## Comparative bone regeneration study of hardystonite and hydroxyapatite as filler in critical sized defect of rat calvaria

Kunal Khanna<sup>1</sup>, Amit Jaiswal<sup>2</sup>, Rohit V Dhumal<sup>3</sup>, Nilakash Selkar<sup>3</sup>, Pradip Chaudhari<sup>4</sup>, Vivek P Soni<sup>5</sup>, Geeta R Vanage<sup>3</sup>, Jayesh Bellare<sup>1,4,5\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Center for Research in Nanotechnology and Science, <sup>4</sup>Department of Chemical Engineering, <sup>5</sup>Wadhwani Research Center for Bioengineering, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Mumbai, India; <sup>2</sup>Centre for Biomaterials, Cellular and Molecular Theranostics, VIT University Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India; <sup>3</sup>National Centre for Preclinical Reproductive and Genetic Toxicology, National Institute for Research in Reproductive Health, J. M. Street, Parel, Mumbai 400012, India; <sup>4</sup>Division of Animal Oncology, Advanced Centre for Treatment, Research & Education in Cancer, Navi Mumbai, India; <sup>5</sup>Department of Biosciences and Bioengineering

## \*Corresponding Author

Jayesh R. Bellare Department of Chemical Engineering Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Powai, Mumbai - 400076, India. Tel.: +91 22 25767207 E-mail: jb@iitb.ac.in



**Supplementary Figure 1:** Surgical process of the rat: A-Shaved head of the rat, B-Incision at the cranial site, C-8 mm critical sized defect and D- Scaffold at the defect site.



**Supplementary Figure 2:** SEM micro graphs with EDAX of the HA and HS particle used for preparing the electrospinning solution where image A & C is of HA particle with EDAX, B & D HS particle with EDAX

Micro CT	Time-	Groups				
Parameter	point	SHAM	PCL	PCL-HA	PCL-HS	Native bone
BVF	6 Week	2.18 <u>+</u> 0.28	5.55 <u>+</u> 0.37	4.34 <u>+</u> 0.66	5.50 <u>+</u> 1.48	32.41 <u>+</u> 1.81
	12 Week	4.06 <u>+</u> 0.68	4.87 <u>+</u> 0.95	9.00 <u>+</u> 2.62	10.60 <u>+</u> 1.07	32.41 <u>+</u> 1.81
BMD	6 Week	18.53 <u>+</u> 1.83	28.52 <u>+</u> 9.21	28.13 <u>+</u> 9.64	51.07 <u>+</u> 16.90	321.65 <u>+</u> 30.73
	12 Week	35.79 <u>+</u> 6.44	34.93 <u>+</u> 8.04	69.32 <u>+</u> 26.47	74.72 <u>+</u> 23.82	321.65 <u>+</u> 30.73
ТМС	6 Week	1.87 <u>+</u> 0.18	2.84 <u>+</u> 0.93	2.84 <u>+</u> 0.97	5.16 <u>+</u> 1.71	32.50 <u>+</u> 3.10
	12 Week	3.61 <u>+</u> 0.65	3.56 <u>+</u> 0.80	7.0 <u>+</u> 2.67	7.55 <u>+</u> 2.41	32.50 <u>+</u> 3.10
TMD	6 Week	867 <u>+</u> 30	509 <u>+</u> 153	607 <u>+</u> 172	877 <u>+</u> 41	1022 <u>+</u> 788
	12 Week	852 <u>+</u> 62	787 <u>+</u> 193	829 <u>+</u> 48	740 <u>+</u> 284	788 <u>+</u> 100

**Supplementary Table 1**: Micro CT parameter values at 6 and 12 Week timepoint of various groups



**Supplementary Figure 3:** Individual organ weight at 6 Weeks (A) and 12 Weeks (B). There was no significant difference in any of the organ weights between all SHAM, PCL, PCL-HA, PCL-HS groups at both timepoints



**Supplementary Figure 4:** Individual hematology parameters at 6 Weeks (A), 12 Weeks (B) and Platelets, PLT (C). There was no significant difference in any of the parameters between SHAM, PCL, PCL-HA and PCL-HS groups at both timepoints.



**Supplementary Figure 5:** Individual serum biochemistry parameters at 6 Weeks (A), 12 Weeks (B). There was no significant difference in any of the parameters between SHAM, PCL, PCL-HA and PCL-HS groups at both timepoints.