

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**THE QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF
PHOTODENSITY OF THE THIRD
CARPAL BONE IN THE HORSE.**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Veterinary Science
at Massey University, Palmerston North
New Zealand**

Cristy Jane Secombe

2000

CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.....	i
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	vii

INTRODUCTION.....1

1.1 Prevalence of carpal bone fractures.....	1
1.2 Normal structure and function of synovial joints.....	4
1.3 Functional anatomy of the carpus.....	7
1.4 Physiology.....	11
1.5 Changing micromorphology of C3.....	15
1.6 Diagnosis of third carpal bone disease.....	16
1.7 Methods of analysing bone mineral density.....	20
1.7.1 Subjective evaluation of radiographs.....	22
1.7.2 Radiogrammetry.....	22
1.7.3 Objective evaluation of radiographs -radioabsorptiometry.....	23
1.7.4 Single photon absorptiometry.....	24
1.7.5 Dual photon absorptiometry.....	26
1.7.6 Computed tomography.....	27
1.7.8 Quantitative ultrasound.....	28
1.7.9 Neutron activation analysis.....	29
1.7.10 Compton scattering technique.....	30
1.8 Summary.....	30
1.9 Research hypothesis and objectives.....	30

MATERIALS AND METHODS.....32

2.1 Definitions.....	32
2.2 Animals.....	34
2.3 Disarticulation of the distal row of carpal bones.....	35

2.4 Determination of the extent of variation in x-ray beam angle required before C3 becomes obscured in the tangential views.....	35
2.5 Film type	35
2.6 Digitising the radiographs	35
2.7 Determining photodensity of the distal row when the x-ray beam angle is varied from 90°	36
2.7.1 Radiographing the distal row	36
2.7.2 Image analysis.....	38
2.8 Determining photodensity of the distal row of carpal bones when x-ray beam angle is varied from 60°.....	44
2.8.1 Radiographing the distal row	44
2.8.2 Image analysis.....	44
2.9 Changing ROI size.....	44
2.9.1 ROI program	44
2.10 Determination of the inherent differences between View A and B.....	45
2.10.1 Leg angle	45
2.10.2 Plate angle.....	46
2.10.3 X-ray beam angle	46
2.10.4 Modifying images A and B to form hypothetical image C.....	46
2.10.5 Image analysis.....	47
2.11 Statistical analysis	48
2.11.1 Dorsal analysis	48
2.11.2 Palmar analysis	49
2.11.3 Region of interest size analysis.....	49

THE RELIABILITY OF THE QUANTITATIVE MEASUREMENT OF PHOTODENSITY IN ISOLATED DISTAL ROWS OF CARPAL BONES..... 50

3.1 Introduction	50
3.2 Materials and Methods	50
3.2.1 Study 1.....	50
3.2.2 Study 2.....	51
3.3 Results	52
3.3.1 Study 1.....	52

3.3.2 Study 2.....	54
3.4 Discussion.....	56

RESULTS.....59

4.1. Dorsal analysis	61
4.1.1 Main effect of angle	62
4.1.2 Main effect of ROI	70
4.1.3 Main effect of group.....	80
4.2. Palmar analysis	83
4.2.1 Main effect of angle	84
4.2.2 Main effect of ROI	92
4.2.3 Main effect of group.....	102
4.3. Region of interest size analysis	105
4.3.1 Main effect of radius size	106

DISCUSSION.....110

5.1 Photodensity in relation to BMD.....	110
5.2 Effect of angle on photodensity.....	111
5.3 Effect of ROI on photodensity	113
5.4 Effect of exercise on photodensity	114
5.5 Effect of ROI size on photodensity	115
5.6 View A Compared to View B - Which is the more accurate view?.....	115
5.7 Relevance of this study.....	116
5.8 Sources of error.....	117
5.9 Critique of the subjective assessment of photodensity of C3.....	115
5.10 Further research	118
5.11 Conclusion.....	118

REFERENCE LIST.....119

APPENDIX 1.....126

Dorsal data..... 126
Palmar data..... 131
ROI size data..... 137

APPENDIX 2.....146

1. Dorsal data..... 146
 1.1 Main effect of angle 147
 1.2 Main effect of ROI 155
 1.3 Main effect of group..... 161
2. Palmar data..... 162
 2.1 Main effect of angle 163
 2.2 Main effect of ROI 171
 2.3 Main effect of group..... 177
3. ROI size analysis 178
 3.1 Main effect of radius size 178

