JOURNAL OF BASIC SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

Strengthening Bioglass: A Comprehensive Review of Mechanical Properties and Enhancement Strategies

Prakrathi S[1*], Monisha GS[1]

[1]Department of Mechanical Engineering, Ramaiah Institute of Technology, Bangalore.

DOI: https://doie.org/10.10399/JBSE.2025908836

Abstract

Bioglass are the particularly those materials than can be used in biomedical applications and are valued for their bioactivity due to its ability to bond with bone tissue. However, one significant challenge is their low toughness, which can compromise their long-term reliability and performance, especially in load-bearing applications. This paper will delve into the challenges associated with the mechanical properties of bioglass, focusing on the trade-offs between bioactivity and toughness. While recent advancements have improved the strength of certain bioglass compositions, low fracture toughness remains a significant hurdle for their widespread use in more demanding clinical settings. Therefore, the primary objective of this work is to identify promising strategies for improving the toughness and overall mechanical performance of bioglass.

Keywords: *Bioglass, mechanical properties, toughness, hydroxyapatite, biocompatible*

1. Introduction

Bioglass are a type of bioactive glasses composed primarily of silica along with varying amounts of calcium oxide, sodium oxide, and phosphorous pentoxide. It is designed to interact with biological tissues, particularly bone, by forming a strong bond through the formation of hydroxyapatite layer upon contact with body fluids. This bioactivity promotes bone regeneration and integration, making bioglass as one of the promising candidate material for dental implants, bone grafting, tissue engineering and other applications in the medical field. Due to its ability to simulate osteogenesis and support cell attachment makes it a valuable material in regenerative medicine.

Due to attractive characteristic features of bioactive glasses, it can be used as a scaffold material for bone repair. During degradation of these glasses get converted into hydroxy appetite due to which a strong bond is created between the bioactive glasses and the host bone [1]. While the strength of bioglasses i.e their ability to withstand force without breaking is important, their brittleness (low toughness) presents a more critical issue. Toughness is a material's ability to absorb energy and deform without fracturing. In bioglasses, low toughness often results from their high silica content, which makes them inherently brittle. This problem can lead to premature failure under stress, particularly in real-world biological environments.

Bioglasses, especially those made from traditional compositions like 45S5, often exhibit relatively low fracture toughness compared to metals or ceramics, which limits their use in structural applications. To address this issue, two main strategies are commonly discussed:

1. **Improvement of mechanical properties:** Research focuses on modifying the composition and processing of bioglasses to enhance toughness. For example, the incorporation of nanofillers, such as hydroxyapatite or reinforcing agents, can help to mitigate brittleness and improve fracture resistance.

2. **Development of alternative materials:** Another solution involves creating entirely new bio composite materials or hybrid structures that combine the beneficial properties of bioglasses with those of other materials. This approach includes the development of bioactive ceramics with improved mechanical properties, such as glass-ceramic composites, or the use of bioresorbable polymers combined with bioglasses to enhance toughness.

In summary, while strength is a key factor in the performance of bioglasses, improving toughness is critical to their broader applicability in medicine, especially for load-bearing applications like bone replacements.

Several approaches are discussed, including modifications to the chemical composition of bioglasses by the incorporation of reinforcing materials like hydroxyapatite or bioactive ceramics. Additionally, advancements in processing techniques, such as the development of glass-ceramic composites or the use of polymeric blends, will be explored as means to enhance the material's fracture resistance without compromising its bioactivity. Ultimately, the goal is to present solutions that would enable bioglasses to maintain their beneficial biological properties while ensuring that their mechanical characteristics are suitable for a wider range of medical applications, particularly in orthopaedic and dental implants, where both strength and toughness are critical for patient safety and treatment efficacy.

