast	18
2.1.2	Internal components of the breast	20
2.1.3	Microanatomy of breast tissues	26
2.1.4	Changes in breast anatomy	26
2.2	Finite Elasticity Theory	32
2.2.1	Kinematics	32
2.2.2	Stress tensors for finite elasticity	35
2.2.3	Stress equilibrium and principle of virtual work	36
2.2.4	Boundary conditions	38
2.2.5	Generalization for different coordinate systems	39
2.2.6	Constitutive relations	39
2.3	Finite Elements for Finite Elasticity	44
2.3.1	The finite element technique	44
2.3.2	Implementation of finite elasticity	47
2.4	Biomechanical Properties of Breast Tissues	54
2.5	Previous Finite Element Models of Breast Biomechanics	57
2.6	Thesis Research Proposal	61
II	Validation of the Biomechanics Modelling Framework	65
3	Forward Mechanics of a Homogeneous Body	67

3.1	Validation with an Analytic Solution	68
3.2	Experimental Framework	69
3.2.1	Modelling mechanical properties of silicon gel	70
3.2.2	Phantom geometry and boundary conditions	74
3.2.3	Applying loading conditions	75
3.2.4	Displacement convergence analysis of phantom model	78
3.3	Validation Experiments	82
3.3.1	Validation method	82
3.3.2	Validation results	84
3.3.3	Discussion	89
3.4	Conclusion	90
4	Reverse Mechanics of a Homogeneous Body	91
4.1	Directly Calculating a Reference State - The Reverse Method	92
4.2	Validation with an Analytic Solution	94
4.3	Validation with an Experiment	95
4.3.1	Validation results	96
4.3.2	Discussion	101
4.4	Conclusion	104
5	Forward Mechanics of a Heterogeneous Body	105
5.1	The Interface between Skin and Breast Tissue	107
5.1.1	Validation experiment	107
5.1.2	3D-3D tight coupling	109
5.1.3	2D-3D tight coupling	112
5.1.4	ABAQUS	114
5.2	The Interface between Fat and Fibroglandular Tissues	115
5.2.1	Validation experiment	116
5.2.2	3D-3D tight coupling	116
5.3	Discussion	119
5.4	Conclusion	120
III	Modelling the Breast	121
6	Modelling Breast Geometry	123
6.1	Background and Previous Work	124
6.2	Creating Individual-Specific Models	125
6.2.1	Tissue segmentation and digitisation	126

6.2.2	Initial geometry	129
6.2.3	Automatic model generation	133
6.2.4	Fitting Results	137
6.3	Discussion	143
6.4	Conclusions	143
7	Modelling Breast Mechanics - The Clinical Setting	145
7.1	Clinical Experimental Plan	146
7.1.1	Imaging the breast under gravity loading conditions	146
7.1.2	Imaging the breast in neutral buoyancy	151
7.2	Modelling the Clinical Experiments	156
7.2.1	Neutral buoyancy to gravity loading - a homogeneous model .	156
7.2.2	Using the reverse method	169
7.2.3	Using the prone gravity-loaded configuration	177
7.3	Discussion	184
7.4	Conclusions	186
IV	Thesis Review	187
8	Conclusions and Future Work	189
8.1	Silicon Gel Studies	189
8.2	Clinical Studies	190
8.3	Future Work	191
8.4	List of Publications	193
V	Appendices	195
A	Phantom Mould Design	197
B	Model Validation Using X-Ray Images	203
B.1	Methods	203
B.1.1	X-Ray Distortion and Biplane Registration	204
B.2	Results	207
B.3	Discussion	211
C	The Reverse Optimisation Method	213
C.1	Preliminary Study	214
C.2	Results	218

C.3 Discussion	218
D Comparing ABAQUS and CMISS Simulations	221
E Defining Constitutive Models in CMISS Using CellML	227
F A Review on Characterising Mechanical Properties of Breast Tissues	229
F.1 Yu-Neifert (1995)	229
F.2 Krouskop et al. (1998)	230
F.3 Wellman (1999)	231
F.4 Williams (2000)	232
F.5 Discussion	234
G Automatic Generation of Breast Geometries	237
G.1 Scaling and Repositioning the Initial Mesh	237
G.2 Further Customisation of the Initial Mesh	242
G.3 Modelling the Skin Contour	246
G.4 Scaling and Repositioning the Skin Fitted Mesh	249
G.5 Modelling the Muscle Contour	253
G.6 Adjusting Derivatives Through the Thickness	255

