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Abstract
Kelvin–Voigt fractional derivative (KVFD) model parameters have been used to describe viscoelastic properties of soft tissues. However, translating model parameters into a concise set of intrinsic mechanical properties related to tissue composition and structure remains challenging. This paper begins by exploring these relationships using a biphasic emulsion materials with known composition. Mechanical properties are measured by analyzing data from two indentation techniques—ramp-stress relaxation and load-unload hysteresis tests. Material composition is predictably correlated with viscoelastic model parameters. Model parameters estimated from the tests reveal that elastic modulus $E_0$ closely approximates the shear modulus for pure gelatin. Fractional-order parameter $\alpha$ and time constant $\tau$ vary monotonically with the volume fraction of the material’s fluid component. $\alpha$ characterizes medium fluidity and the rate of energy dissipation, and $\tau$ is a viscous time constant. Numerical simulations suggest that the viscous coefficient $\eta$ is proportional to the energy lost during quasi-static force-displacement cycles, $E_A$. The slope of $E_A$ versus $\eta$ is determined by $\alpha$ and the applied indentation ramp time $T_r$. Experimental measurements from phantom and ex vivo liver data show close agreement with theoretical predictions of the $\eta - E_A$ relation. The relative error is less than 20% for emulsions 22% for liver. We find that KVFD model parameters form a concise features space for biphasic medium characterization that described time-varying mechanical properties.
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1. Introduction

Mechanical properties of soft biological tissues have been studied extensively with the hope of enriching our collective understanding of how tissue composition and structure influence the mechanical properties that guide cellular behavior [1–5]. Tissue deformation patterns resulting from applied force stimuli can reveal properties of the tissue mechno-environment that influence cellular decision making in health and disease [6]. To exploit the diagnostic potential of this information, we must identify combinations of measurement techniques and data-reduction models that provide consistent parametric estimates corresponding to intrinsic tissue properties.

Deformation modeling is challenging because tissues are not material continua. Parameters derived from classical material modeling that represent mechanical measurements in tissues at one scale may not at another. Tissue properties are determined in part by fluid movement in the open- and closed-cell compartments found within a viscoelastic collagen matrix that is actively maintained by the embedded cells to meet programmed needs. These biphasic (solid/liquid) media exhibit multifaceted deformation responses that are particularly difficult to model using a concise feature set. Among the many techniques available for measuring mechanical properties, indentation testing remains the simplest and most recognized, and therefore has become the focus of our study. Time-dependent testing methods involving quasi-static loading yield force-relaxation curves and load-unload hysteresis loops that can reveal the intrinsic properties we seek.

It is common to parameterize time-varying mechanical responses using constitutive models that fit to measurement data [7]. Hookean elastic springs and Newtonian viscous dashpots are combined to parameterize the biphasic characteristics of soft tissues. Spring constants represent the elastic responses of connective-tissue elements and dashpot coefficients quantify viscous responses, each selected to summarize tissue components at a relevant scale and load rate. The ideal constitutive model for this purpose is able to represent more than one testing measurement over a practical range of medium properties and deformation rates with one set of parameter values. We aim to achieve consistently accurate models with as few parameters as possible to avoid overfitting. Such models are diagnostically useful if the parameters can be related to tissue components involved in disease processes. There is little evidence for such consistency with classic integer-order derivative models (Kelvin–Voigt, Maxwell, and standard linear solid (SLS)) despite widespread use [8–10]. Some labs have shown that fractional-derivative models [11] can represent a range of measurement data with a small number of parameters [12–19]. Achieving the same close fit between models and measurement data using a Prony series and compound integer-order derivative models requires many more parameters [20].

The KVFD model has been applied to data from a wide range of multiphasic viscoelastic composite materials under different loading conditions [38–41]. We examined KVFD models applied to measurements of breast tissues following quasi-static uniaxial plate compressions in search of diagnostic indicators [38]. Others interpreted model parameters from data fit to compressed clays subjected to vertical-line loads to inform civil engineering applications [39]. Some general interpretation of medium composition and structure may be represented by model-parameter values, but these parameters are not intrinsic to the medium as they are also influenced by changing experimental conditions [21, 40]. KVFD model parameters describe how the microscopic properties of molecular crosslinking and fluid movement influence macroscopic properties like stiffness and mechano-biological state [41].