2. Basic Bioglass Composition

Bioglass was first discovered at the University of Florida by L.L. Hench et al. in 1969 having a composition of 45% SiO_2, 24.5% CaO, 24.5% Na_2O, 6% P_2O_5 which was later termed as 45S5 Bioglass. The synthesis of Bioglass is carried out frequently through traditional melt quenching methods and sol gel methods. Crystallization is one of the common outcomes in bioglasses that occurs during sintering of solgel processed bioglasses, annealing of melt quench scaffolds, sintering of quenched granules, and stabilization [2]. Bone regeneration capacity and the mechanical properties greatly influenced by the composition and microstructural features of the bioglass. [1].

Peitl et al have studied the effect of exposure of bioglasses synthesised with varying composition and thermal treatments to simulated body fluid solution SBF-K9 (closest to human plasma) for several time periods. [3]. It was also observed that crystallization of 45S5 Bioglass did not prevent hydroxyl carbonate apatite (HCA) formation in an in vitro test with SBF-K9. The reaction mechanism of HCA layer formation in vitro in SBF K-9 on the glass and corresponding glass-ceramics followed the five-stages on the material side, summarized as:

a. Stage (I)-Rapid exchange of Na^+ or K^+ with H^+ or H_3O^+ from the solution.
b. Stage (II)-Loss of soluble silica as $Si(OH)_4$ to the solution resulting from breakage of Si–O–Si bonds and formation of Si–OH (silanols) at the glass/solution interface.
c. Stage (III)- Condensation and repolymerization of a SiO_2-rich layer on the glass surface that is depleted in alkali and alkaline earth cations.
d. Stage (IV)-Migration of Ca^{2+} and PO_4^{3-} groups to the glass surface through the SiO_2-rich layer forming a CaO–P_2O_5-rich film on top of the SiO_2-rich layer followed by growth of an amorphous CaO–P_2O_5-rich film by incorporation of soluble calcium and phosphate from solution.
e. Stage (V)- Crystallization of the amorphous CaO–P_2O_5 film by incorporation of OH, CO_3^{2-} or F anions from solution to form a mixed HCA or hydroxy fluorapatite (HCFA) layer. [3]

Vol. 22, No. 1, (2025)
ISSN: 1005-0930

3. **Key factors affecting the strength of bioglass**

One of the major concerns in structural bone repair is the mechanical reliability of the material. Xin Liu et al evaluated the mechanical properties such as strength, elastic modulus, Weibull modulus, fatigue resistance, and fracture toughness of strong porous silicate scaffolds of S13-93 bioactive glass fabricated by robocasting. As fabricated scaffolds testing compressive strength of 86 ± 9 MPa, elastic modulus of 13 ± 2 GPa, and a Weibull modulus of 12 was obtained. [4].

Porosity is a key characteristic of bioglass that plays a critical role in promoting bioactivity, particularly in facilitating the bonding of bioglass to bone tissue. The presence of pores within the material allows for enhanced cellular infiltration, the exchange of nutrients, and the formation of a strong interface between the bioglass and surrounding tissues. These porous structures are essential for the material's functionality in applications like bone regeneration and repair, where biological integration is a priority. However, while porosity enhances bioactivity, it negatively impacts the mechanical strength of bioglass. The formation of pores, which are essentially voids or spaces within the material, reduces the overall density and structural integrity of the glass. As a result, the material becomes more vulnerable to fracture under stress, as the pores act as stress concentrators. When force is applied to the bioglass, the pores weaken the material by reducing its load-bearing capacity, making it more prone to crack propagation.

The extent of this negative impact on strength depends on factors such as pore size, distribution, and overall porosity percentage. Larger pores or irregularly distributed pores tend to cause greater reductions in strength, as they create more significant areas of weakness within the bioglass. Additionally, excessive porosity can lead to a substantial decrease in the material's fracture toughness, as the pores promote crack initiation and facilitate the spread of fractures under mechanical loading.