List of Figures

1.1	Typical breast compression protocols.	3
1.2	A typical mammogram of the breast.	4
1.3	Benign lesion obscured by overlapping tissue structures.	5
1.4	An ultrasound image of a simple breast cyst within the glandular layer of breast tissue.	6
1.5	A MR image of the breasts of a volunteer.	7
2.1	Gross anatomy of the breast.	17
2.2	External parts of the breast.	19
2.3	A section of the mammary gland through the nipple.	21
2.4	Lactiferous ducts and glandules.	22
2.5	Arteries, veins and nerves in the breast.	25
2.6	Microanatomy of the breast.	27
2.7	Changes in breast parenchyma during the menstrual cycle.	29
2.8	Microanatomy of the lactating breast.	30
2.9	Involution of breast parenchyma.	30
2.10	Body in reference and current configuration.	33
2.11	Deformation of line segment $d\mathbf{X}$ to $d\mathbf{x}$	34
2.12	A line segment with a function u represented with field values U_1 and U_2 at the boundary points and linear basis functions.	48
2.13	Linear Lagrange basis functions.	48
2.14	Variation in breast biomechanical properties.	56
3.1	The tensile testing rig used to model the behaviour of the material.	70
3.2	Force-displacement data experimentally recorded and reproduced by model for the uniaxial extension of the silicon gel.	72
3.3	Comparison of finite element prediction of deformation of silicon gel under gravity.	73
3.4	Mould, gel and model.	76
3.5	Orientation of gel under different gravity loading conditions.	77

3.6	(top) Three-dimensional view of initial phantom model and data points at which strains were calculated. (bottom) Predicted mode of deformation using 30 SI gravity loading condition	79
3.7	Graph showing the convergence of RMS error in displacements of points inside mesh (Fig 3.6) with increasing resolution.	80
3.8	Mesh resolution (with 4200 degrees of freedom) chosen for this study.	81
3.9	MRI of gel in the reference, supine and 20 SI configurations.	86
3.10	Visual representation of surface deformation matching accuracy.	87
3.11	Visual representation of the internal marker tracking accuracy for 20 SI deformation.	88
4.1	Algorithm to solve for the reference state, given a deformed state and loading conditions	93
4.2	Convergence rate of reverse method.	95
4.3	Finite element model fitted to data from 20 SI deformation.	98
4.4	Reference configuration surface matching accuracy from the 20 SI deformation.	99
4.5	Internal marker tracking accuracy for 20 SI deformation.	100
4.6	Two predicted reference state surface data sets using the reverse method.	103
5.1	Mould and composite phantom used to validate interface models	108
5.2	Data points at which displacements are recorded for convergence analysis.	110
5.3	Model convergence of RMS error in displacements of selected points inside the mesh (Fig 5.2) with increasing mesh resolution.	111
5.4	Comparison of model prediction (shaded) to experimental data (gold spheres).	111
5.5	Model convergence of the RMS error in displacements of selected points inside the mesh (Fig 5.2) with increasing mesh resolution.	112
5.6	Comparison of model prediction (shaded) to experimental data (gold spheres).	113
5.7	Node used to compare between ABAQUS and CMISS shown as a gold sphere.	115
5.8	Data points at which displacements are compared for convergence analysis.	117
5.9	Model convergence of RMS error in Euclidean displacements of selected points inside the mesh (Fig 5.8) with increasing mesh resolution.	118

5.10	Comparison of model prediction (lines) to experimental data (gold spheres).	118
6.1	Segmenting different tissue types.	127
6.2	3D digital representation of the various breast tissue components obtained from manual segmentation.	128
6.3	First attempt at creation of initial mesh specific to each individual.	130
6.4	Surface fitted initial mesh showing distorted volume elements.	131
6.5	The initial mesh used to model breast geometry.	132
6.6	Scaling and translation of the initial mesh to the skin data cloud	134
6.7	The new mesh for a particular image set, showing that the scaling and repositioning was not sufficient to produce a good initial mesh.	135
6.8	Further customisation of the initial mesh.	136
6.9	Fitting results.	138
6.10	Repositioning of the mesh.	139
6.11	Fitting results.	140
6.12	Recalculating ξ_3 derivatives changes the shape of the volume (in blue for example) to be less distorted, making the model usable for large deformation mechanics problems	141
6.13	Final breast surface geometry for each individual following the fitting procedure	142
7.1	A typical breast coil used for MR imaging of the breast.	147
7.2	(a): Polystyrene board with hole to position breasts in prone position with no contact. (b) Polystyrene board with a 11.5 degree incline.	149
7.3	Polystyrene boards used to support the lower half of the volunteer's body	150
7.4	Overlay of cylinder on surface of mannequin breast.	152
7.5	Profile of points on mannequin and MR dataset that intersect with the cylinder opening.	153
7.6	Cylinder used for neutral buoyancy imaging.	154
7.7	Image of the breast in neutral buoyancy.	155
7.8	Generic breast mesh fitted to the skin and bone surface data points from neutral buoyancy images.	159
7.9	Data points at which displacements are recorded for convergence analysis.	160
7.10	Convergence of RMS error in Euclidean displacements of selected points inside the model (Fig 7.9) with increasing mesh resolution.	161

