

**Electrostatically and Electrodynamically Stimulated
Ca and Zr- doped MgSiO₃ [Mg_{1-x}Ca_xSi_{1-x}Zr_xO₃ (x =
0 - 0.4), MCSZO] Bioceramics for Orthopedic
Implant Application**



**Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment for the
Award of Degree**

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Priya Singh

**DEPARTMENT OF CERAMIC ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
(BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY)
VARANASI – 221005
INDIA**

CERTIFICATE

It is certified that the work contained in the thesis titled “Electrostatically and Electro-dynamically Stimulated Ca and Zr- doped MgSiO_3 [$\text{Mg}_{1-x}\text{Ca}_x\text{Si}_{1-x}\text{Zr}_x\text{O}_3$ ($x = 0 - 0.4$); MCSZO] bioceramics for Orthopedic Implant application” by Priya Singh has been carried out under my supervision and this work has not been submitted elsewhere for a degree.

It is further certified that the student has fulfilled all the requirements of Comprehensive examination, Candidacy and SOTA for the award of Ph.D. Degree.

Ashutosh KDS

Dr. Ashutosh Kumar Dubey

Dr. Ashutosh Kumar Dubey
(Supervisor)
Associate Professor

Department of Ceramic Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology
Banaras Hindu University (BHU)
Varanasi-221005 (U.P.), India
IIT (BHU) Varanasi

COPYRIGHT TRANSFER CERTIFICATE

Title of the Thesis "Electrostatically and Electrostatically Stimulated Ca and Zr-doped MgSiO_3 [$\text{Mg}_{1-x}\text{Ca}_x\text{Si}_{1-x}\text{Zr}_x\text{O}_3$ ($x = 0 - 0.4$); MCSZO] bioceramics for Orthopedic Implant application"

Name of Student: Priya Singh

Copyright Transfer

The undersigned hereby assigns to the Institute of Technology (Banaras Hindu University) Varanasi all rights under copyright that may exist in and for the above thesis submitted for the award of the degree of "Doctor of Philosophy".

Date: 4/04/2024

Place: Varanasi

Priya Singh
Priya Singh

Note: However, the author may reproduce or authorize others to reproduce material extracted verbatim from the thesis or derivative of the thesis for the author's personal use provided that the source and university's copyright notice are indicated.

Acknowledgement

I am sincerely thankful to my supervisor, **Dr. Ashutosh Kumar Dubey (Associate Professor & Head, Department of Ceramic Engineering)**, for providing me with the necessary guidance and support to pursue my research interests. His extensive knowledge in the field of materials science and his willingness to share it has motivated me to delve deeper into the subject matter. Throughout my thesis project, **Dr. Dubey** has been a source of constant encouragement and assistance, helping me overcome various obstacles and ultimately leading me to a successful outcome. I am truly grateful for his mentorship and guidance.

I also feel so much gratitude towards the members of my research evaluation committee, **Dr. Akhilesh Kumar Singh** and **Dr. Imteyaz Ahmad**, for their invaluable advice and guidance throughout my research project. Additionally, I would like to extend my thanks to the other professors of Department of Ceramic Engineering at IIT(BHU), for providing the essential resources and facilities that enabled me to carry out my research work effectively. Their support and assistance have been instrumental in the successful completion of my thesis, and I sincerely appreciate their contributions. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my seniors **Dr. Abhinav Saxena, Dr. Anurag Kumar** and **Mr. Harsh Jain** for helping me during my research work. I am deeply grateful to **Dr. Deepak Khare** for their unwavering support and their insightful comments and suggestions.

I would like to thank my friend, **Ms. Urvashi Kesarwani** for helping me during experiments and for creating a work-friendly environment in the lab.

I would also like to thank my other friends and colleagues such as Kuntal Kumar Das, Ratnanjali Pandey, Ankita Singh, Pratistha, Shienu Vats, Asim Ahmad and Ashwani Gautam making my life memorable at the campus of IIT (BHU). I would also like to thank to staff members of the department, Mr. Rajeev Ranjan, Mr. Shailendra, Mr, Zishan Ahamad, Mr.

Ravinder Rai, Mr. Prashant Kumar, Mr. Ashish Tripathi for helping me in the experimental and paperwork.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my brother, my parents, my husband, and all other family members for their unconditional support, both financially and emotionally throughout my research work. Without their tremendous understanding and encouragement in the past few years, it would have been impossible for me to complete my research work.

Indeed, I would like thank to “**GOD**” the almighty for giving me the strength to remain on the path to success.