We previously examined the data-fitting accuracy of ramp-relaxation indentation measurements acquired from viscoelastic media using a Kelvin–Voigt fractional derivative (KVFD) model [21]. The aim of this report is to continue exploring that measurement-analysis combination by comparing different indentation-based measurement techniques applied to biphasic hydrogel emulsions and tissues. In this way, we can systematically relate changes in medium composition to variations in KVFD model parameters. Our analysis of the emulsions is then expanded to include measurements of ex vivo liver-tissue samples, some of which are heated to denature the collagenous matrix thus systematically modifying the mechanical properties. Together, the results suggest there is an interpretation of composite-medium properties in terms of model parameters that further encourages use of KVFD modeling in isotropic biological tissues.

2. Material and methods

2.1. Material preparation

2.1.1. Hydrogel samples. Emulsion samples included in these experiments were made from a combination of gelatin powder, deionized water, and a commercial skin cream, each component in precise weight concentrations. Gelatin powder (Type B gelatin, Rousselot, Dubuque, IA) was first mixed with deionized water in a beaker at room temperature and heated at 70 °C in a water basin for 45 min. The beaker was covered by aluminum foil during heating to minimize water evaporation. The mixture was stirred with a spoon every 5 min. Once the molten gelatin was removed from the water bath, it was cooled at room temperature to 30 °C while being periodically stirred. Then a mass of Vanicream (oil-in-water emulsion with oil-droplet size 100–1000 nm, Pharmaceutical Specialties, Inc., Rochester MN) was added to the clear gelatin and rapidly stirred for several minutes until a visually homogenous milky-white liquid formed. The still-molten mixture was poured into cylindrical molds, sealed in plastic wrap, and stored at room temperature for 24 h to congeal before mechanical testing. Rigid plastic molds used to form the samples were cylindrical in shape, being 50 mm in diameter and 20 mm in height. It is essential that the manufacturing process be exactly reproduced in every detail if the mechanical properties of the samples are to be highly reproducible.

The congealed gelatin-cream samples are emulsions of cream particles suspended within the denatured collagen-
polymer aggregates, where cream particles on the order of 10 μm diameter are themselves a finer-scale oil-in-water emulsion. Fixing the gelatin concentration, the concentration of cream was increased as the water concentration decreased so the total sample mass remained constant. This recipe was scaled in volume to produce 6 samples at every cream concentration studied. As long as the gelatin concentration was held fixed, we will show that sample stiffness remains roughly constant. Cream adds a viscous-fluid component that generates a time-varying mechanical response during quasi-static compressive macro-indentation. Without cream, pure gelatin responds elastically [22].

A range of time-varying mechanical responses to indentation, similar to those observed in soft parenchymal tissues, was generated by varying both gelatin and cream concentrations as follows. At each of three gelatin concentrations (3%, 5%, and 8% by weight), we constructed 6 samples at one of five different cream concentrations (0%, 5%, 20%, 30%, and 50% by weight). Samples labeled G3C5 contain 3 g gelatin, 5 g Vanicream, and 92 g deionized water per 100 g of sample material. A sample labeled G8C20 has 8 g of gelatin powder, 20 g of cream, and 72 g of water per 100 g. From magnified visual inspection of the samples, it appears that cream particles in the congealed gel samples are liquid at room temperature (22 °C) where measurements are made.

2.1.2. Porcine liver. Frozen pig livers were obtained from a local market and completely thawed in water over several hours. Measurements were made on ex vivo liver samples at room temperature within 6 h of thawing. Samples roughly 40 × 30 × 15 mm³ in size were cut from liver lobes lacking major vasculature or ducts. Some specimens were tested without further processing. Others were tested after being heated in isotonic saline at 45 °C, 55 °C, or 65 °C for 40 min. After heating, samples were placed in new isotonic saline at room temperature for at least 45 min before indentation. Further experimental details are provided in section 3.4.

2.2. Methods

2.2.1. Indentation testing. Mechanical tests were conducted on all samples using the TA-XT Plus Texture Analyzer (Texture Technologies, Algonquin, IL, USA) with a 5-mm-diameter spherical stainless steel indentation probe. Two mechanical tests were performed on each sample: a ramp load-unload hysteresis test and a force-relaxation test with ramp-and-hold loading [23]. Time series and P–s curves for the two experiments are illustrated in figure 1. All hydrogel samples were tested while bonded to their cylindrical molds. The mold size was shown to be large enough to avoid significant boundary influences during indentation for pure gelatin samples at concentrations between 3% and 8% [24]. Liver specimens were tested when placed on a flat surface without constraining sample boundaries.