7.11	Mesh resolution (with 5184 degrees of freedom) chosen for this study.	162
7.12	Comparison of model prediction (lines, surfaces) to experimental data (blue spheres) for the prone orientation.	163
7.13	Comparison of model prediction to experimental data in the prone orientation.	164
7.14	Comparison of model prediction (lines, surfaces) to experimental data (blue spheres) with volunteer arched upward in MR machine.	165
7.15	Comparison of model prediction (lines, surfaces) to experimental data (blue spheres) with volunteer arched downward in MR machine.	166
7.16	Comparison of model prediction (lines, surfaces) to experimental data (blue spheres) with volunteer oriented with the right shoulder down.	167
7.17	Comparison of model prediction (lines, surfaces) to experimental data (blue spheres) in supine position.	168
7.18	Flow chart of the material parameter optimisation algorithm to characterise the mechanical behaviour of the breast.	170
7.19	Generic mesh fitted to the skin and bone surface data points from prone gravity-loaded images.	171
7.20	Comparison of model prediction from computed reference configuration to experimental data with volunteer in “head up” position in MR machine (blue spheres).	172
7.21	Comparison of model prediction (lines, surfaces) to experimental data (blue spheres) in the “head up” orientation.	173
7.22	Comparison of model prediction (lines, surfaces) from computed reference configuration to experimental data (blue spheres) with volunteer arched downward in MR machine.	174
7.23	Comparison of model prediction (lines, surfaces) from computed reference configuration to experimental data (blue spheres) with volunteer oriented with the right shoulder down.	175
7.24	Comparison of model prediction (lines, surfaces) from computed reference configuration to experimental data (blue spheres) in supine position.	176
7.25	Comparison of model prediction (lines, surfaces) from the prone gravity-loaded configuration to experimental data (blue spheres) with volunteer in “head up” position in MR machine.	179
7.26	Comparison of model prediction (lines, surfaces) to experimental data (blue spheres) in the “head up” orientation.	180

7.27	Comparison of model prediction (lines, surfaces) from the prone gravity-loaded configuration to experimental data (blue spheres) with volunteer arched downward in MR machine.	181
7.28	Comparison of model prediction (lines, surfaces) from the prone gravity-loaded configuration to experimental data (blue spheres) with volunteer oriented with the right shoulder down.	182
7.29	Comparison of model prediction (lines, surfaces) from the prone gravity-loaded configuration to experimental data (blue spheres) in supine position.	183
A.1	Draft view of mould created for phantom studies	198
A.2	Base plate of mould	199
A.3	Bottom lid of mould	200
A.4	Assembly of the parts into the mould	201
B.1	X-ray image of a acrylic grid. No distortion visible	204
B.2	Acrylic phantom and its x-ray images taken from orthogonal views.	206
B.3	X-ray images of the gel phantom used to measure internal marker tracking errors.	208
B.4	Visual representation of surface deformation matching accuracy in the supine deformation.	209
B.5	Visual representation of the internal marker tracking accuracy for the supine deformation.	210
C.1	The reverse optimisation method: Proposed method of estimating the reference state.	216
C.2	(a): Undeformed state and data cloud. (b): Predicted deformed state and tracked data cloud (c): undeformed state (gold lines), and initial guess at undeformed state (blue lines overlayed on undeformed)	217
D.1	First one-element unit cube problem set up for comparison between CMISS and ABAQUS.	222
D.2	Comparison of deformed state (blue lines), predicted from the reference state (green lines) using ABAQUS and CMISS.	223
D.3	Second one-element unit cube problem set up for comparison between CMISS and ABAQUS.	223
D.4	Comparison of deformed state (blue lines), predicted from the reference state (green lines) using ABAQUS and CMISS.	224

List of Tables

2.1	Mean and standard deviation values of the calculated Young's modulus summarizing the tested 169 breast tissue samples (From Samani et al. (2007)).	55
3.1	Parameters used for validation purposes using analytic solution for pressure inflation, and extension of a thick-walled cylinder	69
3.2	Deformed internal and external radii predicted for different mesh refinements of the reference state	69
3.3	Root-mean-squared errors (RMSE) in tracking surface deformations and Euclidean distance (ED) between predicted and measured internal marker positions for the silicon gel phantom imaged using MRI.	85
4.1	Root-mean-squared errors (RMSE) in fitting finite element model surfaces to laser scanned surface deformation data.	96
4.2	Root-mean-squared errors (RMSE) in matching the reference configuration surface and Euclidean distance (ED) between predicted and measured internal marker positions for the silicon gel phantom imaged using MRI.	97
6.1	RMS errors and time for geometric fitting of skin and muscle surfaces of the finite element model to skin and muscle from MR images of breasts from six individuals.	137
B.1	Root-mean-squared errors (RMSE) in tracking surface deformations and Euclidean distance between predicted and measured internal marker (Int. Mk.) positions for a silicon gel phantom imaged using x-ray.	207
C.1	Performance of the reverse optimisation method in estimating the reference configuration with increasing degrees of freedom.	219