



Nanotechnology: Translational Applications in Orthopaedic Surgery

Kevin J. McHale, MD
Matthew P. Sullivan, MD
Samir Mehta, MD

Department of Orthopaedic Surgery,
University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, PA

Introduction

The infinite molecular interactions that take place in the human body occur on the scale of nanometers (nm), or one billionth of a meter.^{1,2} Particles of less than 100nm have drastically different behavior versus larger particles with regard to melting point, conductivity, and reactivity.³ Materials with nanoscopic grain size have altered chemical properties that may produce unique and advantageous surface characteristics.⁴ Nanotechnology has developed into a multibillion dollar industry that has applications in dozens of fields, including science, electronics, cosmetics, and medicine. Basic science and translational research has revealed many important potential applications for nanotechnology in orthopaedic surgery. In this brief overview, we will discuss current concepts and future directions of nanotechnology in total joint arthroplasty, trauma surgery, orthopaedic oncology, musculoskeletal infection, and the treatment of peripheral nerve injuries.

Nanotechnology and Bone

Bone synthesis takes place at the nanoscopic level through interactions between macromolecules that promote osteoblast function. When orthopaedic implants are introduced into the natural cell environment, interactions between the implant and extracellular proteins are critical for osteointegration. Extracellular adhesion proteins, such as fibronectin and vitronectin, mediate osteoblast activation and adhesion to biomaterials, resulting in osteointegration.^{5,6} Unlike conventional implants, nanoscale surface topography mimics the topography of the natural cell environment allowing them to interact more effectively than conventional materials with extracellular adhesion proteins.³ Adsorption of these molecules is significantly increased on nanosurfaces as compared to conventional surfaces.⁴ Furthermore, nanostructured materials have been shown to inhibit the activity of cells that impede ingrowth and ongrowth, including smooth muscle cells, fibroblasts, and chondrocytes, resulting in improved osteointegration of implants.⁷

Corresponding author:

Samir Mehta, MD
Chief, Division of Orthopaedic Trauma
Assistant Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery
University of Pennsylvania
3400 Spruce Street, 2 Silverstein Pavilion
Philadelphia, PA 19104
samir.mehta@uphs.upenn.edu

Orthopaedic Device Applications

The application of nanotextured materials may reduce the risk of implant failure through improved osteointegration.^{4,8} As previously discussed, nanotextured surfaces enhance osteoblast function and decrease fibroblast function. This preferential cell activity results in increased bone formation on nanotextured hydroxyapatite coated surfaces when compared to similar materials with conventional roughness.^{3,9,10} When nano-sized hydroxyapatite is added to morselized cancellous bone graft, *in vitro* acetabular cup integration and stability following impaction grafting is significantly enhanced.¹¹ Improved mechanical properties are also seen in bone cement reinforced with nanoclay filler material.⁸ Some additional materials that display nanophase characteristics include nanoceramics, alumina, titania, carbon, selenium, nanometals Ti6AlV, cobalt chrome alloys, and nanocrystalline diamond.^{4,7,9,10,12-18}

Nano-composite scaffold implants composed of Type I collagen and nanostructured hydroxyapatite are being used clinically in the treatment of osteochondral defects of the knee. This type of implant may provide an 'off the shelf' cell-free solution to chondral defect treatment that is easier and less morbid than autograft or stem cell procedures.^{10,19,20}

In vitro studies have shown promise for nanotechnologic applications in orthopaedic oncology. Selenium has been found to be a powerful potentiator of chemotherapeutic agents.²¹ When manufactured on the nanometer scale and coated on titanium orthopaedic implants, nanophase selenium appears to inhibit malignant osteoblastic growth at the implant-tissue interface.²² Similarly, nanophase hydroxyapatite causes *in vitro* inhibition and apoptosis of osteosarcoma cells.²³

Advancements in nanotechnology have also shown potential for use in the prevention of infection. Nanophase silver dressings have proved to be more effective at preventing wound infections and stimulating wound healing than traditional silver-based dressings.^{24,25} Nanophase silver incorporated onto the surface of titanium orthopaedic implants has demonstrated strong, immediate bactericidal and anti-adhesive effects lasting for up to 30 days.²⁶