During ramp-hold force-relaxation testing (figure 1(a)), the maximum indentation depth was s_max = 1 mm applied at the center of the cylindrical sample face. The ramp speed (probe velocity) was ν = 0.04 mm s⁻¹ delivered during a ramp time of T_r = 25 s. Subsequently, probe position was held constant for 300 s as relaxation of the force was monitored. The same experimental parameters ν and T_r were applied during loadunload testing, where ramp-load (P₁–s) and ramp-unload (P₂–s) curves were recorded (figure 1(b)).

In both tests, deionized water was added to the top surface of the samples so the spherical indenter was submerged. We showed this method reduces probe-sample adhesion forces to negligible values. We also verified that the water was not significantly absorbed by the samples during the measurement time [24].

2.2.2. Kelvin–Voigt fractional derivative (KVFD) model. Others [12, 13] have shown the KVFD model is an accurate and flexible method for generating a concise set of parameters describing the mechanical responses of biphasic media during quasi-static deformation.

The constitutive equation relating stress σ(t) to strain ε(t) for the fractional-derivative Kelvin–Voigt model is expressed as [14, 15]

\[ σ(t) = E_0ε(t) + η\frac{d^αε(t)}{dt^α}, \]  

(1)

where E₀ is an elastic modulus (Pa), η = E₀τ⁻α is a viscous coefficient (Pa·s⁻α) with time constant τ(s), and α is a unitless real number between (0, 1) that defines the derivative order. A primary goal of this paper is to relate model parameters E₀, α, τ to changes in gelatin and cream concentrations, while controlling for experimental parameters ν, T_r, as we test whether measurements of model parameters can be used to identify medium components.

Relaxation modulus G is defined through the Boltzmann superposition equation [14, 15]

\[ σ(t) = \int_0^t G(t - τ)\frac{dε(τ)}{dτ}dτ. \]  

(2)

Equating the Laplace transforms of equations (1) and (2), solving for G, and transforming back to the time domain yields the relaxation modulus for theKVFD model in two forms,

\[ G(t) = E_0\left(1 + \frac{(tτ)^{\alpha}}{Γ(1 - α)}\right) = E_0 + η\left(\frac{t^{-α}}{Γ(1 - α)}\right), \]  

(3)

where Γ(·) is a gamma function (see equation (7)). For the spherical indenter geometry, it was shown [14–16] that time-varying force P(t) and displacement s(t) could be substituted for stress and strain in equation (2) to give

\[ P(t) = \frac{8\sqrt{R}}{3}\int_0^t G(t - τ)\frac{d^2s(t)}{dt^2}dτ, \]  

(4)

where s(t) is specifically the depth of the indenter tip into the surface relative to the uncompressed equilibrium state of the sample surface.

2.2.3. Ramp-hold force relaxation experiment. The measured relaxation force can be modeled as a function of time-varying displacement s(t) and three KVFD model parameters descriptive of the compressed medium,
Given the ramp-hold displacement function,
\[ s(t) = \begin{cases} vt, & 0 \leq t \leq T_r \\ s_{\text{max}} = vT_r, & t > T_r \end{cases}, \]  
the ramp-hold relaxation force resulting from spherical indentation can be expressed by [21],
\[
P(t) = \begin{cases} 4\sqrt{R} s_{\text{max}} \int_0^1 t^{\eta-1}(1-t)^{\eta-1} dt & 0 < t \leq T_r \\ 4\sqrt{R} s_{\text{max}} \left[ \frac{2}{3} \Gamma(\frac{1}{\eta}) - \frac{(vt)^{\eta-1}}{\eta(1-\eta)} B(\frac{3}{2},1-\alpha) \right] & t \geq T_r \end{cases}
\]  
where \( \Gamma(z) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t} t^{z-1} dt \) is a Gamma function, \( B(x,y) = \int_0^1 t^{x-1}(1-t)^{y-1} dt \) \( \Re(x) > 0, \Re(y) > 0 \) is a beta function, and \( B(\alpha;x,y) = \int_0^a t^{\eta-1}(1-t)^{\eta-1} dt \) \( \alpha \in [0,1] \) is an incomplete beta function.

The three KVFD model parameters are estimated simultaneously by fitting the ramp solution in equation (7) to force-relaxation measurement data [21].

2.2.4. Loss-energy measurements from load-unload hysteresis experiment. When media are subjected to cyclic ramp loading-unloading and found to respond differently for the load phase than the unload phase, the area between the load-unload cycles is a triangular function of time,
\[ E_A = \int_0^{vT_r} ds(P_1(s) - P_2(s)). \]

Since there is no closed-form analytic solution for equation (10), \( E_A \) is calculated by numerical integration. In the results section, we explore the relationship between \( E_A \) and \( \eta \) under different combinations of model parameters for fixed ramp speed \( v \), to discover any relationships between the two quantities.