Date: 4/04/2024

Place: IIT (BHU) Varanasi

Priya Singh

(Priya Singh)

Contents

1. Introduction.....	(1-27)
1.1 Bone	(1)
1.2 Significance of Mg, Ca, and Si ions in bone metabolism.....	(3)
1.3 Bioceramics.....	(5)
1.4 Effect of surface charge and electrodynamic stimulation on cell viability.....	(7)
1.5 Surface charge induced antibacterial response.....	(8)
1.6 Objectives.....	(10)
1.7 Outlines for the thesis.....	(11)
2. Literature Review.....	(28-132)
2.1 Introduction	(28)
2.2 MgSiO ₃ - based biomaterials.....	(31)
2.2.1 Crystal structure.....	(31)
2.2.2 Synthesis.....	(34)
2.2.3 Biocompatibility.....	(35)
2.2.3.1 <i>in vitro</i> response.....	(35)
2.2.3.2 <i>in vivo</i> response.....	(37)
2.3 CaSiO ₃ - based biomaterials.....	(45)
2.3.1 Crystal structure.....	(45)
2.3.2 Synthesis.....	(48)
2.3.3 Biocompatibility.....	(53)
2.3.3.1 <i>in vitro</i> response.....	(53)
2.3.3.2 <i>in vivo</i> response.....	(63)
2.4 Mg – Ca silicate- based biomaterials.....	(70)
2.4.1 Crystal structure.....	(70)

2.4.2 Synthesis.....	(72)
2.4.3 Biocompatibility.....	(75)
2.4.3.1 <i>in vitro</i> response.....	(75)
2.4.3.2 <i>in vivo</i> response.....	(79)
2.5 Influence of surface charge and electrodynamic stimulation on cellular response	(86)
2.6 Influence of surface charge on antibacterial response.....	(87)
2.7 Closure.....	(88)
3. Experimental.....	(133-155)
3.1 Synthesis.....	(133)
3.1.1 Synthesis of $Mg_{1-x}Ca_xSi_{1-x}Zr_xO_3$ bioceramics.....	(133)
3.1.2 Synthesis of hydroxyapatite (HA) bioceramics	(134)
3.2 Processing and densification of prepared MCSZO and HA bioceramics.....	(135)
3.3 Phase and microstructure analysis of MCSZO and HA bioceramics.....	(136)
3.3.1 Phase evaluation.....	(136)
3.3.2 FTIR spectroscopy.....	(138)
3.3.3 Microstructural analyses.....	(138)
3.4 Development of bioelectrets.....	(138)
3.5 Ion leaching behavior of MCSZO-X bioceramics in stimulated body fluid (SBF).....	(138)
3.6 Contact angle measurement.....	(139)
3.7 X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS).....	(139)
3.8 <i>In-vitro</i> cellular assessment.....	(139)
3.8.1 Cell attachment/ proliferation assay (quantitative).....	(140)
3.8.2 Morphological assay (qualitative).....	(141)

3.8.3 Alkaline phosphatase activity (ALP).....	(141)
3.8.4 Intracellular Ca ²⁺ ions measurement.....	(142)
3.9 <i>In vitro</i> antibacterial assessment.....	(143)
3.9.1 Quantitative assessment.....	(144)
3.9.1.1 MTT assay.....	(144)
3.9.2 Qualitative assessment.....	(144)
3.9.2.1 Live/ dead assay.....	(144)
3.10 Enzymatic response.....	(144)
3.10.1 Super oxide radical (SOD) assay.....	(145)
3.10.2 Catalase assay.....	(145)
3.10.3 Protein estimation assay.....	(146)
3.10.4 Lipid peroxide (LPO) assay.....	(146)
3.11 <i>In vivo</i> toxicity assessment of MCSZO-X (X = 0 -4) nanoparticles.....	(147)
3.11.1 Sample preparation and material characterization.....	(147)
3.11.2 Phase and morphological characterization.....	(147)
3.11.3 Eluate solution preparation.....	(147)
3.11.4 Leaching behavior	(148)
3.11.5 Cellular response of MCSZO-X nanoparticles.....	(148)
3.11.6 <i>In vivo</i> study.....	(149)
3.11.6.1 Animals.....	(149)
3.11.6.2 Experimental procedure.....	(149)
3.11.6.3 Hematology and Biochemical assay.....	(150)
3.11.6.4 Histopathological analyses.....	(151)
3.12 Statistical analyses	(151)
3.13 Closure.....	(151)