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 1.1: Diagrammatic representation of the isolated proximal row of carpal bones.	8
Figure 1.2: Diagrammatic representation of the articulation of the proximal row with the radius	8
Figure 1.3: Diagrammatic representation of the isolated distal row of carpal bones.	9
Figure 1.4: Diagrammatic representation of the intercarpal ligaments of the carpus.	12
Figure 1.5: Line drawing of view A.	17
Figure 1.6: Radiograph of the distal row of carpal bones using View A.	17
Figure 1.7: Line drawing of View B.	18
Figure 1.8: Radiograph of the same distal row of carpal bones as in Figure 1.6 using View B.	18
Figure 1.9: The relative use of methods of non-invasive bone mineral density methods from 1960-1990.	21
Figure 1.10: Linear absorption coefficient as a function of photon energy.	23
Figure 2.1: Line drawing of View A.	33
Figure 2.2: Line drawing of View B.	34
Figure 2.3: Image of isolated distal row taken at 90 degrees.	36
Figure 2.4: The distal row of carpal bones, together with circle, cube and wedge on a radiographic cassette, ready for exposure.	37
Figure 2.5: Line drawing demonstrating that if the distal row of carpal bones is lying horizontal on the cassette the x-ray beam angle is equal to both the C3-beam angle and the plate-beam angle.	38
Figure 2.6: Line drawing of determination of θ	39
Figure 2.7: A calibrated image taken at 90°.	41
Figure 2.8: Image of isolated distal row of carpal bones with lines determining the position of the ROI's.	43
Figure 2.9: ROI's placed in a dorsal position.	43
Figure 2.10: ROI's placed in a palmar position.	43
Figure 2.11: ROI's with a radius of 2.5mm.	44
Figure 2.12: ROI's with a radius of 3.5mm.	44
Figure 2.13: Line drawing illustrating bone-MCIII angle(a), skin-MCIII angle(b) and C3 beam angle(c)	45
Figure 2.14: Line drawing illustrating hypothetical View C.	47
Figure 4.1: Graph illustrating the effect of colour in reading the graph.	60

Figure 4.2: Column graph of the main effect of x-ray beam angle on the photodensity of ROI's when in a dorsal position. Error bars represent +/- 1 standard error (s.e.m.).	62
Figure 4.3: Column graph of the effect of angle on photodensity of ROI 1 in a dorsal position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	63
Figure 4.4: Column graph of the effect of angle on photodensity of ROI 2 in a dorsal position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	64
Figure 4.5: Column graph of the effect of angle on photodensity of ROI 3 in a dorsal position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	65
Figure 4.6: Column graph of the effect of angle on photodensity of ROI 4 in a dorsal position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	66
Figure 4.7: Column graph of the effect of angle on the photodensity of ROI 5 in a dorsal position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	67
Figure 4.8: Column graph of the effect of angle on the photodensity of the non-exercised group when ROI's were in a dorsal position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	68
Figure 4.9: Column graph of the effect of angle on the photodensity of the exercised group when ROI's were in a dorsal position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	69
Figure 4.10: Column graph demonstrating the main effect of ROI site on photodensity when ROI's were in a dorsal position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	70
Figure 4.11: Column graph of the effect non-exercise on the photodensity of ROI's in a dorsal position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	71
Figure 4.12: Column graph of the effect of exercise on the photodensity of ROI's in a dorsal position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	72
Figure 4.13: Column graph of the photodensity of ROI's in a dorsal position when x-ray beam angle was 60 degrees. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	73
Figure 4.14: Column graph of photodensity of ROI's in a dorsal position when x-ray beam angle was 65 degrees. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	74
Figure 4.15: Column graph of photodensity of ROI's in a dorsal position when x-ray beam angle was at 70 degrees. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	75
Figure 4.16: Column graph of photodensity of ROI's in a dorsal position when x-ray beam angle was 75 degrees. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	76
Figure 4.17: Column graph of photodensity of ROI's in a dorsal position when x-ray beam angle was 80 degrees. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	77
Figure 4.18: Column graph of photodensity of ROI's in a dorsal position when x-ray beam angle was 85 degrees. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	78
Figure 4.19: Column graph of photodensity of ROI's in a dorsal position when x-ray beam angle was 90 degrees. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	79

