

Multimodule imaging of the hierarchical equine hoof wall porosity and structure



Mahmoud A. Mahrous ^a, Charul Chadha ^b, Pei L. Robins ^c, Christian Bonney ^b, Kingsley A. Boateng ^d, Marc Meyers ^e, Iwona Jasiuk ^{b,*}

^a Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, USA

^b Department of Mechanical Science and Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, USA

^c Department of Physics, Lawrence University, Appleton, WI, USA

^d Carl R. Woese Institute for Genomic Biology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, USA

^e Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, University of California San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 20 June 2023 Accepted 11 August 2023 Available online 28 August 2023

Keywords: Porosity Biological materials Tubules Hierarchical structure Micro-computed tomography (μ-CT) Serial block-face scanning electron microscopy (SBF-SEM)

ABSTRACT

The equine hoof wall has a complex, hierarchical structure that can inspire designs of impact-resistant materials. In this study, we utilized micro-computed tomography (µ-CT) and serial block-face scanning electron microscopy (SBF-SEM) to image the microstructure and nanostructure of the hoof wall. We quantified the morphology of tubular medullary cavities by measuring equivalent diameter, surface area, volume, and sphericity. Highresolution μ -CT revealed that tubules are partially or fully filled with tissue near the exterior surface and become progressively empty towards the inner part of the hoof wall. Thin bridges were detected within the medullary cavity, starting in the middle section of the hoof wall and increasing in density and thickness towards the inner part. Porosity was measured using three-dimensional (3D) μ -CT, two-dimensional (2D) μ -CT, and a helium pycnometer. The highest porosity was obtained using the helium pycnometer (8.07%), followed by 3D (3.47%) and 2D (2.98%) µ-CT. SBF-SEM captured the 3D structure of the hoof wall at the nanoscale, showing that the tubule wall is not solid, but has nano-sized pores, which explains the higher porosity obtained using the helium pycnometer. The results of this investigation provide morphological information on the hoof wall for the future development of hoof-inspired materials and offer a novel perspective on how various measurement methods can influence the quantification of porosity.

© 2023 Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

1. Introduction

The remarkable properties of biological materials, including self-healing, adhesion, and impact resistance, offer inspiration for developing advanced engineering materials [1]. Impact

resistance refers to a material's ability to withstand intense forces or shocks. Porosity is a common feature of naturally occurring impact-resistant materials and those used in biomedical, aerospace, automotive, and packaging applications [2–5]. The hoof wall is a porous material responsible for

E-mail address: ijasiuk@illinois.edu (I. Jasiuk).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmrt.2023.08.246

2238-7854/© 2023 Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

^{*} Corresponding author. Department of Mechanical Science and Engineering University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign 1206 West Green Street Urbana, IL 6180, USA.

protecting the internal structure of the hoof from impact forces generated during contact with the ground at high speed.

The hoof wall has a complex, hierarchical structure, shown in Fig. 1, providing high impact resistance and fracture toughness [6,7]. At the nanoscale, intermediate filaments (IFs) (~7–10 nm) act as fibers embedded in an amorphous protein matrix [8]. Aligned IFs form macrofibrils, roughly 700 nm in diameter that are dispersed inside disk-shaped cells around 10–40 μ m across and 5 μ m thick [9]. Concentric lamellae, each made from a single layer of cells, create cylindrical structures called tubules that run from the top to the bottom of the hoof wall [10,11]. The tubules have a 200–300 μ m diameter, with a central medulla, or tubule medullary cavity (TMC), of about 50 μ m [6,12]. Intertubular regions consist of lamellae at an oblique angle with the long axis of the tubules [6,10,11,13].

Fig. 2 depicts the coordinate axes typically used to describe locations in the hoof wall. The tubules' axes are parallel to the outer surface, which defines the longitudinal direction. Orthogonal to the longitudinal axis is the radial direction that describes locations along the thickness [6,12]. Most of the hoof wall is the stratum medium except for thin layers on the outer and inner surfaces referred to as the stratum externum and stratum internum, respectively [14]. The hoof wall is further divided along its circumferential or transverse direction into two side regions (medial and lateral) and a front-facing (toe) region. Studies have shown that the tubule density and shape are not constant throughout the hoof wall [6,15]. Lancaster et al. [16] counted the tubules and calculated their density, finding a change along the radial direction and a significant difference between the lateral, medial, and toe regions. Most research has focused on the stratum medium of the toe for consistency due to heterogeneity throughout the hoof wall structure.



Fig. 2 – Coordinate axes and locations of the equine hoof wall.

Previous studies have used the histological examination technique to study the hoof wall structure, which involved sectioning a small strip for polarized or optical microscopy



Fig. 1 – The hierarchical structure of an equine hoof wall.

[6,17]. This process is challenging and time-consuming and can damage the tubules' microstructure during sample preparation. Also, histological examination is limited to a small number of tubules. Micro-computed tomography (µ-CT) allows for scanning larger areas at micro-level resolution. It has proven to be a valuable technique for visualizing the intricate inner structures of biological materials [18-23]. Huang et al. [9] analyzed the structure of the hoof wall with μ -CT to find the average area fraction (~3%) and diameter (41 \pm 9 μ m) of the TMC. Then, Lazarus et al. [24] showed, using μ -CT, that the tubules are not continuous hollow structures but are segmented by bridges. They reported the average bridge width (10.3 \pm 2.4 μ m), bridge density $(0.009 \pm 0.002 \text{ bridges/}\mu\text{m})$, tubule density $(15.91 \pm 0.4 \text{ tu})$ bules/mm²), and porosity (0.77 \pm 0.3%). However, no work was done to visualize and quantify nanoscale porosity using a 3D method. In this study, we quantified the hoof wall structure and porosity by utilizing high-resolution characterization techniques, including µ-CT, scanning electron microscopy (SEM), and serial block face scanning electron microscopy (SBF-SEM), coupled with a helium pycnometer, to measure open porosity.

SBF-SEM is a volume scanning electron microscopy that produces 3D images at nanoscale resolution ($\sim 5 \times 5 \times 5 \text{ nm}^3$) [25]. This technology is like an automated serial transmission electron microscope and requires specialized sample preparation methods, including staining the sample with various solutions, to improve image resolution. SBF-SEM is widely used to study plant and cell tissue nanostructures [26-30] but has not been utilized for hoof wall characterization. Previously, high-resolution transmission microscopy (TEM) was used to visualize cell boundaries in the hoof wall [9]. TEM can image serial sections of a millimeter-sized specimen with a Zresolution between 1 and 50 nm [31]. Still, there is a risk of losing sections during sample preparation, which has not been reported with SBF-SEM. Also, more complicated sample preparation for TEM can damage the microstructure of the hoof wall tissue, while SBF-SEM prevents such damage. On the other hand, SBF-SEM produces large datasets that make reconstructing a 3D volume computationally expensive and time-consuming. Furthermore, the limited sample size of a few micrometers in the X, Y, and Z directions adds another constraint to using SBF-SEM as a characterization technique [32,33]. In this paper, we utilized SBF-SEM to capture features of the hoof wall nanostructure, including the cell structure and the intertubular region, which would be difficult to obtain with other 2D techniques.