4. Synergistic effect of electrostatic and electrodynamic electrical stimulation	
on osteogenic responses.....	(156-198)
4.1 Characterization of MCSZO-X (X = 0 - 4) bioceramics.....	(156)
4.1.1 Densification and phase evaluation	(156)
4.1.2 Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy.....	(159)
4.1.3 Microstructural analyses.....	(159)
4.2 Leaching behavior.....	(160)
4.3 Contact angle measurement.....	(162)
4.4 X-Ray Photoelectron spectroscopic (XPS) analyses.....	(163)
4.5 Synergistic effect of electret and electrodynamic stimulation on	
cellular response	(177)
4.5.1 Cell viability.....	(177)
4.5.2 Morphological analyses.....	(180)
4.5.3 Alkaline phosphatase (ALP) activity.....	(182)
4.5.4 Concentration of intracellular Ca ²⁺ ions.....	(184)
4.6 Discussion.....	(186)
4.7 Closure.....	(189)
5. Effect of doping and surface charge on the antibacterial response	
of Mg_{1-x}Ca_xSi_{1-x}Zr_xO₃ (x = 0 - 0.4) bioceramics.....	(199-226)
5.1 Crystalline Size and lattice strain analyses.....	(199)
5.2 Measurement of surface charge.....	(204)
5.3 Antibacterial response.....	(205)
5.3.1 Quantitative assessment	(205)
5.3.1.1 MTT assay.....	(205)
5.3.2 Qualitative assessment.....	(209)

5.3.2.1 (Live/ dead assay)	(209)
5.4 Enzymatic response.....	(211)
5.4.1 Superoxide radical (SOD) assay.....	(211)
5.4.2 Catalase assessment.....	(213)
5.4.3 Evaluation of protein concentration.....	(215)
5.4.4 Lipid peroxide (LPO) assay.....	(216)
5.5 Discussion.....	(218)
5.6 Closure.....	(221)
6. <i>In vivo</i> response of Ca/Zr co-doped MgSiO₃ nanoparticle.....	(227-251)
6.1 Phase analyses.....	(227)
6.2 Microstructural analyses.....	(229)
6.3 Leaching behavior.....	(230)
6.4 Cell viability.....	(231)
6.5 <i>In vivo</i> studies.....	(233)
6.5.1 General observation.....	(233)
6.5.1.1 Impact of intra-articular injection of MCSZO-X on body weight.....	(235)
6.5.2 Hematological analyses.....	(235)
6.5.3 Biochemical assays.....	(236)
6.5.4 Histopathological analyses.....	(238)
6.6 Closure.....	(244)
7. Conclusion and scope for the future work.....	(252-255)
List of Publication.....	(256-258)

List of Figures

- Fig. 1.1: *Biological response of Mg²⁺, Zn²⁺, Ca²⁺, Sr²⁺, Si⁴⁺ and Zr⁴⁺ ions in Mg/Ca silicate -based perovskite bioceramics.* 5
- Fig.1.2: *Schematic representation of electrostatic and electrodynamic stimulated cellular response.* 8
- Fig.2.1: *Crystal structure of MgSiO₃ and Co and Mn substituted MgSiO₃. a) Portoensstatite (orthorhombic) with space group Pbcn, b) Clinoensstatite (monoclinic) with space group P2₁/c, c) Structure of (Mg_{0.776}Co_{0.224}) SiO₃ with space group Pbca and d) Structure of (Mg_{0.925}Mn_{0.075}) SiO₃ with space group (Mg_{0.925}Mn_{0.075}) SiO₃.* 32
- Fig.2.2: *In vitro and in vivo response of CS, HA-CS and HA-CS-MgSiO₃ scaffolds, while cultured with rat bone marrow mesenchymal stem cells (rBMSCs) as well as implanted in calvaria defect site of rat. (A) Cytoskeleton staining after 3 days as well as angiogenesis and osteogenesis gene (Runx2, OCN, OPN) expression, while scaffolds are cultured with rBMSCs for up to 14 days. (B) Micro-CT images of CS, HA-CS and HA-CS-MgSiO₃ scaffolds. Coronal and interior images reveal that HA-CS-MgSiO₃ scaffold have higher bone regeneration as compared to HA-CS and CS after implantation of 12 weeks. (C) Schematic representing the osteogenic differentiation of rBMSCs into osteoblasts cells. The rBMSCs differentiate into osteoblast cells due to release of Mg²⁺ and Si⁴⁺ ions from MgSiO₃ - based scaffold which consequently, results in enhanced bone regeneration. (D) HA-CS-MgSiO₃ demonstrates higher new bone regeneration as compared to CS and HA-CS scaffold.* 39
- Fig.2.3: *In vitro cellular response of MgSiO₃ and HA coated Ti- alloy, cultured with BMSCs as well as in vivo response after 8 weeks of implantation in rabbit tibial defect site. (A) MgSiO₃ coated Ti-alloy reveals higher osteogenesis related genes (ALP, OCN, COL1) as compared to HA coated Ti- alloy, after 3 and 7 days of culture. (B) Histopathological images, representing neo bone formation (yellow rectangle), while MgSiO₃ and HA coated as well as uncoated Ti-alloy are implanted in rabbit tibial defect site upto 8 weeks. (C) Bone- implant contact area and (D) Neo bone formation area for implanted samples with respect to those of control.* 40
- Fig.2.4: *In vivo response of Zn and Sr doped Mg₂SiO₄ ceramics, while implanted in rabbit femur defect site. The histological (a, e), fluorescence (b, f), 3D micro -CT (c, g) and scanning electron microscopy (d, h) images of bone - implant interface of Zn and Sr doped Mg₂SiO₄ ceramics, after 90 days of implantation. (i) Formation* 41

of neo bone at defect site with varying time and composition of Zn and Sr doped Mg₂SiO₄. (j) Implantation of Zn doped Mg₂SiO₄ ceramic does not cause any toxic effect to the three major organs (such as, heart, kidney and lever) of rabbit model up to 90 days.