Nanophase materials have also had encouraging results when utilized for the treatment of peripheral nerve injury. Nanophase silver-impregnated Type I collagen scaffolds increase the amount of adsorbed proteins critical to nerve healing and lead to significant decreases in the time to nerve regeneration. In one study, the use of these scaffolds for the treatment of sciatic nerve defects in rabbits showed thicker myelin sheaths, improved nerve conduction, and higher rates of laminin adsorption when compared to control Type I collagen scaffolds.²⁷

Safety and Areas of Future Research

Critical unanswered questions remain regarding the safety of nanomaterials. The toxicity profiles of many nanomaterials are currently not known. Nanoparticles may be released over time through the degradation of implanted nanomaterial or may potentially enter the body through the dermal pores of individuals involved in their manufacture.²⁸ The metabolism of nanoparticles has been shown to involve various organ systems, including blood, liver, and kidneys, and may result in inflammation and oxidative stress.^{29,30} Nanoparticle wear debris has uncertain local tissue effects,⁹ and has been correlated with brain and lung toxicity in the in some studies.^{9,31} In contrast, nanosize wear debris has been associated with increased cell viability in bone and lung when compared to conventional wear particles in other studies.⁹ Due to the uncertainty regarding the safety of nanomaterials, studies evaluating the toxicity of nanophase materials must be conducted prior to the clinical application of these materials on a large scale.^{32,33}

Conclusion

The extensive basic research on nano-scale materials may yield beneficial orthopaedic surgical applications; however, relatively few clinical studies have been performed to confirm utility and safety of these agents. Though still in its infancy, nanotechnology has promising applications in arthroplasty, trauma, sports medicine, orthopaedic oncology, orthoplastic surgery, and many other facets of musculoskeletal medicine. The vast opportunities for advancement of nanotechnology and its applications within orthopaedic surgery present an exciting frontier in orthopaedic research.