Hoof wall samples were first scanned using low-resolution μ -CT (13.35 μ m) to visualize and quantify the tubules. Smaller samples were then extracted to study the inner section of the tubules (TMC) using higher resolution μ -CT (0.53 μ m), followed by SBF-SEM to obtain a 3D block image for inner and outer hoof wall tubules as well as the intertubular region at the nanoscale. Open porosity was determined using a helium pycnometer. We show that integrating these advanced techniques enhances the understanding of keratin-based materials and clarifies the effect of measurement techniques on quantifying porosity.

The paper consists of four sections and an Appendix. Section 2 describes methods, Section 3 presents results and their discussion, while Section 4 gives conclusions and future directions. The Appendix shows extra details on μ -CT and SBF-SEM imaging.

2. Materials and methods

The Veterinary Department of the University of California at Davis supplied horse hooves from a mature racehorse of unknown age and sex. The hooves were removed, refrigerated within 48 h, and then frozen at -20° . After thawing, hooves were cut down to isolate the hoof wall, and samples were extracted from the toe region with a bandsaw. SEM samples were taken from the medial and lateral regions, while all other samples were extracted from the toe region.

2.1. X-ray microcomputed tomography (μ -CT)

Four 3x1x1 cm³ samples were collected from various locations in the toe region for a comprehensive statistical analysis of the TMCs. Due to the anisotropy of the equine hoof wall along the growth lines, we exclusively extracted all samples perpendicular to the growth line, as depicted in Fig. 3. To maintain consistency and precision in our measurements, we carefully chose sampling locations along the growth lines. By adopting a systematic method, we strategically identified representative points at specific intervals, enabling us to capture the diverse anisotropic properties of the hoof wall effectively.

The scans were performed using a North Star Imaging X5000 instrument (North Star Imaging, Rogers, MN, USA). Samples were scanned using a voltage of 90 kV and a current of 150 μ A by an X-ray source (XRayWorX [P19-701]), which has a 13.5 μ m focal spot size. Multiple resolutions were evaluated to ascertain the optimal resolution for capturing tubular features. Ultimately, a maximum voxel size of 13.35 μ m was the most suitable. To achieve the desired resolution and sharpness, the distances of the detector and object from the source were 975.478 and 102.545 mm.

For higher resolution imaging with a pixel size of 0.53 μ m, cubic samples with dimensions of 2x2x2 mm³ were extracted from three different locations throughout the thickness of the hoof wall, as depicted by the red cubes in Fig. 7a. The scans were performed using the high-resolution Rigaku Nano 3Dx computed tomography instrument (Rigaku, Tokyo, Japan).



Fig. 3 – Front view of the equine hoof wall indicating the extraction positions for the $\mu\text{-}CT$ scan and SEM samples.

The system is equipped with three different lenses that can be adjusted to achieve varying image resolutions, an X-ray detector, and a Peltier-cooled CCD camera capable of producing images up to 3200x2400 pixels. In this case, a resolution of 0.53 μm was achieved using a lens with a field of view of 3.5 \times 2.6 mm. The samples were scanned using a quasimonochromatic X-ray source, with a voltage of 130 kV and a current of 61 μA produced by a copper target.

2.2. Helium pycnometer

The helium pycnometer was used to determine the open porosity of the hoof wall. Six specimens, each with dimensions of 1x1x0.9 cm³, were used to measure the open porosity through the weighing method. The samples were immersed in water for 24 h to ensure that all the pores were fully saturated. The samples were then removed from the water, and the outer surface was meticulously cleaned to eliminate any residual water and ensure that only the inner pores of the sample were filled. Samples were weighed using an analytical balance with an accuracy of ± 0.0001 g to obtain the bulk mass. The volume was calculated using the pycnometer instead of a standard caliper, as the samples had some irregularity on the outer surface. The samples were individually placed and measured in the AccuPyc 1330 instrument (Micromeritics Instrument Corp., Norcross, GA, USA). This instrument uses pressurized helium gas, as it is a monomolecular gas with a diameter of around 0.22 nm, smaller than the diameter of water vapor (0.28 nm), allowing for the detection of nanoscale pores. The instrument measures the volume of the sample. The bulk density of each sample was calculated using the known weight (measured previously). The samples were then removed from the pycnometer and placed in an oven at 80 °C for 24 h to extract water from the pores of the hoof wall. We selected this temperature carefully after several trials to prevent over-drying of the sample. Over-drying could lead to the formation of cracks in the sample structure, resulting in erroneous porosity results. The dried samples were weighed to obtain the mass and then placed back into the helium pycnometer to measure the sample volume and true density in a dry state. This approach enabled accurate measurement of the amount of helium gas that replaced the air in the inner pores of the sample. By knowing the bulk density of the sample and its true density, the sample porosity was calculated using the following equation [34]:

$$\emptyset = \left(1 - \frac{\rho_{bulk}}{\rho_{true}}\right) x \ 100 \ [Vol\%] \tag{1}$$

where \emptyset is the percent porosity, ρ_{bulk} is the density of the wet sample, and ρ_{true} is the density of the dried sample.

2.3. Scanning electron microscopy (SEM)

For SEM scanning, a $2 \times 2 \times 2 \text{ mm}^3$ sample was removed from location C in Fig. 7a. The sample was mounted on a metal holder and coated with a thin layer of 5 nm gold-palladium in a low-vacuum Emscope SC 500 Sputter Coater. The coating helps to reduce thermal damage to the hoof wall tissue and minimize the charging effect on the sample surface during the scan. The sample was analyzed using high vacuum mode on an Axia ChemiSEM instrument (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cleveland, OH, USA) with an acceleration voltage of 30 kV.