- Fig.2.5: Crystal structure of CaSiO₃ and Sr doped CaSiO₃. a) Monoclinic structure of α - CaSiO₃ with P2₁/a space group, b) Monoclinic structure of α - CaSiO₃ with C2₁/c space group and c) Triclinic structure of Ca_{0.43}Sr_{0.57}SiO₃ with P-1 space group. d) The triclinic structure of CaSiO₃. e) Two chains of tilted SiO₄ tetrahedra. 47*
- Fig.2.6: Schematic illustrating the mechanism of apatite formation on CaSiO₃ surface in SBF. 55*
- Fig. 2.7: In vitro cellular response of hMSCs on β -CaSiO₃ and α -CaSiO₃. (A) Three- ring silicate and chain silicate structures of β -CaSiO₃ and α -CaSiO₃ (O-red, Si- blue and Ca- green). (B) Crystal structure dependent solubility and dissolution rate. (C) Cellular response of hMSCs, cultured on both, β -CaSiO₃ and α -CaSiO₃. 63*
- Fig. 2.8: In vivo response of β - CaSiO₃ and β - TCP scaffolds, while implanted in rabbit calvarial defect site. Histological images of bone - tissue interface, after 16 weeks of implantation with β - CaSiO₃ (A, B) and β - TCP (C, D). The degradation and neo bone formation ability of β - CaSiO₃ and β - TCP (E, F). (NB- Neo bone). 67*
- Fig.2.9: Crystal structures of akermanite, diopside, monticellite and merwinite. 72*
- Fig.2.10: In vivo response of akermanite ceramic, while implanted in rabbit femur and ovx rat defect site. Van Gieson's picric-fuchsine staining images demonstrating new bone formation area around akermanite (A, B) and β -TCP (C, D). The histomorphometric analyze illustrate the neo bone volume and volume of residual material (E, F) on akermanite and β -TCP ceramics, while implanted in rabbit femur defect for 8 and 16 weeks. Histological images representing the neo bone formation area on akermanite (A1, A2) and β -TCP (B1, B2), implanted in calvarial defect area for 8 weeks. (C1), (D1) and (E1) represent the neo bone area, vessel area as well as residual material area of akermanite and β -TCP ceramics. 81*
- Fig.2.11: A glimpse of in vivo studies, performed on Mg-Ca- based biomaterials using small, medium and large animal models. 82*
- Fig.3.1: Flow chart showing the solid - state synthesis for MCSZO-X bioceramics. 134*
- Fig.3.2: Flow chart showing the synthesis protocol for HA bioceramics. 135*
- Fig.3.3: A schematic illustrating the combined effect of electrostatic and 140*

electrodynamical stimulation in a cell culture experiment. a) bioelectret development, b), and c) application of electrical stimulation while the cells are being adhered on uncharged, negative and positive end of electrets.