Baranowska et al studied the influence of crystallization kinetics by the Friedman method. The synthesised glasses were then heat treated in a controlled environment for varying time durations resulting in the formation of $Na_6Ca_3(Si_6O_{18})$ (combeite) phase. [5].This controlled crystallization led to a significant increase in microhardness, indicating enhanced mechanical properties. Importantly, the bioactivity of the glass-ceramics was maintained, as evidenced by the formation of a hydroxy-carbonate apatite (HCA) layer after immersion in simulated body fluid.

Mecca et al highlighted the importance of controlled crystallization of bioactive glasses and its effect on the mechanical strength, making them more suitable for load-bearing applications. The review emphasizes that while crystallization enhances mechanical properties, it is crucial to balance this with bioactivity to ensure the material remains conducive to bone bonding [6]. In summary, increasing the toughness of bioglass through controlled crystallization involves:

1. **Thermal Treatment**: Applying specific heat treatments to induce the formation of crystalline phases like combeite.
2. **Phase Identification**: Utilizing techniques such as X-ray diffraction (XRD) to identify and confirm the presence of desired crystalline phases.
3. **Mechanical Testing**: Assessing properties like microhardness to evaluate improvements in mechanical strength.
4. **Bioactivity Assessment**: Ensuring that the crystallized material retains its bioactivity, typically by testing for HCA layer formation in simulated body fluids.

Vol. 22, No. 1, (2025)
ISSN: 1005-0930

By carefully controlling the crystallization process, it is possible to enhance the toughness of bioglass while preserving its essential bioactive properties

4. Mechanical property evaluation methods

Bioglass, widely used in biomedical applications, must undergo rigorous mechanical testing to ensure its suitability for load-bearing and non-load-bearing applications. Several standardized methods are employed to assess its compressive strength, flexural strength, fracture toughness, hardness, and elastic modulus. These tests provide critical insights into the material's behaviour under mechanical stress and its long-term performance in biological environments.

Compressive strength is a key parameter in evaluating the load-bearing capacity of bioglass scaffolds. The test involves subjecting cylindrical or cubic samples to uniaxial compressive loads until failure. This method provides insights into the material's ability to withstand compressive forces, which is particularly relevant for bone replacement applications.

Flexural (or bending) strength measures a material's resistance to deformation under load. Three-point and four-point bending tests are commonly employed to determine the flexural strength of bioglass. This test is crucial for assessing the mechanical stability of bioglass in thin-film and scaffold applications.

Fracture toughness is essential for understanding the crack propagation resistance of bioglass. The Single-Edge Notched Beam (SENB) technique is commonly used to measure this property, where a pre-notched sample is subjected to a bending force until fracture occurs.

Hardness testing determines the material's resistance to localized deformation and wear. Indentation techniques such as Vickers or Knoop hardness tests are employed, where a diamond indenter is pressed into the bioglass surface under a controlled load. This method provides crucial insights into the wear resistance of bioglass in dental and orthopaedic applications.

The elastic modulus of bioglass, which reflects its stiffness, is often determined using non-destructive methods such as resonant frequency analysis. This technique measures the material's response to mechanical vibrations, providing an accurate assessment of its stiffness and elasticity.

5. Challenges regarding the testing of strength of bioglass

Evaluating the mechanical strength of bioglass depicts several challenges that impact the accuracy and reliability of test results. One of the primary issues is the inherent brittleness and low fracture toughness of bioglass, which can lead to sudden failure during mechanical testing, making it difficult to obtain consistent and reliable data [7]. Additionally, bioglass scaffolds are often designed with high porosity to promote tissue integration and vascularization. However, this increased porosity significantly reduces mechanical strength, posing a challenge in balancing structural integrity with bioactivity during testing [8]. Another critical factor is the degradation rate of bioglass, which must align with new bone formation. If the degradation occurs too quickly or too slowly, it can compromise the long-term mechanical stability of the material, making accurate testing difficult. Furthermore, inconsistencies in testing methodologies, variations in sample preparation, and differences in environmental conditions can lead to discrepancies in mechanical property evaluations. The lack of standardized testing

Vol. 22, No. 1, (2025)
ISSN: 1005-0930

protocols further complicates the ability to compare results across different studies, emphasizing the need for more uniform and reproducible evaluation methods [9]. Addressing these challenges is crucial to accurately assessing the mechanical properties of bioglass and ensuring its safe and effective application in biomedical fields.