2.4. Serial block-face scanning electron microscopy (SBF-SEM)

A sample with dimensions of 2x2x3 mm³ was embedded in epoxy using the standard serial block-face SEM protocol [1,2] with modifications to extend the time. The sample was then treated with three solutions for different durations: 2% osmium in 1.5% potassium ferrocyanide for three days, 0.01% thiocarbohydrazide (TCH) solution for one day, and 2% osmium for one day. The sample was then dehydrated and embedded in Durcupan. The epoxy-embedded samples were mounted on aluminum pins (Gatan) using silver epoxy (Ted Pella, Redding CA) and sputter-coated with a thin layer of Au/ Pd before being subjected to block-face imaging. Serial blockface imaging was performed using a Sigma VP (Zeiss, Oberkochen, Germany) equipped with a Gatan 3View system (model: 3View2XP) and a nitrogen gas injection manifold (Zeiss model 346,061-9002-200). For this work, the samples were typically imaged at 2.0 keV, with 50 nm cutting intervals, a 1.0 nm pixel size ($12k \times 12k$ pixels), a beam dwell time of 1.0 µsec, and a high vacuum chamber pressure of approximately 5×10^{-3} mbar.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Statistical analysis

A total of 3905 tubules (tubules referred to here as the TMCs region, not including the tubule wall) were segmented and isolated from the hoof wall matrix using the segmentation and labeling process described in the Appendix. They were analyzed to obtain the area, volume, sphericity, and equivalent diameter (Eqdiameter) of the TMCs. Eqdiameter is calculated using the following equation [3]:

$$EqDiameter = \sqrt[3]{\frac{6 \times Volume3d}{\pi}}$$
(2)

For a given particle (tubule in our case), the equivalent diameter measures and computes the diameter of a spherical particle of the same volume [1]. The Volume3d presented in Equation (2) represents the volume of the sphere, which can be determined using the formula $V = \frac{4}{3}\pi r^3$, where V denotes the volume and r represents the radius of the sphere. The results of the statistical analysis obtained from the segmented 3D μ -CT scans are summarized in Table 1. The analysis

Table 1 — Summary of statistical results for different geometric descriptors of TMCs in the hoof wall.					
Geometric Descriptor	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.		
Eqdiameter (µm)	69.43	66.66	16.36		
Surface area (µm²)	$3.55 \ge 10^4$	$2.44 \ge 10^4$	$3.45 \ge 10^4$		
Volume (µm³)	$4.53 \ge 10^4$	$2.85 \ge 10^4$	$4.93 \ge 10^4$		
Sphericity	0.86	0.86	0.09		

includes the mean, median, and standard deviation (Std. Dev). Fig. 4a exhibits the average frequency distribution of TMC Eqdiameter. The results indicate that the Eqdiameter of the TMCs ranges from 55 μ m to 153.16 μ m, with an average of 69.43 μ m. Most TMCs have an Eqdiameter ranging from 55.91 μ m to 75.91 μ m, accounting for 48.8% of the tubules analyzed in this study. Only 2.8% of the TMCs have an Eqdiameter greater than 110 μ m.

Previous studies have reported different TMC Eqdiameter values, including 41 \pm 9 μ m (Huang et al. [9]), 200 μ m (Kasapi et al. [35]), and 300 μ m (Kasapi et al. [36]). The significant differences between these results and those of our study are likely due to the location of the sample within the hoof and the analysis techniques used. Our results, obtained using the 3D μ -CT technique, minimize the impact of sample location by covering multiple areas within the hoof wall. Additionally, our analysis was based on approximately 1500 images.

Fig. 4b shows the distribution of TMC surface area measurements. The analysis reveals that the surface area of 2598 tubules (66.5%) ranges from $0.48 \times 10^4 \ \mu m^2$ to $3.48 \times 10^4 \ \mu m^2$, making it the dominant size. The second largest surface area, representing 25.5%, ranges from $3.48 \times 10^4 \ \mu m^2$ to $7.98 \times 10^4 \ \mu m^2$. The remaining TMC surface areas range from $7.98 \times 10^4 \ \mu m^2$ to $15 \times 10^4 \ \mu m^2$, with 66 TMCs measuring more than $15 \times 10^4 \ \mu m^2$.

having a maximum surface area of $56.48 \times 10^4 \ \mu m^2$. Additionally, a calculation was performed to determine the sample's porosity based on the total surface area of the TMCs relative to the total surface area of the sample using the following formula.

Area fraction porosity (%) =
$$\frac{\text{Total TMCs surface area}}{\text{Total surface area of the sample}}$$
*100
(3)

Using Equation (3), we obtained a porosity value of 2.98%, close to the previously recorded value of 3% by Huang et al. [9]. Our results are based on the analysis of a large sample size of 3905 tubules, which provides enough confidence in the accuracy of the obtained porosity value. In addition, previous work, which dealt with the hoof wall porosity calculation, was done by counting the number of tubules relative to the sample area, using primarily light [15,17] and electron microscopy techniques [37]. This method can be prone to human error and can only provide limited information about a specific location which may not accurately represent the entire hoof wall porosity.

We used an automated μ -CT method to eliminate the possibility of human error and obtain more accurate results. The only drawback of using μ -CT is identifying the best-fit threshold values that cover the entire range of densities within the sample. This identification was not difficult in our case as the hoof wall consists of two distinct regions, the TMC



Fig. 4 – (a) Histogram of the Eqdiameter size distribution. (b) Histogram of TMC's area size distribution. (c) Histogram of TMC's volume size distribution. (d) Histogram of TMC's sphericity size distribution.

region (lower density) and the intertubular region (higher density), which can be easily separated using the interactive threshold modules in the Amira software. The details of this process are discussed in the μ -CT segmentation section of the Appendix.

The volume size distribution of the TMC is depicted in Fig. 4c. The volume of the TMC varies from $0.38\times10^5~\mu m^3$ to $73.63\times10^5~\mu m^3$. Most volumes are between $0.38\times10^5~\mu m^3$ and $4.58\times10^5~\mu m^3$, accounting for 67.78% of the total analyzed TMCs. Additionally, 5.4% of the TMCs (211 TMCs) have a volume greater than $13\times10^5~\mu m^3$. As shown in Fig. 4c, there is a gradual decrease in the TMC volume until it reaches the minimum volume of $13\times10^5~\mu m^3$, indicating a significant variation in the TMC volume. The following equation was used to calculate the volumetric porosity of the hoof.

Volumetric porosity (%) =
$$\frac{\text{Total TMCs volume}}{\text{Total volume of the sample}}$$
*100 (4)

The porosity calculated using the 3D volume method is 3.47%, slightly higher than that computed using the 2D surface area method. The 2D analysis assumes that the pores are perfectly circular, neglecting the irregularity of the pore walls, which could result in inaccurate results. Chandrappa et al. [38] concluded that two pores with similar cross-sectional areas would have equal diameters, even with different shapes, surface areas, and volumes. Thus, the 3D pore parameters are more accurate for porosity analysis, as the analysis is based on the voxel size, not the radius of the cavity, as in the 2D image analysis method.

Sphericity, ψ , is a dimensionless parameter used to assess the degree of the spherical shape of an object. It is frequently used to quantify the shape of pores in biological materials [39]. Determining the particle sphericity with high accuracy is challenging as it requires precise measurements of the particle's surface area and volume in three dimensions [40]. The calculation of sphericity is done by dividing the surface area of an equal-volume sphere by the actual surface area of the object (as per Equation (5)). Sphericity values range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating a perfect spherical shape [41]:

$$\psi = \frac{\pi^{1/3} (6V)^{2/3}}{A} \tag{5}$$

where V is the volume of the TMC, and A is the TMC surface area [42].