- Fig.3.4: Representation of intra-articular injection of MCSZO-X (X = 0 – 4) nanoparticles in the Wistar rat knee (synovial) joint. 150*
- Fig.4.1: Densification and phase evolution of $Mg_{1-x}Ca_xSi_{1-x}Zr_xO_3$; MCSZO-X (X = 0– 4) samples, sintered at 1380 - 1320 °C. (a) The relative densities of sintered MCSZO-X samples. (b) XRD patterns for MCSZO-x (x = 0 – 0.4) samples, (c) Enlarged view of the most intense Bragg's peak in 2θ range of 27-30°. 158*
- Fig. 4.2: Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectra of (a) sintered $Mg_{1-x}Ca_xSi_{1-x}Zr_xO_3$ (MCSZO- X) (x = 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, and 0.4) and (b) HA samples. 159*
- Fig. 4.3: Scanning electron micrographs and energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS) graphs for fractured $Mg_{1-x}Ca_xSi_{1-x}Zr_xO_3$ samples: (a) x = 0, (b) x = 0.1, (c) x = 0.2, (d) x = 0.3, and (e) x = 0.4, sintered at 1380- 1320 °C. 160*
- Fig.4.4: Leaching profile of Mg^{2+} , Si^{4+} , Ca^{2+} , Zr^{4+} ions from MCSZO- X (X = 0 - 4) samples in simulated body fluid (SBF). The graphs representing the changes in the concentrations of (a) Mg^{2+} , (b) Si^{4+} , (c) Ca^{2+} and (d) Zr^{4+} ions with respect to immersion period. 161*
- Fig.4.5: Values of Contact angle on the surface of uncharged and MCSZO-X (X = 0 –4) electrets of samples using (a) Deionized (DI) water and (b) DMEM. Asterisk (*) denotes the significant variation in the mean values of water contact angles among the HA electret, and uncharged as well as MCSZO-X electret samples as compared to uncharged HA samples, (at $p \leq 0.05$). (**) and (#) marks indicate the significant variation in the mean values of water contact angles on MCSZO-X electrets with respect to the negative end of HA electret and uncharged MCSZO-X samples, respectively, at $p \leq 0.05$. 163*
- Fig.4.6: X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) spectra of uncharged and MCSZO -X (X = 0 - 4) electret samples. XPS survey spectrum of uncharged and MCSZO -X electret samples, i.e., (a) MCSZO-0, (b) MCSZO-1, (c) MCSZO-2, (d) MCSZO-3, and (e) MCSZO-4, for Mg (1s), Ca (2p), Si (2p), Zr (3d), O (1s), and C (1s) orbital states. 164*
- Fig.4.7: X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) spectra of both, uncharged and electret surfaces of MCSZO-X (X = 0 - 4) samples for O 1s. Representation of O 1s spectra for uncharged MCSZO-X, (a, c, e, g, i) and electrets of MCSZO-X, (b, d, f, h, j) samples, (X = 0 - 4). 166*
- Fig.4.8: XPS spectra of both, uncharged and electret surfaces of MCSZO -X (X 170*

= 0 – 4) samples for Mg 1s. Representation of Mg 1s spectra for uncharged MCSZO-X, (a, c, e, g, i), and electret of MCSZO-X, (b, d, f, h, j) samples, (X = 0 – 4).

Fig.4.9: XPS spectra of both, uncharged and electret surfaces of MCSZO -X (X = 0 – 4) samples for Ca 2p. Representation of Mg 1s spectra for uncharged MCSZO-X, (a, c, e, g, i), and electret of MCSZO-X, (b, d, f, h, j) samples, (X = 0 – 4). 172

Fig.4.10: XPS spectra of both, uncharged and electret surfaces of MCSZO -X (X = 0 – 4) samples for Si 2p. Representation of Si 2p spectra for uncharged MCSZO-X, (a, c, e, g, i) and electret of MCSZO-X, (b, d, f, h, j) samples, (X = 0 – 4). 174

Fig.4.11: XPS spectra of both, uncharged and electret surfaces of MCSZO -X (X = 0 – 4) samples for Zr 3d. Representation of Zr 3d spectra for uncharged MCSZO-X, (a, c, e, g) and electret of MCSZO-X, (b, d, f, h) samples (X = 0 – 4). 176

Fig.4.12: Variation in oxygen deficiencies on uncharged and electret surfaces of $Mg_{1-x}Ca_xSi_{1-x}Zr_xO_3$ (x = 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, MCSZO-X) samples. The graph represents the increase in the oxygen deficiency in the electret samples with respect to their corresponding uncharged samples. 177

Fig.4.13: Viability of MG-63 cells on uncharged, electrets and electrodynamically treated electrets of MCSZO-X (X = 0 - 4) samples and HA control, after the culture duration of 3, 5, 7 days. (*) symbol denotes the significant variation for all uncharged, electrets and electrodynamically treated electrets of MCSZO-X samples and control in comparison to uncharged HA, at $p \leq 0.05$. The (@) symbol indicates a significant variation for all treated MCSZO-X samples with respect to their corresponding uncharged MCSZO-X samples, at $p \leq 0.05$. The (**) symbol indicates the significant variation for all negatively charged electrodynamic stimulated [E(N)] MCSZO-X electret samples and HA control in comparison to negatively charged electret [N] HA, at $p \leq 0.05$. The (@@) symbol indicates significant variation for all of the negatively charged electrodynamic stimulated [E(N)] MCSZO-X electret samples with respect to their corresponding negatively charged [N] MCSZO-X electret samples, at $p \leq 0.05$. The (***) and (@@@) symbols indicates the significant variation for all of the positively charged electrodynamic stimulated [E(P)] MCSZO-X electret samples and HA control with respect to positive end of [P] HA electret and corresponding [P] MCSZO-X samples, respectively, at $p \leq 0.05$. (#) represents significant variation for all of the electrodynamically stimulated MCSZO-X electret samples with respect to their corresponding uncharged MCSZO samples and HA control, at $p \leq 0.05$. The U, P, N represents the uncharge, positive electret and negative electret, respectively. 179

Fig.4.14: Fluorescence microscopic images of stained osteoblast-like MG-63 181

cells, cultured on uncharged and electrodynamically stimulated MCSZO -X (X = 0 - 4) electrets as well as HA samples. The U, P and N represent the uncharged, positive electret and negative electret of MCSZO-X and HA samples. The electrodynamic stimulation treated uncharged, positively and negatively charged electrets are denoted as U(E), P(E) and N(E), respectively.