Figure 4.20: Column graph of the effect of group on photodensity when ROI's were in a dorsal position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	80
Figure 4.21: Column graph of the effect of group on angle when ROI's were in a dorsal position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	81
Figure 4.22: Column graph of the effect of group on photodensity of ROI's when in a dorsal position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	82
Figure 4.23: Column graph of the main effect of x-ray beam angle on photodensity when ROI's were in the palmar position. Error bars represent +/- 1 standard error (s.e.m.).....	84
Figure 4.24: Column graph of the effect of x-ray beam angle on photodensity of ROI 1 when ROI's were in a palmar position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	85
Figure 4.25: Column graph of the effect of x-ray beam angle on photodensity of ROI 2 when ROI's were in a palmar position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	86
Figure 4.26: Column graph of the effect of x-ray beam angle on the photodensity of ROI 3 when ROI's were in a palmar position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	87
Figure 4.27: Column graph of the effect of x-ray beam angle on ROI 4 when ROI's were in a palmar position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	88
Figure 4.28: Column graph of the effect of x-ray beam angle at ROI 5 when ROI's were in a palmar position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	89
Figure 4.29: Column graph of the effect of x-ray beam angle on photodensity of the non-exercised group when ROI's were in a palmar position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m. .	90
Figure 4.30: Column graph of the effect of x-ray beam angle on photodensity of the exercised group when ROI's were in a palmar position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	91
Figure 4.31: Column graph of the main effect of ROI site on photodensity when ROI's were in a palmar position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	92
Figure 4.32: Column graph of the effect of the non-exercise group on photodensity of ROI's in a palmar position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	93
Figure 4.33: Column graph of the effect of exercise on the photodensity of ROI's in a palmar position. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	94
Figure 4.34: Column graph of the photodensity of ROI's in a palmar position when x-ray beam angle was 60 degrees. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	95
Figure 4.35: Column graph of the photodensity of ROI's in a palmar position when x-ray beam angle was 65 degrees. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	96
Figure 4.36: Column graph of the photodensity of ROI's in a palmar position when the angle was 70 degrees. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	97
Figure 4.37: Column graph of the photodensity of ROI's in a palmar position when x-ray beam angle was 75 degrees. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	98

Figure 4.38: Column graph of the photodensity of ROI's in a palmar position when the angle was 80 degrees. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	99
Figure 4.39: Column graph of photodensity of ROI's in a palmar position when angle was 85 degrees. Error bars represent +/- 1 s.e.m.	100
Figure 4.40: Column graph of photodensity of ROI's in a palmar position when angle was 90 degrees.	101
Figure 4.41: Column graph of the main effect of group on photodensity when ROI's were in a palmar position.	102
Figure 4.42: Column graph of the effect of x-ray beam angle on the photodensity of the exercised and non-exercised group.	103
Figure 4.43: Column graph of the effect of group on the photodensity of ROI's in a palmar position.	104
Figure 4.44: Column graph of the effect of ROI size when ROI's were in a palmar position. .	106
Figure 4.45: Column graph of the effect of x-ray beam angle on photodensity of ROI's at varying radius sizes.	107
Figure 4.46: Column graph of the effect of ROI size on photodensity while holding the angle at 60 degrees	108
Figure 4.47: Column graph of the effect of ROI size while holding x-ray beam angle at 90 degrees.	109