The frequency distribution of the sphericity measurements of the TMCs is demonstrated in Fig. 4d. The results indicate that the sphericity of the pores ranges from 0.54 to 1, with most of them having a sphericity value of 0.73–0.92 (65.71%). Table 1 shows that the mean sphericity is 0.86, suggesting that most TMCs are not perfect spheres or are entirely elliptical. Huang et al. [6] and Kasapi et al. [9] described the sphericity of the TMCs based on the lengths of the major and minor axes without giving a well-defined value for the sphericity.

Fig. 5 and Table 2 present the results for the area fraction porosity obtained from low-resolution (13.35 μ m) μ -CT images. The overall area fraction porosity for the entire hoof wall sample is approximately 3.88%, slightly higher than the value reported by Huang et al. [9]. The results indicate that the average area fraction porosity increases from Zone 1 (the inner zone) to Zone 4 (the outer zone) of the hoof wall. However, Zone 3 showed a lower area fraction porosity than Zone 2 but higher than Zone 1. The results reported by Reilly et al. [15] indicate that tubule density increases as the zone moves from the inner to the outer equine hoof wall. This difference between our work and Reilly et al. [15] arises because we partitioned the hoof wall differently. Reilly et al. [15] divided the stratum medium of the hoof wall into four zones at 25%, 47%, and 69% of the hoof wall depth. In our work, we included the stratum medium and part of the stratum externum and divided the hoof wall into four equal zones at 25%, 50%, and 75% of the hoof wall depth. Although we observed trends in the average area fraction porosity from Zone 1 to Zone 4, the data did not exhibit statistically significant differences at a reasonable alpha value. This lack of statistical significance in this study can be linked to several factors, including the relatively small sample size and using a single species with samples extracted from a single horse. Ideally, a larger and more diverse sample pool comprising multiple species and horses would provide a more robust foundation for statistical analysis and result in more reliable conclusions. Furthermore, the heterogeneity and genetic variability within a single species could also influence the observed outcomes. Hoof wall properties can vary significantly between individual horses, and even within different regions of the same hoof. Moreover, different species may exhibit varying hoof wall structures and mechanical properties, making it essential to explore multiple species to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of hoof wall behavior under different conditions. Despite these limitations, our study serves as a valuable starting point for gaining new insights into the species under investigation.

3.2. Low-resolution μ -CT

Fig. 6a presents a μ -CT image of a 3D volume rendering of a hoof wall sample scanned with a 13.35 μ m voxel size resolution. The image illustrates that the tubules are well-aligned and run parallel to each other. The top view of the 3D reconstructed image of the segmented TMC (Fig. 6b and c) reveals that the tubules are arranged parallel to the longitudinal direction and randomly distributed in the radial direction. Fig. 6d shows a waviness in the tubular structure, which was previously reported by Lazarus et al. [43]. This waviness may be an intrinsic feature or might be caused by the dryness and loss of moisture from the hoof sample during the μ -CT scanning, which can result from the heat generated from the X-ray beam. Further research could assess the impact of waviness on the hoof wall's mechanical properties and its energy absorption capacity. Fig. 6e shows that TMCs are segmented into air pockets separated by thin tissue (bridges), similar to the findings of Huang et al. [9] and Lazarus et al. [24]. The air pockets do not have the same size and shape.

3.3. High resolution μ -CT

To better understand the inner structure of the TMC, high-resolution μ -CT with a resolution of 0.53 μ m was performed on samples extracted from three different radial



Fig. 5 – Flowchart for the image analysis process used to determine the area fraction porosity percentage. The chart includes the following steps: (a) 3D reconstruction of the μ -CT scan, (b) selection of a random image for analysis, where the black box represents the cropped area, (c) division of the cropped area into 4 zones at 25%, 50%, and 75% of the hoof wall depth, and (d) a histogram showing the results of the area fraction porosity, which is averaged for each zone.

Table 2 – A summary of area fraction porosity (%) results for different zones.				
Zone	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	
1	3.49	2.87	1.23	
2	4.07	3.60	1.42	
3	3.65	2.83	1.62	
4	4.21	4.60	1.10	

locations of the hoof wall, as shown in Fig. 7a. The μ -CT images in Fig. 7 include axial, coronal multiplanar reconstructed, and sagittal images. In Fig. 7b, an axial view of a μ -CT image from location A (the outermost layer or dorsal region of the hoof wall) reveals that some of the TMC regions at this location are closed and fully filled with tissue. In contrast, others are partially filled with soft tissue, contrary to previous beliefs that they were empty. The coronal



Fig. 6 – 3D X-ray Micro-CT visualization of hoof wall specimen: a) 3D reconstruction of hoof wall sample with a voxel size resolution of 13.35 μ m, b) top view of 3D segmented (TMCs), c) longitudinal view of TMCs demonstrating their parallel alignment, d) magnified view of tubules exhibiting periodic waviness, and e) magnified view of TMCs highlighting the discontinuity of the modular cavity and the presence of bridges.

multiplanar reconstructed image in Fig. 7e also indicates that the TMCs are not hollow but filled with tissue in the outer section of the hoof wall.

Fig. 7c shows that at location B, the tubules begin to have well-defined walls without any tissue within the TMC region. However, the coronal longitudinal multiplanar reconstructed view in Fig. 7f shows fine white lines within the TMC region, believed to be the beginnings of the bridges previously described by Huang et al. [9] and quantified by Lazarus et al. [24]. As we move toward the stratum internum, we observe an increasing number of bridges with thicker walls (Fig. 7d, g). The thin layer of a soft tissue-like structure within the TMC region in Fig. 7i appears to be a part of the bridge structure seen in Fig. 7j.

The observations of hoof wall microstructure from μ -CT images in this work mostly agree with previous studies by Huang et al. [9] and Lazarus et al. [23,24]. While bridges, air pockets, and tubule waviness have all been discussed in the literature, filled tubules near the exterior of the hoof wall have not yet been reported. The reason could be that, in some cases, the samples were taken exclusively from the middle of the stratum medium corresponding to location B in Fig. 7a. In studies that imaged larger sections of the thickness, nominal sample sizes were 5 mm cubes, which may not have included material close to the stratum externum since the total thickness of the hoof wall is typically around 10 mm.

3.4. Helium pycnometer

The average porosity obtained from the helium pycnometer is approximately 8.07%, which is higher than the porosities reported by Huang et al. (3%) [4] and Lazarus et al. (0.77 \pm 0.3%) [24]. This discrepancy is attributed to variations in sample

location within the hoof and the analysis method used. The pycnometer employs helium gas, with helium molecules small enough to penetrate all types and sizes of pores, including the nanopores that other imaging methods cannot detect. Furthermore, the pycnometer measures the open porosity only, whereas other techniques measure the total porosity (open and closed porosities).