6. **Future Directions and Research Needs**

3D printing, or additive manufacturing, has emerged as a transformative technique in fabricating bioglass structures with enhanced mechanical properties and intricate geometries, addressing limitations of traditional manufacturing methods.

Enhancing Mechanical Properties: By precisely controlling the microarchitecture during the 3D printing process, it's possible to optimize the mechanical strength of bioglass scaffolds. For instance, incorporating bioglass into polylactic acid (PLA) matrices has resulted in composite scaffolds with an 80% increase in mechanical strength compared to pure PLA scaffolds. This enhancement is attributed to the homogeneous distribution of bioglass particles within the PLA matrix, leading to improved load-bearing capabilities. [10]

Fabrication of Complex Geometries: 3D printing enables the creation of scaffolds with tailored pore architectures that closely mimic natural bone structures, promoting better cell infiltration and tissue integration. Techniques such as selective laser sintering (SLS) have been utilized to fabricate bioglass scaffolds with controlled porosity and interconnected pore networks, essential for effective bone regeneration [11]

Composite Scaffolds with Gradient Porosity: Combining bioglass with other bioceramics, like tricalcium phosphate (TCP), through 3D printing has led to scaffolds exhibiting improved mechanical properties and bioactivity. For example, bioglass-TCP composite scaffolds demonstrated enhanced compressive strength and elastic modulus compared to pure TCP scaffolds, attributed to the synergistic effects of the composite materials. [12]

Multiscale Porosity for Bone Regeneration: Advanced 3D printing techniques have been employed to create scaffolds with multiscale porosity, incorporating meso-, micro-, and macro-pores. This hierarchical porosity enhances bone-forming ability by facilitating nutrient transport and cell migration. Studies have shown that such scaffolds exhibit early mineralization and homogeneous calcium phosphate layer formation, crucial for successful bone regeneration.

In summary, 3D printing has significantly advanced the development of bioglass-based scaffolds, enabling the fabrication of mechanically robust and complex structures tailored for specific biomedical applications.

The need for clinical trials in bioglass research is crucial to ensure its safety, effectiveness and long -term influence in biomedical applications. While the vitro and vivo teaches numerous bioglass bioactivity and mechanical consistency, clinical trials are required to recognize these findings in human subjects. Bioglass complexes with biological tissue, and factors such as the patient's age, bone density and immune response can affect its influence. Without clinical evaluation, there is a risk of unexpected complications, including inadequate integration, excessive degeneration or inflammatory reactions. Regulatory approval for bioglass -based medical applications is also based on strong clinical evidence. For example, in orthopedic and dental treatments, Bioglass must prove its effectiveness compared to traditional materials such

as hydroxypatite and titanium. Clinical trials provide data on its mechanical reliability, degeneration rate, and bioactivity, ensuring that they meet the necessary medical standards. In addition, this trial helps ease the composition, porosity and structural properties of bioglass to enhance its clinical utility. Long -term studies are especially important to monitor how bioglass behave in the body during an extended period. Bioglass goes through a controlled degeneration when promoting tissue regeneration, so clinical trials must evaluate whether it provides constant mechanical support and integrates well with original tissue. By checking the patient's results over time, researchers can collect its stability, effectiveness and critical insights of the possible side effects. It would be necessary to expand the clinical trials to advance the bioglass application and ensure its widespread in regenerated drugs.