References

1. Tasker LH, Sparey-Taylor GJ, Nokes LD. Applications of nanotechnology in orthopaedics. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2007;456:243-9.
2. Feynman RP. There's plenty of room at the bottom. *Eng Sci* 1960;23:22-36.
3. Balasundaram G, Webster TJ. An overview of nano-polymers for orthopedic applications. *Macromol Biosci* 2007;7:635-42.
4. Webster TJ, Ejirofor JU. Increased osteoblast adhesion on nanophase metals: Ti, Ti6Al4V, and CoCrMo. *Biomaterials* 2004;25:4731-9.
5. Webster TJ, Schadler LS, Siegel RW, et al. Mechanisms of enhanced osteoblast adhesion on nanophase alumina involve vitronectin. *Tissue Eng* 2001;7:291-301.
6. Wilson CJ, Clegg RE, Leavesley DI, et al. Mediation of biomaterial-cell interactions by adsorbed proteins: a review. *Tissue Eng* 2005;11:1-18.
7. Price RL, Waid MC, Haberstroh KM, et al. Selective bone cell adhesion on formulations containing carbon nanofibers. *Biomaterials* 2003;24:1877-87.
8. Misra N, Kapusetti G, Jaiswal S, et al. Toughening of bone cement using nanoparticle: the effect of solvent. *J Appl Polym Sci* 2011;121:1203-13.
9. Sato M, Webster TJ. Nanobiotechnology: implications for the future of nanotechnology in orthopedic applications. *Expert Rev Med Devices* 2004;1:105-14.
10. Durmus NG, Webster TJ. Nanostructured titanium: the ideal material for improving orthopedic implant efficacy? *Nanomedicine* 2012;7:791-3.
11. Chris Arts JJ, Verdonchot N, Schreurs BW, et al. The use of a bioresorbable nano-crystalline hydroxyapatite paste in acetabular bone impaction grafting. *Biomaterials* 2006;27:1110-8.
12. Appleford MR, Oh S, Oh N, et al. In vivo study on hydroxyapatite scaffolds with trabecular architecture for bone repair. *J Biomed Mater Res A* 2009;9:1019-27.
13. Webster TJ, Ergun C, Doremus RH, et al. Enhanced functions of osteoblasts on nanophase ceramics. *Biomaterials* 2000;21:1803-10.
14. Price RL, Ellison K, Haberstroh KM, et al. Nanometer surface roughness increases select osteoblast adhesion on carbon nanofiber compacts. *J Biomed Mater Res A* 2004;70:129-38.
15. Webster TJ, Siegel RW, Bizios R. Osteoblast adhesion on nanophase ceramics. *Biomaterials* 1999;20:1221-7.
16. Perla V, Webster TJ. Better osteoblast adhesion on nanoparticulate selenium - A promising orthopedic implant material. *J Biomed Mater Res* 2005;75:356-64.
17. Yang L, Sheldon BW, Webster TJ. Orthopedic nano diamond coatings: control of surface properties and their impact on osteoblast adhesion and proliferation. *J Biomed Mater Res A* 2009;91:548-56.
18. Yang L, Zhang L, Webster TJ. Carbon nanostructures for orthopedic medical applications. *Nanomedicine* 2011;6:1231-44.
19. Kon E, Delcogliano M, Filardo G, et al. Novel nano-composite multi-layered biomaterial for the treatment of multifocal degenerative cartilage lesions. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2009;17:1312-5.
20. Kon E, Delcogliano M, Filardo G, et al. A novel nano-composite multi-layered biomaterial for treatment of osteochondral lesions: technique note and an early stability pilot clinical trial. *Injury* 2010;41:693-701.
21. Nilsson G, Sun X, Nyström C, et al. Selenite induces apoptosis in sarcomatoid malignant mesothelioma cells through oxidative stress. *Free Radic Biol Med* 2006;41:874-85.
22. Tran P, Sarin L, Hurt RH, et al. Titanium surfaces with adherent selenium nanoclusters as a novel anticancer orthopedic material. *J Biomed Mater Res A* 2010;93:1417-28.
23. Shi Z, Huang X, Liu B, et al. Biological response of osteosarcoma cells to size-controlled nanostructured hydroxyapatite. *J Biomater Appl* 2010;25:19-37.
24. Lu S, Gao W, Gu HY. Construction, application and biosafety of silver nanocrystalline chitosan wound dressing. *Burns* 2008;34:623-8.
25. Atiyeh BS, Costagliola M, Hayek SN, et al. Effect of silver on burn wound infection control and healing: Review of the literature. *Burns* 2007;33:139-48.
26. Zhao L, Wang H, Huo K, et al. Antibacterial nano-structured titania coating incorporated with silver nanoparticles. *Biomaterials* 2011;32:5706-16.
27. Ding T, Luo ZJ, Zheng Y, et al. Rapid repair and regeneration of damaged rabbit sciatic nerves by tissue-engineered scaffold made from nano-silver and collagen type I. *Injury* 2010;41:522-7.
28. Christenson EM, Anseth KS, van den Beucken JJ, et al. Nanobiomaterial applications in orthopedics. *J Orthop Res* 2007;25:11-22.
29. Laurencin CT, Kumbhar SG, Nukavarapu SP. Nanotechnology and orthopedics: a personal perspective. *Nanomed Nanobiotechnol* 2009;1:6-10.
30. Borm PJ. Particle toxicology: from coal mining to nanotechnology. *Inhal Toxicol* 2002;14:311-24.
31. Tamura K, Takashi N, Akasaka T, et al. Effects of micro/nano particle size on cell function and morphology. *Key Engng Mat* 2004;254-256, 919-922.
32. Maynard AD, Warheit DB, Philbert MA. The new toxicology of sophisticated materials: nanotoxicology and beyond. *Toxicol Sci* 2011;120(Suppl 1):S109-29.
33. Pleshko N, Grande DA, Myers KR. Nanotechnology in orthopaedics. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg* 2012;20:60-2.