3.5. SBF-SEM

Fig. 8 displays 2D images obtained using the SBF-SEM technique, showcasing the TMC region, tubule wall, and intertubular region. The white color in the images indicates the hollow area inside the tubules (TMC), which appears bright due to impregnation with epoxy resin. The darker spots represent the soft tissue enhanced by osmium and potassium ferrocyanide absorption. Based on Fig. 8a, we conclude that the tubule wall (between the green lines) has nanoscale pores penetrated by the resin. Leach [17] suggested that the horse hoof might have a similar permeability to the human nail since the horse hoof has a similar ultrastructure to the nail palate [44]. The porosity obtained from the helium pycnometer (Section 3.4) supports this observation, as it is higher than the porosity measured using other techniques. The difference is attributed to the nanopores within the tubule wall, as visualized through SBF-SEM in Fig. 8g.

The presence of nanopores exclusively within the tubular region indicates a structural organization that potentially serves a mechanical function in the hoof wall. Notably, decreasing pore size in polymers often leads to an increase in fracture toughness [45]. When the pore size approaches the nanoscale, the fracture toughness can exceed that of the same material with no porosity by a factor of 1.1–30, depending on the relative density and size of the pores [46]. Enhanced fracture



Fig. 7 – High-resolution X-ray micro-computed tomography (μ -CT) images of a hoof wall specimen. μ -CT images obtained at a resolution of 0.53 μ m, with a) a schematic representation of the hoof wall structure indicating the locations of the examined samples, b) an axial view of a μ -CT image from location A (the outermost region), c) an axial view from location B, d) an axial view from location C, e) a coronal multiplanar reconstructed image of the tubules at location A, f) a coronal multiplanar reconstructed image of the tubules at location B, g) a coronal multiplanar reconstructed image of the tubules at location C, h) a coronal multiplanar reconstructed image of the medullary tubule cavity at location A, i) a scanning electron microscopy (SEM) cross-sectional image from location C, and j) a magnified coronal multiplanar reconstructed image from location C.

100 ur

100 µm



Fig. 8 – SBF-SEM images of a hoof wall specimen. (a) Stack of SBF-SEM scan images, (b) 3D volume rendering obtained by semi-automatic segmentation using Amira software, (c) 3D volume rendering displaying the inner and side walls of the tubule, (d) 3D volume rendering showing the TMC and intertubular area (shown in blue), (e) 3D volume rendering displaying a sagittal view of the TMC, (f) 3D extracted volume of the TMC with the tubule wall subtracted, (g) representing nanopores located within the tubule wall, (h) single slice from an SBF-SEM volume with green arrows indicating locations of debris on the sample surface during the slicing process, and (i) depiction of cell boundaries in the intertubular region highlighted in red.

toughness of the tubular region due to nanoporosity could explain the observed crack deflection and bowing around tubules in the hoof [24,43]. Theoretical investigations have examined the behavior of cracks approaching the interface between two materials by comparing the energy release rate of a crack forming a kink and deflecting into the interface with that of a crack penetrating the interface and advancing into the second material. According to these analyses, cracks are generally deflected when the material ahead of the crack has a much greater fracture toughness than the interface, especially when the two materials forming the interface have similar elastic properties [47-49]. Both nanoindentation and modeling of hoof wall substructures have revealed that the tubular and intertubular regions exhibit very similar elastic properties, especially at dry and intermediate hydration levels [9,12]. Therefore, if nanopores enhance the fracture toughness of the tubule wall relative to the interface between tubular and

intertubular regions, cracks would be deflected around tubules, demanding additional energy, ultimately contributing to higher overall fracture toughness. A more detailed analysis of fracture in the hoof wall could show if crack deflection and bowing are primarily influenced by the enhanced fracture toughness resulting from nanoporosity within the tubules or if other factors, such as the orientation of IFs or the geometry of cell and lamellar interfaces, play significant roles.

Fig. 8a, b, and c show that TMCs are not entirely hollow, as previously reported [6,17]. Fig. 8d shows a 3D reconstructed image of a solitary tubule where the blue area represents the intertubular region and the white area depicts the hollow spaces within the TMC region, colored brown. Fig. 8e presents a sagittal view of the tubule's inner section, showing irregular tissue within the inner wall of the TMC instead of being entirely hollow. The hollow areas and the tubule's inner wall were successfully extracted and represented in 3D in Fig. 8f using SBF-SEM and Amira software. The reconstructed image illustrates the irregular surface of the tubule's inner wall. SBF-SEM imaging supported the results obtained earlier from the coronal multiplanar reconstructed image (Fig. 7), indicating that the TMC contains soft tissue, and its inner wall is not smooth. A single 2D image from the stacked volume is illustrated in Fig. 8h, where the magnified area depicted by the overlaid irregular red line in Fig. 8i shows cell boundaries that appear as a wavy structure. The black particles shown on the sample's surface in Fig. 8g resulted from falling debris generated during the cutting process inside, a common problem encountered in SBF-SEM [31].

3.6. Limitations and future scope

The present study has several limitations. The number of samples and studied locations are limited. Thus, results cannot be generalized to other areas within the hoof wall. Additionally, samples were extracted from one horse, representing only one species. The absence of statistically significant differences in the area fraction porosity between different zones within the hoof wall structure can be attributed to the relatively small number of samples under examination. To mitigate this limitation, future studies could consider a broader range of horse breeds and individuals to account for natural variations and enhance the overall validity of the findings. Such studies would build upon the foundation laid by this research, paving the way for further characterization of the hoof wall and other materials.

4. Conclusions

We explored the hierarchical structure of the hoof wall. We utilized various measurement methods for quantifying hoof wall porosity using state-of-the-art 2D and 3D multimodal imaging techniques, including μ -CT and SBF-SEM. Additionally, we used the helium pycnometer, a novel approach in biological materials characterization, to further enhance our understanding of the hoof wall porosity. We conducted μ -CT imaging at resolutions of 0.53 μ m and 13.35 μ m to obtain a comprehensive statistical analysis of the hoof wall microstructure and TMCs region. SBF-SEM was used for the first time to study the microstructure of the hoof wall at the nanoscale level.

Our conclusions from this research are as follows:

- 1) 3D images acquired from μ -CT indicate that the tubules have thin bridges segmenting them into air pockets, which start in the middle of the stratum medium and increase in density towards the inside of the hoof wall.
- The tubules exhibit some degree of periodic waviness, which may be an intrinsic feature or a result of dryness and moisture loss caused by X-ray exposure during μ-CT testing.
- 3) High-resolution μ -CT revealed that tubules are filled with tissue near the outer surface and are empty in the middle to inside sections of the hoof wall.
- 4) Statistical analysis of the TMCs indicated that the average values of Eqdiameter, surface area, volume, and sphericity are 69.43 μm , 3.55 \times 10^4 μm^2 , 4.53 \times 10^5 μm^3 , and 0.86, respectively.