2.2.6. Statistical analysis. The elastic modulus of these samples is very sensitive not only to component materials but to the thermal history of the gelatin gel during manufacturing and storage. We occasionally made all 6 samples on 1 d and at other times 2 samples each day over 3 d. In this way, inter-sample variability was observed as well as measurement uncertainty. Error bars in plots summarizing gel-cream sample measurements are standard deviations of one measurement from each of 6 samples, unless otherwise noted. Error bars for liver-tissue measurement data are standard deviations of one measurement uncertainty. Error bars in plots summarizing gel-cream sample measurements are standard deviations of one measurement from each of 6 samples, unless otherwise noted. Error bars for liver-tissue measurement data are standard deviations of one measurement uncertainty. Error bars in plots summarizing gel-cream sample measurements are standard deviations of one measurement from each of 6 samples, unless otherwise noted. Error bars for liver-tissue measurement data are standard deviations of one measurement uncertainty. Error bars in plots summarizing gel-cream sample measurements are standard deviations of one measurement.
An analysis of variance (ANOVA) method was applied to analyze the sensitivity of each measured KVFD parameter to sample component concentrations. Two-way ANOVA was applied to examine the influence of two component variables, viz., gelatin percentage and cream percentage, on each KVFD parameter measured from a ramp-relaxation test. We rejected the null hypothesis when \( p < 0.05 \).

3. Results

3.1. KVFD modeling of measurement data

Ramp-relaxation measurements for each gel-cream emulsion sample were combined in a regression fit with equation (7) to estimate KVFD model parameters \( E_0, \alpha, \) and \( \tau \) for that sample. To illustrate, the best-fit model response (line) for sample G5C20 is shown along with the measurement data (dots) in figure 2(a). Applying the same parameter estimates (without further fitting) to equation (10), the predicted force response (line) in figure 2(b) is compared with load-unload hysteresis measurements (dots). Hence KVFD model parameters estimated from data obtained using the ramp-hold experiment closely predict data obtained from a load-unload hysteresis experiment except over those times when the probe separates from the sample.

3.2. Interpreting KVFD model parameters for ramp-relaxation data

Physical interpretations of \( E_0, \alpha, \) and \( \tau \) begin with their definitions in equations (1)–(3). In the following sections we amplify upon those interpretations for the media in this study using measurement data features. \( E_0 \) is the relaxation modulus measured at infinite time, \( E_0(\infty) \). The fractional-order parameter \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \) is widely regarded as a measure of material fluidity; specifically, \( \alpha \to 0 \) for solids and \( \alpha \to 1 \) for fluids. Intermediate values of \( \alpha \) reflect mixtures of the two phases [18, 19]. Relaxation time constant \( \tau \) scales measurement time \( t \) in the factor \( (t/\tau)^{-\alpha} \) of equation (3). It combines with \( \alpha \) to give the initial medium response to ramp loading.

3.2.1. Elastic parameter \( E_0 \). The elastic modulus measured by applications of the Kevin–Voigt (integer-order derivative) model approximates the shear modulus [24, 25]. To show this is also true for the KVFD model, we compared \( E_0 \) in equation (3) with the elastic modulus determined from Hertzian contact theory and wave-propagation measurements. Since the latter quantities only apply to linear-elastic solids, measurements in pure-gelatin cylinders were acquired for these comparisons; viz., samples G3C0, G5C0, and G8C0. We estimated shear modulus via Hertzian theory by assuming gelatin gels are incompressible. In that case, Hertzian estimates of Young’s modulus are divided by three to estimate the shear modulus.

Table 1 shows that values for KVFD parameter \( E_0 \) approximate the shear modulus when one set of force-displacement data are analyzed both ways. The table also shows the results approximate those using other measurement techniques [24–26].