Fig.4.15: Alkaline phosphatase (ALP) activity of osteoblast-like MG-63 cells, seeded on uncharged and electrodynamically stimulated MCSZO -X (X = 0 - 4) electret samples and HA control, after the culture duration of (a) 7 and (b) 14 days. [U-uncharged, P- positive electret, and N-negative electret. The electrodynamic stimulation treated uncharged, positively and negatively charged electrets are denoted as U(E), P(E) and N(E), respectively.]. The symbols (*), (**), and (***) denote the significant variation, at $p \leq 0.05$ in the mean values of ALP activity between the untreated and treated MCSZO-X samples compared to U, P and E (P) HA samples, respectively. The (#) denotes the significant variation at $p \leq 0.05$ in the mean values of ALP activity between the the electrodynamic stimulation treated and untreated MCSZO-X electret samples compared to uncharged MCSZO-X samples, at $p \leq 0.05$. (@) symbol represents the significant variation, among the mean values of ALP activity on negatively charged electrodynamic stimulated E(N) MCSZO-X electret samples in comparison to their respective negatively electret samples, at $p \leq 0.05$.

Fig.4.16: Intracellular Ca^{2+} concentration in MG-63 cells, seeded on uncharged and electrodynamically stimulated MCSZO -X (X = 0 - 4) electret samples and HA control. The graph demonstrates the ratios of the mean values of the peak fluorescence intensity, recorded at the excitation of 340 and 380 nm, for Fura-2 AM (Intracellular Ca^{2+} indicator) loaded MG-63 cells, cultured on uncharged and electrodynamically stimulated MCSZO -X (X = 0 - 4) electrets as well as HA samples. The asterisk (*) denotes a significant difference, among the mean peak value of estimated ratios for MG-63 cells, seeded on N, E (U), E (P) and E (N) MCSZO-X as well as HA control, as compared to uncharged and P HA, at $p \leq 0.05$. (#) mark represents the significant difference, at $p \leq 0.05$, among the mean peak value of estimated ratios for MG-63 cells, cultured on electrodynamic stimulated uncharged / electret MCSZO-X samples as compared to the estimated mean peak values for their corresponding uncharged/electret MCSZO-X samples, cultured in absence of electrodynamic field, at $p \leq 0.05$. The U, P, N represents the charge, positive electret and negative electret, respectively.

Fig.4.17: schematic diagram demonstrating the Synergistic effect of electrostatic and electrodynamic electrical stimulation on osteogenic responses of MCSZO-X (X= 0 - 4). (a) The negative end of electret operates as a stimulus for the adhesion and proliferation of cells by attracting Ca^{2+} , H^+ ions from culture media which further attract negatively charged fibronectin and integrin protein. Also, the negative end of MCSZO-X (X = 0 - 4) electrets exhibit noticeable increase in surface hydrophilicity.

(b) Further, the application of electric field stimulation triggers the voltage-gated Ca^{2+} channels located on the cell membrane as well as also regulate the configuration of receptors present in endoplasmic reticulum. The local electric field makes it easier for Ca^{2+} ions to enter into the cell from the endoplasmic reticulum and extracellular milieu. This increased amount of intracellular Ca^{2+} ions helps in the production of transforming growth factor and bone morphogenic protein-2, which is crucial for regulation of cellular metabolism