- 5) Different techniques yielded different porosity measurements. While 2D μ -CT resulted in a porosity of 2.98%, similar to previous studies, the 3D calculation showed an increase in porosity to 3.47%, which is considered more accurate because the estimates are based on the volume of the tubule cavities, rather than the radii of the cavities from a 2D image. These measurements reflect the porosity at the microscale and above.
- 6) Helium pycnometer measurements detected nanoscale pores that were not visible using standard imaging techniques like μ -CT or SEM, which resulted in a higher average porosity of 8.07%. Thus, it is an accurate technique that can detect pore sizes ranging from microscale to nanoscale.
- 7) SBF-SEM successfully provided a nanoscale image of the hoof wall, which is challenging to obtain using transmission electron microscopy or any 3D microscopy technique. SBF-SEM imaging showed nano-sized pores within the tubule wall, which have not been previously detected, and explains the higher porosity measured using the helium pycnometer.

Mechanics studies of the hoof wall and bioinspired materials under impact will benefit from the morphometric data presented in this work. Drop tower tests indicated tubule density strongly affects crack propagation in bioinspired samples [24], and the elliptical shape and bridges of tubules are hypothesized to have essential mechanical functions [17,24]. Therefore, it is crucial to identify methods to accurately quantify the structure of the hoof wall with metrics such as sphericity, porosity, and tubule density. Moreover, the hierarchical porosity observed in this work should be further explored as a potential design motif for bioinspired impactresistant materials.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

During the preparation of this work, the authors used GPT-3.5 to improve readability and clarity. After using this tool, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the researchers at the Core facilities at the Carl R. Woese Institute for Genomic Biology (IGB) for their assistance with micro-computed tomography (μ -CT) and serial block-face scanning electron microscopy (SBF-SEM). The staff scientists of the Microscopy Suite at the Beckman Institute for Advanced Science and Technology at the University of Illinois

at Urbana-Champaign are also acknowledged for their help in performing μ -CT imaging. The authors would also thank Dr. Ahmed Adel Hassan for developing the 3D visualization of the hierarchical structure of the hoof wall shown in Fig. 1. Lastly, the authors gratefully acknowledge the National Science Foundation (NSF) for the support received under Grants No. MOMS-1926353 and 1926361.

Appendix A

A.1 Image processing for μ -CT

Micro-CT or µ-CT is a non-destructive 3D imaging technique to obtain the internal structure of an object. In this technique, xrays generated using an X-ray source are transmitted through the samples. An X-ray detector then records the X-rays as a 2D projection image. The sample is then rotated, and the same procedure is followed. The projection (imaging) is continuously collected while the sample is rotating continuously at a fixed angular rotational angle while repeatedly irradiated with an X-ray beam. Upon the interaction between the X-ray beam and the sample, the beam gets attenuated (loses its initial energy) as it passes through the sample by the sample matrix [5]. X-ray beam attenuation is a function of beam energy (characterized by intensity and flux density), which is controlled by the atomic number and density of the object being scanned [5]. Lambert Beer's law describes monochromatic X-ray beam attenuation by demonstrating the transmitted intensity I of a beam as it propagates through an object in a straight pass:

$$I = I_0 e^{(-\mu X)} \tag{6}$$

where I_0 is the integral current of the X-ray photon (initial photon intensity), I is the integral current transmitted by the sample (final photon intensity), μ is the linear attenuation coefficient of the specimen being scanned [L-1], and X is the specimen thickness. The linear attenuation coefficient (μ) value depends on the bulk density of the sample, photon energy, and the electron density of the scanned materials [50].

The 2D images produced from the scan are combined and reconstructed to develop 3D images using the 3D volume rendering procedure, which provides an excellent representation of the internal structure of the investigated materials. Therefore, μ -CT is considered a powerful non-destructive technique for analyzing the variation in the densities and visualizing the internal structure of most materials. A more detailed discussion about X-ray computer tomography principles is discussed intensively by Refs. [42,51–53].

Quantitative analyses of μ -CT data are considered the primary purpose of image processing which is done by reconstructing and visualizing sample volume via 3D rendering procedures. Non-destructive 3D reconstruction techniques are used herein to obtain a comprehensive statistical analysis of the hoof wall. Various software such as (Avizo, pore 3D, VSG, etc.) is now commercially available for textural and morphological quantification of the internal constituents of different materials. The quantitative analysis consists of multiple steps, which start with a volume of interest (VOI) selection. In our case, the tubule area is considered VOI. The image segmentation process is done by dividing the image volume into different regions represented by a group of voxels belonging to the same phase.

The segmentation algorithms are divided into two categories determined by the discontinuity and similarity of the beam intensity values [54]. The intensity discontinuity category involves partitioning the image based on the sudden change in the intensity. In contrast, the similarity intensity category is partitioning the image based on areas with similar intensities using the thresholding method [54]. There are many thresholding methods, including global threshold, basic adaptive threshold, clustering, and region-growing methods. The choice of the efficient thresholding technique is based on the degree of the morphological complexity of the required study area in the sample. For example, geometry in the pore spaces is more complex since the pores have irregular shapes and are at times filled with mixed phases (air, liquid, solid), making it difficult to separate them efficiently using the automatic thresholding method (global thresholding). Therefore, more sophisticated methods such as refined thresholding techniques, basic adaptive thresholding, and clustering by iterative methods are more efficient in such cases. However, one threshold value used in the global threshold method is enough in portioning the image when the graylevel histogram is bimodal or multimodal but cannot be applied in unimodal histogram images [54,55]. The last step is refining the image from unwanted pixels containing more than one phase caused by artifacts such as the partial volume effect [42].

The goal of segmentation in our case was to isolate the TMC region from the hoof wall intratubular region to visualize and perform statistical quantification for the tubule's volume, area, sphericity, and equivalent diameter (Eqdiameter) in 3D. For better accuracy for the segmentation and to ensure that no incomplete tubule was included in the analysis, the segmentation process starts with selecting a cubical volume of interest in the middle of each specimen which is away from the concave corners of the hoof sample. Selecting a threshold value is crucial for a successful segmentation procedure. A series of known processing steps for tubule segmentation following Avizo software [56] was performed. Initially, interactive threshold modules were used for tubule detection to produce a binary image where the intensity level is 1 for the cavity, and the 0-intensity level is for the hoof wall intratubular region. A morphological opening operator was applied to remove all the small objects and smoothen the boundaries of the interesting feature (tubules medullary cavities), producing filtered images free of artifacts and noise. Finally, a labeling analysis module was used to perform a set of computational measurements for each particle in a 3D image.

To determine the area fraction porosity through the hoof wall thickness, images were analyzed using Fiji [57] software. Two images were selected for analysis: one on the top and one on the bottom of each hoof wall sample. The images were cropped such that the sections to analyze are tangential to the Stratum Internum, and further cropped into smaller sections. The threshold, that was manually applied, ranged between 2 and 7% between the four hoof wall samples to include all microtubules while eliminating the background noise. A median filter, DE speckle, was applied to further eliminate the background noise. The threshold and median filter parameters were applied consistently for each hoof wall sample. The command, Particle Analyzer, measured the tubule areas and total area of the crop section.