Estimates of \( E_0 \) for all emulsion samples are summarized in figure 3(a). Each curve displays data at a different gelatin concentration as a function of cream concentration. Clearly, \( E_0 \) increases with gelatin concentration. \( E_0 \) also increases with cream concentration initially from changes to the crosslinking structure of the denatured collagen aggregates as cream particles are introduced. At higher cream concentrations, however, sample stiffness is relatively insensitive to...
Table 1. Comparison of $E_0$ and shear modulus values from gelatin gel samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gelatin % (sample label)</th>
<th>KVFD $E_0$ (Pa)</th>
<th>Hertzian Shear modulus (Pa)</th>
<th>Shear modulus$^b$ (Pa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3% (G3C0)</td>
<td>329 ± 11</td>
<td>292 ± 14</td>
<td>320 ± 28$^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% (G5C0)</td>
<td>766 ± 30</td>
<td>806 ± 18</td>
<td>930$^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8% (G8C0)</td>
<td>2120 ± 80</td>
<td>2070 ± 27</td>
<td>2286 ± 315$^{***}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Measurements from [24] in pure gelatin at concentrations of 2%, 4%, 6%, and 8% were fit to the polynomial $y = 178.75x^2 - 426.5x + 485$ to interpolate and estimate a value at 5%. Thus no error bar is reported. Oracsenin et al reported gelatin prepared in the manner of our study by applying an ultrasonic impulse-response measurement method to 3% gelatin$^{**}$ [23] and rheometer-based estimates to 8% gelatin$^{***}$ [26].

b Comparisons are with previous measurements made in our lab to minimize sample-preparation variability.

Cream concentrations$^5$. Two-way ANOVA test results showed significant differences between various gelatin concentrations ($p = 0.0005$) and less significant differences between various cream concentrations ($p = 0.129$).

In summary, KVFD model parameter $E_0$ approximates the shear modulus of the sample that is determined primarily by gelatin concentration. It describes the stiffness of the denatured collagen aggregates that form the solid matrix within these biphasic samples. As shown in figure 3(b), $E_0$ mainly acts to scale $P(t)$, thus reflecting the elastic response in the ramp relaxation curve that is relatively insensitive to cream at concentrations between 20% and 50%.

3.2.2. Derivative-order parameter $\alpha$. The data in figure 3(c) show that $\alpha$ increases linearly with cream concentration. Because points overlap, we also see that $\alpha$ is independent of gelatin concentration. Two-way ANOVA tests confirm there are no significant differences between gelatin concentrations ($p = 0.82$).

A linear increase of $\alpha$ with cream percentage is consistent with that parameter being related to sample fluidity. Moreover, parameter $\alpha$ also characterizes the rate of energy dissipation with time. As shown in figure 3(d), $\alpha$ determines both the peak force and the shape of the force-relaxation curve during ramp-hold indentation tests. Larger $\alpha$ values correspond to more fluid samples, which generates a smaller force peak. Then the applied energy dissipates quickly as the force returns to equilibrium. One expects such behavior in highly fluidic biphasic media with large $\alpha$ because of the weak elastic response. Smaller values of $\alpha$ generate higher force peaks and the energy dissipates more slowly. This is expected from a viscoelastic matrix embedded in some fluid. Relaxation of a viscoelastic solid depends on the degree and type of molecular bonds in the matrix connections [19, 28]. The extracellular matrix in tissues and the matrix in these emulsion samples have very different collagen-component structures, and yet both naturally self-assemble in fluids to respond viscoelastically. In such media, we generally find that $\alpha > 0.2$ [19]. In contrast, pure gelatin has tightly bound water that strongly adheres to exposed charged sites in the denatured collagen molecules, so it responds as an elastic solid [28, 29]. For pure gelatin we find $\alpha \approx 0$. Our findings are consistent with those of others studying wet clay [40].

3.2.3. Time constant $\tau$ and viscous coefficient $\eta$. The first form of equation (3) shows that $\alpha$ and $\tau$ combine with measurement time $t$ to predict the rate at which the indentation force relaxes through the power-law factor $(t / \tau)^{-\alpha}$. The second form of equation (3) combines terms in the expression $\eta = E_0 \tau^\alpha$, where $\eta$ is the viscous coefficient for the time-dependent component of the relaxation modulus $G$.

Figure 4(a) shows that $\tau$ increases with cream concentration but not gelatin concentration. This finding shows an increase in viscous relaxation for the solid matrix of the emulsion. For a given $\alpha$, parameter $\tau$ characterizes the recovery speed of the relaxation process to its equilibrium state. Larger $\tau$ values correspond to slower recoveries. Higher cream concentrations increase the viscosity and require longer recovery times.

Measurements of the viscous coefficient in figure 4(b) show that $\eta$ increases with both cream and gelatin concentrations. However, normalizing the viscous coefficient by the elastic modulus, i.e. $\eta / E_0$, we can eliminate the gelatin-concentration dependence as shown in figure 4(c). This result indicates that parameters $\alpha$ and $\tau$ together determine the time-dependent viscous behavior and are related to the energy loss in the emulsion. Finally, figure 4(d) shows the ramp-relaxation curves predicted for different values of $\tau$.