- Fig.5.1: Modified Scherrer plots for MCSZO – X (X = 0 -4) bioceramics. (a) X = 0, (b) X = 1, (c) X = 2, (d) X = 3, and (e) X = 4. 200
- Fig.5.2: Williamson-Hall plots for MCSZO – X (X = 0 -4) bioceramics. (a) X = 0, (b) X = 1, (c) X = 2, (d) X = 3 and (e) X = 4. 201
- Fig.5.3: Size -strain plots for MCSZO – X (X = 0 -4) bioceramics. (a) X = 0, (b) X = 1, (c) X = 2, (d) X = 3 and (e) X = 4. 202
- Fig.5.4: Figure 5.4. EDS spectrum of MCSZO-X (X = 0 – 4) powders. (a) X= 0, (b) X= 1, (c) X= 2, (d) X= 3, and (e) X= 4. 203
- Fig.5.5: Thermally stimulated depolarization current (TSDC) plot for MCSZO-X (X = 0 – 4) electrets. 205
- Fig.5.6: Optical density (OD) of *E. coli* (a) and *S. aureus* (b) bacteria on uncharged, negative and positive ends of MCSZO-X (X = 0 - 4) electret surfaces and HA control. (*) indicates significant difference among all the samples, as compared to uncharged HA, at $p \leq 0.05$, (**) indicates significant difference among all the samples with respect to the positive end of HA electret surfaces, at $p \leq 0.05$ and (#) indicates significant difference among all the samples with respect to the negative end of HA electret surfaces, at $p \leq 0.05$. (U- uncharged, P-Positive end of electrets, N- Negative end of electrets). 207
- Fig. 5.7: Antibacterial ratio for *E. coli* (a) and *S. aureus* (b) bacteria on uncharged, negative and positive ends of MCSZO-X (X = 0 - 4) electret surfaces and HA control. (*), (**) and (***) indicate significant difference among all the uncharged, positive and negative ends of MCSZO-X electret surfaces with those of HA, at $p \leq 0.05$, (@) indicates the significant difference in negative end of MCSZO-X electret surfaces with respect to their corresponding uncharged surfaces of MCSZO-X samples, at $p \leq 0.05$. (\$) indicates the significant difference in positive end of MCSZO-X electret surfaces with respect to corresponding uncharged surfaces of MCSZO-X samples, at $p \leq 0.05$. (U- uncharged, P-Positive end of electrets, N- Negative end of electrets). 208
- Fig.5.8: Fluorescence microscopy (live / dead) images of *E. coli* bacteria, cultured on uncharged, positive and negative ends of MCSZO -X (X = 0 210

– 4) electret surfaces as well as HA samples. (U- uncharged, P P- Positive end of electrets, N- Negative end of electrets)

- Fig.5.9: Fluorescence microscopy (live / dead) images of *S. aureus* bacteria, cultured on uncharged, positive and negative ends of MCSZO -X (X = 0 – 4) electret surfaces as well as HA samples. (U- uncharged, P P- Positive end of electrets, N- Negative end of electrets) 211
- Fig.5.10: The content of superoxide ($\cdot O_2^-$) for *E. coli* (a) and *S. aureus* (b) bacteria on uncharged, negative and positive ends of MCSZO-X (X = 0 - 4) electret surfaces and HA control. (*), (**) and (***) indicate the significant difference among all the uncharged, positive and negative ends of MCSZO-X electret surfaces with respect to uncharged, positive and negative end of HA electret surfaces, at $p \leq 0.05$, (@) indicates significant variation in negative end of MCSZO-X electret surfaces with respect to their uncharged counterpart, at $p \leq 0.05$. (&) indicates significant difference in positive end of MCSZO-X electret surfaces, with respect to their uncharged counterpart, at $p \leq 0.05$. (U- uncharged, P-Positive end of electrets, N- Negative end of electrets). 212
- Fig.5.11: The catalase activity for *E. coli* (a) and *S. aureus* (b) bacteria on uncharged, negative and positive ends of MCSZO-X (X = 0 - 4) electret surfaces and HA control. (*), (**) and (***) indicate significant difference among all the uncharged, positive and negative ends of MCSZO-X electret surfaces with respect to those of HA, at $p \leq 0.05$, (@) indicates significant variation in negative end of MCSZO-X electret surfaces with respect to their uncharged counterpart, at $p \leq 0.05$. (&) indicates significant difference in positive end of MCSZO-X electret surfaces with respect to their uncharged counterpart, at $p \leq 0.05$. (U- uncharged, P-Positive end of electrets, N- Negative end of electrets). 214
- Fig.5.12: Protein leakage for *E. coli* (a) and *S. aureus* (b) bacteria on uncharged, negative and positive ends of MCSZO-X (X = 0 - 4) electret surfaces and HA control. (*), (**) and (***) indicate significant difference among all the uncharged, positive and negative ends of MCSZO-X electret surfaces with respect to those of HA surfaces, at $p \leq 0.05$, (@) indicates significant difference in negative end of MCSZO-X electret surfaces with respect to their uncharged counterparts, at $p \leq 0.05$. (&) indicates significant difference in positive end of MCSZO-X electret surfaces with respect to their uncharged counterparts, at $p \leq 0.05$. (U- uncharged, P-Positive end of electrets, N- Negative end of electrets). 216
- Fig.5.13: Concentration of MDA for *E. coli* (a) and *S. aureus* (b) bacteria on uncharged, negative and positive ends of MCSZO-X (X = 0 - 4) electret surfaces and HA control. (*), (**) and (***) indicate significant difference among all the uncharged, positive and negative ends of MCSZO-X electret surfaces as compared to those of HA, at $p \leq 0.05$, (@) indicates significant difference in negative end of MCSZO-X electret surfaces with respect to their uncharged counterparts, at $p \leq$ 218

0.05. (&) indicates significant difference in positive end of MCSZO-X electret surfaces with respect to their uncharged counterparts, at $p \leq 0.05$. (U- uncharged, P-Positive end of electrets, N- Negative end of electrets).