A.2 Image processing for SBF-SEM

The data collected using SBF-SEM does not require further alignment because the images are acquired continuously during the scan before sectioning. Therefore, the collected images can be staked in volume files using software such as AmiraTM [32]. 3D Serial Block Face SEM datasets were batchconverted into a total of 1426 tiff files in preparation for modeling in Amira™ (FEI), following the method described by Ref. [58] with a few modifications. About 1426 data stacks were imported into Amira™, and the appropriate voxel dimensions were inputted when prompted. Semi-automated segmentation was performed using a combination of the threshold, the magic wand, the lasso, and interpolation tools, allowing parameters such as volume and surface area to be measured. The magic wand, an automatic tool that uses a polygon expansion based on a voxel contrast gradient to select a connected group of triangles, was used to segment the pores. The lasso and interpolation tools were used to segment the hoof walls. The rest of the block was segmented using the threshold tool. Each segmented material was statistically analyzed using the label analysis tools and filtered out using the threshold by criterion and filter by measure tools. The volume rendering and generated surface tools were then used to render the segmented data in 3D.

REFERENCES

- Wegst UG, Bai H, Saiz E, Tomsia AP, Ritchie RO. Bioinspired structural materials. Nat Mater 2015;14(1):23–36. https:// doi.org/10.1038/nmat4089.
- [2] Fu Q, Saiz E, Tomsia AP. Bioinspired strong and highly porous glass scaffolds. Adv Funct Mater 2011;21(6):1058–63. https:// doi.org/10.1002/adfm.201002030.
- [3] Gibson LJ, Ashby MF, Harley BA. Cellular materials in nature and medicine. Cambridge University Press; 2010.
- [4] Schaedler TA, Carter WB. Architected cellular materials. Annu Rev Mater Res 2016;46:187–210. https://doi.org/ 10.1146/annurev-matsci-070115-031624.
- [5] Al-Ketan O, Rowshan R, Alami AH. Biomimetic materials for engineering applications. Elsevier; 2021. p. 25–34.
- [6] Kasapi MA, Gosline JM. Design complexity and fracture control in the equine hoof wall. J Exp Biol 1997;200(11):1639–59. https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.200.11.1639.
- [7] Bertram J, Gosline J. Functional design of horse hoof keratin: the modulation of mechanical properties through hydration effects. J Exp Biol 1987;130(1):121–36. https://doi.org/10.1242/ jeb.130.1.121.
- [8] Hémonnot CY, Reinhardt J, Saldanha O, Patommel J, Graceffa R, Weinhausen B, et al. X-rays reveal the internal structure of keratin bundles in whole cells. ACS Nano 2016;10(3):3553–61. https://doi.org/10.1021/acsnano.5b07871.
- [9] Huang W, Yaraghi NA, Yang W, Velazquez-Olivera A, Li Z, Ritchie RO, et al. A natural energy absorbent

polymer composite: the equine hoof wall. Acta Biomater 2019;90:267–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.actbio.2019.04.003.

- [10] Islam MK, Wang H, Hazell PJ, Kader MA, Escobedo JP., quasistatic response of horse hoof inspired biomimetic structures, mater. Today Proc 2022;59:1168–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.matpr.2022.03.185.
- [11] Wang B, Yang W, McKittrick J, Meyers MA. Keratin: structure, mechanical properties, occurrence in biological organisms, and efforts at bioinspiration. Prog Mater Sci 2016;76:229–318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmatsci.2015.06.001.
- [12] Shiang C-SA, Bonney C, Lazarus B, Meyers M, Jasiuk I. Hierarchical modeling of elastic moduli of equine hoof wall. J Mech Behav Biomed Mater 2022;136:105529. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jmbbm.2022.105529.
- [13] Bertram JE, Gosline JM. Fracture toughness design in horse hoof keratin. J Exp Biol 1986;125(1):29–47. https://doi.org/ 10.1242/jeb.125.1.29.
- [14] Goodman A, Haggis L. Regional variation in the flexural properties of the equine hoof wall. Comp. Exerc. Physiol. 2008;5(3–4):161–8.
- [15] Reilly J, Cottrell D, Martin R, Cuddeford D. Tubule density in equine hoof horn. Biomim 1996;4:23–36.
- [16] Lancaster LS, Bowker RM, Mauer WA. Equine hoof wall tubule density and morphology. J Vet Med Sci 2013;75(6):773–8. https://doi.org/10.1292/jvms.12-0399.
- [17] Leach DH. The structure and function of the equine hoof wall. University of Saskatchewan; 1980.
- [18] Al-Agele R, Paul E, Dvojmoc VK, Sturrock CJ, Rauch C, Rutland CS. The anatomy, histology and physiology of the healthy and lame equine hoof. Vet. Anat. Physiol. 2019;13. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.84514.
- [19] Claerhoudt S, Bergman E, Saunders J. Computed tomographic anatomy of the equine foot. Anat Histol Embryol 2014;43(5):395–402. https://doi.org/10.1111/ahe.12091.
- [20] Getman LM, Davidson EJ, Ross MW, Leitch M, Richardson DW. Computed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging-assisted partial hoof wall resection for keratoma removal. Vet Surg 2011;40(6):708–14. https:// doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-950X.2011.00864.x.
- [21] Huang W, Zaheri A, Jung J-Y, Espinosa HD, Mckittrick J. Hierarchical structure and compressive deformation mechanisms of bighorn sheep (Ovis canadensis) horn. Acta Biomater 2017;64:1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.actbio.2017.09.043.
- [22] Pauwels F, Hartmann A, Alawneh J, Wightman P, Saunders J. Contrast enhanced computed tomography findings in 105 horse distal extremities. J Equine Vet Sci 2021;104:103704. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jevs.2021.103704.
- [23] Wittig NK, Østergaard M, Palle J, Christensen TEK, Langdahl BL, Rejnmark L, et al. Opportunities for biomineralization research using multiscale computed X-ray tomography as exemplified by bone imaging. J Struct Biol 2022;214(1):107822.
- [24] Lazarus BS, Luu RK, Ruiz-Pérez S, Bezerra WBA, Becerra-Santamaria K, Leung V, et al. Equine hoof wall: structure, properties, and bioinspired designs. Acta Biomater 2022;151:426–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actbio.2022.08.028.
- [25] Yang F, Liu X, Wang P, Wang S, Robinson I, Chen B. Investigation of spatial nano-structure development of the hardened C3s pastes by serial block-face sem. Mater Char 2021;174:110973.
- [26] Bushong EA, Johnson Jr DD, Kim K-Y, Terada M, Hatori M, Peltier ST, et al. X-ray microscopy as an approach to increasing accuracy and efficiency of serial block-face imaging for correlated light and electron microscopy of biological specimens. Microsc Microanal 2015;21(1):231–8. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1431927614013579.