3.3. Interpreting KVFD model parameters for load-unload data

Ramp-relaxation indentation was applied to samples in the last section. This section examines load-unload indentation testing so we may measure the loss energy $E_A$ from the load-unload hysteresis curve (figure 1(b)). The goal is to relate the KVFD parameters estimated from ramp-relaxation data to $E_A$ measured from load-unload data.

Numerical simulations were first performed to examine possible correlations between the viscous coefficient $\eta$ and loss energy $E_A$. Predictions were made for all combinations of the three KVFD parameters: $E_0$ was varied from 0.1 to 7.3 kPa, $\alpha$ from 0.01 to 0.7, and $\tau$ from 0.1 to 2500 s. These parameter ranges span those observed experimentally in the emulsions and liver-tissue samples (described below).

The simulation results in figure 5(a) show that loss energy $E_A$ is proportional to the KVFD viscous coefficient $\eta$, i.e. $E_A = k \eta$, where the proportionality constant $k$ depends on material parameter $\alpha$ and experimental parameter $T_r$, viz., $k = k(\alpha, T_r)$. Fixing $T_r = 25$ s, each line in figure 5(a) is associated with a different value of $\alpha$. That is, combinations of $E_0$ and $\tau$ for fixed values of $\alpha$ and $T_r$ can be found along the straight lines. Proportionality between $E_A$ and $\eta$ suggests that energy loss in a load-unload indentation experiment, which

---

$^5$There are well-known secondary effects in gelatin that contribute to variations in $E_0$ with cream concentration. For example, Vanicream is acidic (pH = 3.73). Increasing gelatin acidity during the gelation process will soften the samples [27]. Thus the downward trend in $E_0$ at cream concentrations observed above 20% is expected.
is a model-independent quantity, is highly correlated to \( \eta \) the viscous coefficient in a ramp-hold experiment.

Figure 5(b) displays \( E_A \) versus \( \alpha \) for \( \eta \) fixed at 800 Pa-s and at four values of \( T_r \). \( E_A \) peaks at a different value of \( \alpha \) for each ramp time. The presence of a peak in these curves can be explained physically. As \( \alpha \to 0 \), we find that \( E_A \approx 0 \) indicating an elastic medium that exhibits little frictional loss. Similarly, as \( \alpha \to 1 \), we again find \( E_A \approx 0 \) but now indicating a fluid medium under a quasi-static load. Fluid-medium energy loss is smallest for the slowest ramp speed (\( T_r = 100 \) s). In between these extremes, viscous response of the collagen matrix within the emulsion is magnified by distributed pockets of fluid exhibiting high internal friction. Energy dissipation is greatest at the highest ramp speed, \( T_r = 10 \) s.

Those simulations were verified experimentally in figure 6. Measurements of \( E_A \) (points) for emulsion samples that were acquired during load-unload experiments are plotted against separate measurements of \( \eta \) for the same samples obtained from ramp-relaxation experiments. Lines associated with measurement points in the figure are predictions made using equation (10) for the average \( \alpha \) measurement. Each line corresponds to the averaged \( \alpha \) value of certain cream percentage (\( \alpha = 0.035, 0.07, 0.16, 0.197, 0.3 \) for cream percentage 0%, 5%, 20%, 30%, 50%). As predicted, measurements from samples with the same cream concentration have approximately the same \( \alpha \) values. In contrast, samples with different gelatin concentrations fall along a straight line determined by \( \alpha \) in the \( \eta \) versus \( E_A \) plane. Predictions were verified by emulsion measurements where each sample had one of the following cream percentages: 0%, 5%, 20%, 30%, and 50%. Results show that the measured loss energy from quasi-static load-unload experiments is linearly related to the viscous coefficient computed from the KVFD model applied to ramp-relaxation experiments. One set of model parameters describes data from both experiments. Hence, the KVFD parameters apply equally well to the data from these different indentation techniques.

Fractional bias error is \( e_b = \frac{\bar{E}_A - k_0\bar{\eta}}{k_0\bar{\eta}} \) as shown in the figure, where \( \bar{\eta} \) is the mean value. In brackets we display confidence interval \( e_{c_i} = \frac{\bar{E}_A - k_0(\bar{\eta} \pm \sigma)}{k_0(\bar{\eta} \pm \sigma)} \) predicting the error range associated with \( \sigma \), which is the standard deviation for \( \eta \) estimates. For example, the numerator for error \( e_{c_i} \) is illustrated in the figure below.
Table 2 shows the relative uncertainties in $E_A$ predictions given errors in $\eta$ measurements. Table values are bias errors; the two values in brackets below give the confidence intervals corresponding to ±1 standard deviation for each $\eta$ measurement. All bias errors are less than 20% and many are less than 5%; the notable exception being the elastic, 0% cream samples. Stiff elastic samples generate the largest prediction errors.