- Fig.5.14: Schematic illustrating the mechanism of antibacterial response of negative (a) and positive (b) ends of electrets of MCSZO-X ($X = 0 - 4$) samples. (a) The electrostatic repulsion between negative end of electret and negatively charged bacterial membrane prevent the adhesion of bacteria (b) Production of reactive oxygen species (ROS) on the positive end of electret kill the bacterial cells by means of DNA damage, lipid layer distraction, membrane rupture. 221
- Fig.6.1: XRD patterns for MCSZO-X ($X = 0- 4$) nanoparticles. (a) XRD patterns of different samples of MCSZO ($X= 0 - 4$) calcined at 1300°C for 10 h. (b) enlarged view of the highest intense peaks of samples. 228
- Fig.6.2: FT-IR spectra of Ca- Zr doped MgSiO_3 (MCSZO-X, $X = 0 - 4$) nanoparticles. 229
- Fig.6.3: Scanning electron micrographs of MCSZO-X nanoparticles. (a) $X=0$, (b) $X= 1$, (C) $X= 2$, (d) $X=3$ and (e) $X=4$. 230
- Fig.6.4: Leaching behavior of Mg^{2+} , Si^{4+} , Ca^{2+} , and Zr^{4+} from MCSZO- X ($X = 0 - 4$) nanoparticles in saline. 231
- Fig.6.5: Optical density of MG-63 cells, after the culture duration of 1 and 3 days, on MCSZO-X ($X = 0-4$); [M1, M2, M3, M4 and M5) nanoparticles at different concentration, i.e; 0.25, 2.5 and 25 mg/ml samples] and HA, used as a control. 233
- Fig.6.6: Digital camera images of rat paws before injection, on the 3rd day, and 7th day after receiving injections of MCSZO-X nanoparticles into their knee joints. 234
- Fig.6.7: The effect of intraarticular injection of MCSZO-X (M1, M2, M3, M4 and M5) nanoparticles on the body weight of rat's throughout the experiment. All given values are in mean \pm SD ($n = 5$ rats/group). (Two-way ANOVA showed no notable variation in the body weight of all rats). 235
- Fig.6.8: Effect of intrarticular injection of MCSZO-X nanoparticles in rats . (a) WBC count and (b) MCV on 7 day of injection. All given values are in mean \pm SD ($n = 5$ rats per group). 236
- Fig.6.9: Effect of MCSZO-X nanoparticles on serum concentration after 7 days 238

of injection in rats. (a) ALP and (B) creatinine. All these values are in mean \pm SD ($n = 5$ rats/group).

- Fig.6.10: *Histopathological images of the heart tissues, stained with H & E after 7 days of injection in the following groups of rats: (a) Control (non-injected), (b) Saline, (c) M1, (d) M2, (e) M3, (f) M4 and (g) M5 nanoparticles eluates treated groups (Scale bar: 1 μ m).* 239
- Fig.6.11: *Histopathological images of the kidney tissues, stained with H & E after 7 days of injection in the following groups of rats: (a) Control (non-injected), (b) Saline, (c) M1, (d) M2, (e) M3, (f) M4 and (g) M5 nanoparticles eluates treated groups (Scale bar: 1 μ m).* 241
- Fig.6.12: *Histopathological images of the liver section, stained with H & E after 7 days of injection in the following groups of rats: (a) Control (non-injected), (b) Saline, (c) M1, (d) M2, (e) M3, (f) M4 and (g) M5 nanoparticles eluates treated groups (Scale bar: 1 μ m).* 242
- Fig.6.13: *Histopathological features of rat knee joint tissue, stained with H & E of intra-articular injection after 7 days in the following groups of rats: (a) Control (non-injected), (b) Saline, (c) M1, (d) M2, (e) M3, (f) M4 and (g) M5 nanoparticles eluates treated groups (magnification: 40 X).* 243

List of Tables

<i>Table 2.1:</i>	<i>Lattice parameters and space group of various polymorphic forms of Mg-Ca silicate based bioceramics with the different crystal structures.</i>	33
<i>Table 2.2:</i>	<i>In vitro and in vivo biocompatibility of Mg-based silicate bioceramics.</i>	42
<i>Table 2.3:</i>	<i>Processing parameters for Ca - based silicate bioceramics.</i>	52
<i>Table 2.4:</i>	<i>In vitro and in vivo biocompatibility of Ca - based silicate bioceramics.</i>	68
<i>Table 2.5:</i>	<i>In vitro and in vivo biocompatibility of Mg-Ca silicate-based bioceramics.</i>	82
<i>Table 3.1:</i>	<i>Optimized sintering parameters for the MCSZO-X (X = 0 – 4) and HA compositions.</i>	136
<i>Table 5.1:</i>	<i>The crystallite size and lattice strain for the developed MCSZO -X bioceramics.</i>	204