- [27] Denk W, Horstmann H. Serial block-face scanning electron microscopy to reconstruct three-dimensional tissue nanostructure. PLoS Biol 2004;2(11):e329. https://doi.org/ 10.1371/journal.pbio.0020329.
- [28] Miller JL, Cahoon AB. 3d plant cell architecture of arabidopsis thaliana (brassicaceae) using focused ion beam–scanning electron microscopy. Appl Plant Sci 2014;2(6):1300090. https://doi.org/10.3732/apps.1300090.
- [29] Smith D, Starborg T. Serial block face scanning electron microscopy in cell Biology: applications and technology. Tissue Cell 2019;57:111–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.tice.2018.08.011.
- [30] Pfeifer C, Shomorony A, Aronova M, Zhang G, Cai T, Xu H, et al. Quantitative analysis of mouse pancreatic islet architecture by serial block-face sem. J Struct Biol 2015;189(1):44–52.
- [31] Kizilyaprak C, Stierhof Y-D, Humbel BM. Volume microscopy in Biology: fib-sem tomography. Tissue Cell 2019;57:123–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tice.2018.09.006.
- [32] Hughes L, Hawes C, Monteith S, Vaughan S. Serial block face scanning electron microscopy—the future of cell ultrastructure imaging. Protoplasma 2014;251:395–401. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00709-013-0580-1.
- [33] Kubota Y, Sohn J, Kawaguchi Y. Large volume electron microscopy and neural microcircuit analysis. Front Neural Circ 2018;12:98. https://doi.org/10.3389/ fncir.2018.00098.
- [34] Krus M, Hansen KK, Künzel H. Porosity and liquid absorption of cement paste. Mater Struct 1997;30:394–8. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/BF02498561.
- [35] Kasapi M, Gosline J. Exploring the possible functions of equine hoof wall tubules. Equine Vet J 1998;30(S26):10–4. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2042-3306.1998.tb05116.x.
- [36] Kasapi MA, Gosline JM. Micromechanics of the equine hoof wall: optimizing crack control and material stiffness through modulation of the properties of keratin. J Exp Biol 1999;202(4):377–91. https://doi.org/ 10.1242/jeb.202.4.377.
- [37] Kempson S, Currie R, Johnston A. Influence of biotin supplementation on pig claw horn: a scanning electron microscopic study. Vet Rec 1989;124(2):37–40. https://doi.org/ 10.1136/vr.124.2.37.
- [38] Chandrappa AK, Biligiri KP. Pore structure characterization of pervious concrete using X-ray microcomputed tomography. J Mater Civ Eng 2018;30(6):04018108. https:// doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)MT.1943-5533.0002285.
- [39] Palombini FL, Kindlein Jr W, de Oliveira BF, de Araujo Mariath JE. Bionics and design: 3d microstructural characterization and numerical analysis of bamboo based on X-ray microtomography. Mater Char 2016;120:357–68.
- [40] Grace JR, Ebneyamini A. Connecting particle sphericity and circularity. Particuology 2021;54:1–4. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.partic.2020.09.006.
- [41] Rane K, Petrò S, Strano M. Evolution of porosity and geometrical quality through the ceramic extrusion additive manufacturing process stages. Addit Manuf 2020;32:101038. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addma.2020.101038.
- [42] Baker DR, Mancini L, Polacci M, Higgins MD, Gualda G, Hill R, et al. An introduction to the application of X-ray

microtomography to the three-dimensional study of igneous rocks. Lithos 2012;148:262–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lithos.2012.06.008.

- [43] Lazarus BS, Luu RK, Ruiz-Pérez S, Barbosa JD, Jasiuk I, Meyers MA. Equine hoof wall deformation: novel aspects revealed. Small Struct 2023:2200402.
- [44] Hashimoto K. Ultrastructure of the human toenail: cell migration, keratinization and formation of the intercellular cement. Arch Dermatol Forsch 1971;240(1):1–22. https:// doi.org/10.1007/BF01036163.
- [45] Notario B, Pinto J, Rodriguez-Perez MA. Nanoporous polymeric materials: a new class of materials with enhanced properties. Prog Mater Sci 2016;78:93–139.
- [46] Martín-de León J, Van Loock F, Bernardo V, Fleck NA, Rodríguez-Pérez MÁ. The influence of cell size on the mechanical properties of nanocellular pmma. Polym 2019;181:121805.
- [47] Ming-Yuan H, Hutchinson JW. Crack deflection at an interface between dissimilar elastic materials. Int J Solid Struct 1989;25(9):1053–67.
- [48] Thouless M, Cao H, Mataga P. Delamination from surface cracks in composite materials. J Mater Sci 1989;24:1406–12.
- [49] Parmigiani J, Thouless M. The roles of toughness and cohesive strength on crack deflection at interfaces. J Mech Phys Solid 2006;54(2):266–87.
- [50] Susi A, Mahrous A, Elwegaa K, Sims PL, Heinze I, Soliman M, et al. Optimization of composite layering effect based on measured formation fracture height to length ratios. J Petrol Environ Biotechnol 2018;9(3). https://doi.org/10.4172/2157-7463.1000376.
- [51] Akin S, Kovscek A. Computed tomography in petroleum engineering research. Geological Society, London, Spec. Pub. 2003;215(1):23–38. https://doi.org/10.1144/ GSL.SP.2003.215.01.03.
- [52] Ketcham RA, Carlson WD. Acquisition, optimization and interpretation of X-ray computed tomographic imagery: applications to the geosciences. Comput Geosci 2001;27(4):381–400. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0098-3004(00) 00116-3.
- [53] Withers PJ, Bouman C, Carmignato S, Cnudde V, Grimaldi D, Hagen CK, et al. X-ray computed tomography. Nat. Rev. Methods Primers 2021;1(1):18. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43586-021-00015-4.
- [54] Raju PDR, Neelima G. Image segmentation by using histogram thresholding. Int J Comput Sci Eng Technol 2012;2(1):776–9.
- [55] Parker JR. Algorithms for image processing and computer vision. John Wiley & Sons; 2010.
- [56] Thermo Scientific Avizo Software 9 User's Guide. Thermo Fisher scientific. 1995.
- [57] Schindelin J, Arganda-Carreras I, Frise E, Kaynig V, Longair M, Pietzsch T, et al. Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image analysis. Nat Methods 2012;9(7):676–82. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2019.
- [58] Booth DG, Beckett AJ, Prior IA, Meijer D. Superclem: an accessible correlative light and electron microscopy approach for investigation of neurons and glia in vitro. Biol. Open 2019;8(5). https://doi.org/10.1242/bio.042085.