The magnitudes of the relative errors and confidence intervals indicate that it is reasonable to use a pre-generated prediction plot to relate loss energy and viscous coefficient parameters in our test samples. Consequently, either measurement can be made to estimate KVFD parameters.

In summary, KVFD model parameters, $E_0$, $\alpha$, and $\tau$, characterize, respectively, the elasticity, the fluidity and the rate of energy dissipation, and the viscous time constant of compressed biphasic emulsions. These model parameters help explain the response of samples to indentation in terms of sample components and molecular structure. $E_0$ is the shear modulus that quantifies material stiffness controlled primarily by gelatin concentration. Within the cream-concentration range of 20–50%, emulsion stiffness does not significantly change, although secondary effects provide small systematic variations. Parameter $\alpha$ indicates the rate at which the emulsion internally dissipates mechanical energy. In this study, it increases in proportion to the replacement of water with cream.

We find that two parameters, $E_0$ and $\eta/E_0 = \tau^*$, form a representative feature space that describes, respectively, the stiffness and the normalized viscosity of the emulsions. In addition, $E_0$ increases predictably with gelatin concentration, independent of cream concentration, while the ratio $\eta/E_0$, the normalized viscous coefficient, increases predictably with cream concentration and is independent of gelatin concentration. Further, $\eta$ measured using ramp-relaxation testing is proportional to loss energy $E_A$ measured from the hysteresis in load-unload experimental curves.

### 3.4. Liver samples

We now extend our analysis of KVFD model parameters to *ex vivo* liver tissue. Of course, liver is compositionally and...
structurally more complicated than two-component gelatin-cream emulsions. Nevertheless, it is an important test medium for its well-known mechanical response to heating [30–34].

A major medical application of liver-tissue heating is curative nonsurgical treatments of hepatocellular carcinoma. Liver is locally heated in patients, in vivo, using percutaneous radiofrequency ablation, microwave ablation, or high-intensity ultrasound (HIFU) techniques [35, 36]. Heating liver to 45 °C for 30–60 min irreversibly damages cells, inhibiting DNA replication and mitochondrial function [36]. Fast heating to temperatures above 60 °C causes irreversible protein denaturation, which is also cytotoxic and leads to coagulative cellular necrosis. Besides the desired cellular damage, extracellular protein structure is altered in ways that can be sensed through macroscopic mechanical testing [32, 33].

We used a simple technique of heating porcine liver samples in isotonic saline. Frozen livers were thawed in room temperature saline overnight. Samples were then transferred to saline heated in a double boiler to 45 °C, 55 °C, or 65 °C for 40 min. Samples were then removed from the heated saline and cooled in room temperature saline for 45–60 min before testing began. Specimens were placed on a flat surface during testing without boundary constraints. Each sample size was roughly 40 × 30 × 15 mm³, large enough to avoid significant boundary effects during indentation.

Measurements of thermally-damaged liver are compared with those of fresh liver in figure 7 and table 3. Note that ‘fresh’ refers to samples that were not heated; all liver tissues were initially frozen. As with the emulsion samples, we measured...
measured $\eta(E_0, \alpha, \tau)$ using ramp-relaxation experiments and fit those data to the KVFD model to estimate model parameters. We also measured $E_A$ using load-unload experiments. $T_i = 25 \text{s}$ was applied to all liver measurements. Mean estimates from the two experiments are plotted against each other in figure 7. The last line in Table 3 lists the bias errors and confidence intervals expected when predicting loss energy from KVFD parameters.

### 4. Discussion

Table 3 summarizes the *ex vivo* liver-tissue measurements obtained by fitting the KVFD model to ramp-relaxation and load-unload experimental data. Thermally damaged liver clearly exhibits modified parameters. Generally, liver heated to higher temperatures dramatically increases $E_0$ and $\tau$ while $\alpha$ decreases by about a third relative to tissue that was not heated.