7. Conclusion

Bioglass has emerged as a crucial biomaterial in regenerative medicine due to its bioactivity, osteoconductivity, and ability to form strong bonds with biological tissues. However, its mechanical limitations, particularly low fracture toughness and brittleness, have hindered its widespread application in load-bearing clinical settings. This review has explored the fundamental factors influencing the strength of bioglass, including its composition, porosity, and crystallinity, alongside various strategies to enhance its mechanical performance. Advances in material modifications, reinforcement techniques, and processing methods such as controlled crystallization and composite development have shown promise in addressing these challenges.

Furthermore, the incorporation of 3D printing in bioglass fabrication has opened new avenues for designing complex, mechanically robust, and patient-specific scaffolds with optimized porosity and structural integrity. While these innovations have significantly improved the potential of bioglass-based materials, there remains a need for extensive mechanical testing and long-term in vivo studies to validate their clinical reliability. Standardizing testing protocols and refining processing techniques will be essential to ensure reproducibility and scalability for biomedical applications.

Moving forward, clinical trials will play a pivotal role in translating laboratory advancements into real-world medical applications. Ensuring the long-term safety, durability, and bioactivity of bioglass implants will be critical for their acceptance in orthopedic, dental, and tissue engineering applications. Future research should focus on refining the balance between mechanical strength and bioactivity while addressing the regulatory challenges associated with medical-grade biomaterials. By overcoming these obstacles, bioglass has the potential to revolutionize regenerative medicine and significantly improve patient outcomes.

References

[1] M. N. Rahaman, “Review - bioactive glass implants for potential,” *Biomedical Glasses*, p. 56–66, 2017.

[2] S. Prasad, “A Review on Understanding the Crystallization Process of Bioglass in Recent Decade,” *Journal of Mines, Metals and Fuels,* pp. 444-449, 2024.

[3] O. Peitl, “Highly bioactive P2O5–Na2O–CaO–SiO2 glass-ceramics,” *Journal of non crystalline solids,* pp. 115-116, 1999.

[4] X. Liu, “Mechanical properties of bioactive glass (13-93) scaffolds fabricated by robotic deposition for structural bone repair,” *Acta Biomaterialia,* pp. 7025-7034, 2013.

[5] M. L. 2. ,. M. K. 1. ,. J. Z. 1. ,. Agata Baranowska 1, “Crystallization Kinetics and Structural Properties of the 45S5 Bioactive Glass and Glass-Ceramic Fiber Doped with Eu3+,” *Materials,* pp. 1-17, 2020.

[6] F. Mecca, “Effect of thermal treatments and ion substitution on sintering and crystallization of bioactive glasses: A review.,” *Materials, ,* 2023.

[7] R. B. D. &. C. V. Sergi, “ A comprehensive review of bioactive glass coatings: State of the art, challenges and future perspectives.,” *Coatings,* p. 757, 2020.

[8] M. N. D. D. E. B. B. S. F. Q. J. S. B. B. L. F. &. T. A. P. Rahaman, “Bioactive glass in tissue engineering.,” *Acta biomaterialia,* pp. 2355-2373., 2011.

[9] L. C. &. B. A. R. Gerhardt, “Bioactive glass and glass-ceramic scaffolds for bone tissue engineering.,” *Materials,* pp. 3867-3910., 2010.

[10] S. T. N. V. M. D. Y. J. S. H. S. &. M. A. P. Sultan, “Sultan, S., Thomas, N., Varghese, M., Dalvi, Y., Joy, S., Hall,The design of 3D-printed polylactic acid–bioglass composite scaffold: a potential implant material for bone tissue engineering,” *Molecules, ,* p. 7214, 2022.

[11] K. C. H. Y. W. S. J. A. &. L. M. C. Kolan, “Kolan, K. C., Huang, Y. W., Semo3D-printed biomimetic bioactive glass scaffolds for bone regeneration in rat calvarial defects.,” *International Journal of Bioprinting,* p. 274., 2020.

[12] Y. D. H. H. X. &. L. Y. Ma, “3D printing of bioglass-reinforced β-TCP porous bioceramic scaffolds,” *Journal of Materials Science,* pp. 10437-10446., 2019.