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Prevalence of carpal fractures in Thoroughbreds and Quarterhorses.....	2
Table 1.2: Prevalence of carpal fractures in Standardbreds.....	2
Table 1.3: Racing performance following surgical treatment of osteochondral (chip) and slab fractures.....	3
Table 1.4: Microradiography studies of excised C3's from horses in different stages of training.....	14
Table 1.5: Scoring of the trabecular pattern of C3 seen on the sky-line projection.....	20
Table 3.1: Results of raw data and descriptive statistics for ROI after digitisation of a radiograph 10 times.....	52
Table 3.2: Results of one-way ANOVA for ROI after digitisation of a radiograph 10 times.....	52
Table 3.3: The coefficient of variation (within) for each ROI after digitisation of a radiograph 10 times.....	53
Table 3.4: Results of raw data and descriptive statistics for variation of horizontal and vertical angle after digitisation of a radiograph 10 times.....	53
Table 3.5: Results of one-way ANOVA for angle after digitisation of radiograph 10 times.....	54
Table 3.6: The coefficient of variation (within) for both horizontal and vertical angle after digitisation of a radiograph 10 times.....	54
Table 3.7: Descriptive statistics of varying bone/angle combinations including coefficient of variation and coefficient of variation (within).....	55
Table 3.8: The intra-class coefficient for each ROI at varying bone/angle combinations.....	55
Table 3.9: Results of descriptive statistics and the coefficient of variation (within) for vertical angle when the bone/angle combination is varied.....	56
Table 3.10: Results of descriptive statistics and the coefficient of variation (within) for horizontal angle when the bone/angle combination is varied.....	56
Table 4.1: A table of the overall ANOVA results for the dorsal analysis.....	61
Table 4.2: A table of the overall ANOVA results for the palmar analysis.....	83
Table 4.3: A table of the overall ANOVA results for the ROI size analysis.....	105

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank-you to my supervisors, **Elwyn Firth, Nigel Perkins, Donald Bailey and Brian Anderson** for their time and effort in assisting me through the journey of my masters project. I am particularly thankful for the enthusiasm and time Elwyn spent helping me with all aspects of this research. Many thanks to Donald, without whom the transition into the world of image analysis would have been far more turbulent. I especially wish to thank Nigel for his continuous support, invaluable statistical assistance and wisdom, particularly regarding manuscript preparation. Thank-you to **Nicki Moffat, Sue Jenkins and Julie Warnock** for their help, both practical and theoretical with the radiographic component of the project. My appreciation also goes to **Russell Watson and Jim Hargreaves**, without whom the cube, wedge and circle would still be a figment of my imagination. I wish to thank Nigel, **Chris Rogers and Jason Shaw** for their assistance with computer related challenges that I faced along the way. Finally a special thank-you to my husband **Mark Secombe**, whose unyielding support, commitment and enthusiasm enabled me to lock myself in front of the computer and complete this project.

The work in this project was supported financially by a grant from the **New Zealand Equine Research Foundation**, of which I am grateful.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if a method of non-invasive bone mineral analysis could be adapted to quantitatively assess photodensity in the third carpal bone of the horse. The technique chosen was radiographic absorptiometry, which determines bone mineral density from a radiograph that includes a control (usually a wedge) of known photodensity. When taken correctly the tangential view of the distal row of carpal bones allows visualisation of the dorsal aspect of the third carpal bone, without superimposition of overlying structures. The method is technically demanding, because the angle at which the x-ray beam penetrates the third carpal bone can not be exactly replicated in a clinical situation, as it is affected by the x-ray beam angle and the limb flexion angle. To utilise radioabsorptiometry in the tangential view, assessment of the effect of variation in x-ray beam angle was required.

Fourteen isolated distal rows of carpal bones were radiographed varying the x-ray beam angle in 5° increments over 15° from the base angles of 60° and 90°. The radiographs were digitised and processed to determine the photodensity of specific regions of interest in terms of millimetres of aluminium, using the wedge as reference. The results indicated that small variations in x-ray beam angle significantly affect photodensity.

Quantitative assessment of the photodensity of the fourth carpal bone showed changes associated with exercise, similar to those in the third carpal bone. Changing the size of the region of interest when x-ray beam angle was varied by 30° did not affect photodensity of the region of interest. Although conversion from photodensity to bone mineral density was not possible within this project, the findings supported other authors who have studied bone mineral density of the third carpal bone.

There are two tangential views of the distal row of carpal bones. The two methods affect the radiographic image differently because the magnification and distortion changes are different in each, and this precluded accurate comparison. Therefore, it was impossible to determine which method would more accurately assess the photodensity of the third carpal bone.

The study concluded that quantitative assessment of photodensity of the third carpal bone using either tangential view was clinically inapplicable at this time, because of the significant effect of very small changes in angle on photodensity. This is unfortunate, because the current practice of visual subjective assessment of photodensity of the third carpal bone remains unsatisfactory, in particular the differentiation between grades of sclerosis.