The values shown in table 3 suggest the increase in $\eta$ is due to the increase in $E_0$. That is, $\eta/E_0$ is not significantly modified by heating. Table 3 shows that thermally damaged liver becomes stiffer, more dissipative, and less fluidic but it maintains a relatively constant normalized viscous coefficient. All of these indicators, including the increase in loss energy with the degree of thermal damage, appear as primarily elastic-property changes caused by an increased density of cross links in thermally-damaged collagen.

The data in table 3 and figure 7 show that the *ex vivo* liver samples undamaged by heat have a strong fluidic response to indentation ($\alpha = 0.41$) and are soft ($E_0 = 75 \text{ Pa}$) dissipating little mechanical energy ($E_A = 0.29 \mu J$). These shear modulus estimates are smaller than most estimates reported in the literature for *in vivo* or freshly-excised liver [31]. Our values in table 3 are smaller for several reasons: (a) freezing tissue causes cell damage that softens tissues once thawed. (b) Longer ramp times applied to minimize the effects of instrument responses on the stress-relaxation data also lower modulus values compared to shorter ramp times [21]. (c) Submerging samples in saline reduces sample-to-sample variations but also reduces stiffness [43]. Although the overall elastic modulus of samples used in this study is lower than that reported *in vivo*, the relative response to tissue heating is similar. Table 3 shows that heating liver to 45 °C (and measuring at 22 °C) stiffens the tissue ($E_0 = 188 \text{ Pa}$) as it creates a more solid ($\alpha = 0.35$) and dissipative ($E_A = 1.36 \mu J$) medium.

Heating liver to 55 °C causes a major transformation in tissue structure, as noted by others [32, 33, 36]. We find that liver stiffness increases more than 20 fold ($E_0 = 4510 \text{ Pa}$) compared to the value of $E_0$ at 45 °C. At 55 °C, the extracellular collagen denatures to expose charged sites that form a higher density of cross links. This process further solidifies the tissue ($\alpha = 0.27$) with viscoelastic cross links that greatly increase loss energy ($E_A = 24.5 \mu J$). Parameter $\tau$ changes drastically at this temperature also, probably from the suddenly increased number of chemical bonds.

At 65 °C, liver stiffness increases further ($E_0 = 7398 \text{ Pa}$) while $\alpha$ and $\tau$ change very little. Between 55 °C and 65 °C, loss energy doubles ($E_A = 42.6 \mu J$), which can be attributed entirely to changes in $E_0$. Interestingly, figure 5(b) predicts that for the indentation ramp time of $T_i = 25 \text{s}$ that we applied during liver measurements, we can expect there to be no significant change in loss energy $E_A$ related to changes in $\alpha$. The reason is that $\alpha$ values in liver for $T_i = 25 \text{s}$ are near the peak of the $\alpha$ versus $E_A$ curve. Consequently, loss energy is not expected to be sensitive to changes in tissue fluidity. Care must be taken to adjust experimental parameters appropriately to maximize KVFD parameter changes when the goal is to track thermal damage.

Changes observed in thermally-damaged *ex vivo* liver are likely to be different from those measured *in vivo*. The effects of blood perfusion, at the very least, modify the temperature
distribution in ablative therapy where tissue temperatures quickly rise above 80 °C and fall as blood perfusion cools the region. The rates of tissue heating and cooling will have additional effects on mechanical properties. Our point in this study is not to predict in vivo tissue effects. Instead, our goal is to show that KVFD model parameters can explain known basic effects of thermal damage in tissues as complex as liver.

5. Summary and conclusions

The KVFD model of the relaxation modulus summarized by equation (3) provides a 3D feature space of mechanical properties that characterizes the composition and structure of biphasic emulsions. We found that the combination of KVFD parameters given by $E_0$ and $\eta/\eta_0 = \tau^0$ was able to separately track the compositional changes in the emulsions. Also these model parameters were found to equivalently apply to data from different indentation experiments. Based on our experience analyzing emulsion samples, we then studied indentation measurement data from ex vivo porcine liver samples. We found the KVFD model parameters described changes caused by thermal damage that were consistent with results found in the literature—increased H-bond cross linking from protein denaturation. From these combined results, we conclude that KVFD model parameters form a concise features space for biphasic medium characterization that described time-varying mechanical properties.

Experimental factors can influence the parameters obtained by fitting model equations to force-displacement indenter data. However these influences are consistent between different indentation method, and thus a concise feature set can be formed to reliably represent material properties. This is an important result for medical elasticity imaging, where images formed from KVFD parameters are interpreted for detecting disease processes or treatment-induced effects. KVFD model parameters are worthy of further study for medical imaging applications and as indicators for disease differentiation.
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