

Springer Series in Materials Science 165

Steven W. Cranford
Markus J. Buehler

Biomateriomics

 Springer

Springer Series in MATERIALS SCIENCE

Editors: R. Hull C. Jagadish R.M. Osgood, Jr. J. Parisi Z. Wang

The Springer Series in Materials Science covers the complete spectrum of materials physics, including fundamental principles, physical properties, materials theory and design. Recognizing the increasing importance of materials science in future device technologies, the book titles in this series reflect the state-of-the-art in understanding and controlling the structure and properties of all important classes of materials.

Please view available titles in *Springer Series in Materials Science*
on series homepage <http://www.springer.com/series/856>

Steven W. Cranford • Markus J. Buehler

Biomateriomics

With 159 Figures

 Springer

Steven W. Cranford
Civil and Environmental Engineering
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA, USA

Markus J. Buehler
Civil and Environmental Engineering
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA, USA

Series Editors:

Professor Robert Hull
Dept. of Materials Science and Engineering
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA, USA

Professor Jürgen Parisi
Fachbereich Physik
Abt. Energie- und Halbleiterforschung
Universität Oldenburg
Oldenburg, Germany

Professor Chennupati Jagadish
Research School of Physics and Engineering
Australian National University
Canberra, Australia

Dr. Zhiming Wang
Department of Physics
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR, USA

Professor R.M. Osgood, Jr.
Microelectronics Science Laboratory
Department of Electrical Engineering
Columbia University
New York, NY, USA

ISSN 0933-033X Springer Series in Materials Science

ISBN 978-94-007-1610-0

ISBN 978-94-007-1611-7 (eBook)

DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1611-7

Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg New York London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2012939523

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2012

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

For Deborah, LOML—S.W.C.

To my family—M.J.B.

Preface

The holistic study of biological material systems has emerged as an exciting area of research. While such systems are commonly complex, we frequently encounter similar components—universal building blocks and hierarchical structural motifs—which result in a diverse set of functionalities. Similar to the way music or language arises from a limited set of musical notes and words, the relationships between form and function can be exploited in a meaningful way by recognizing the similarities between Beethoven and bone, or Shakespeare and silk. Through the investigation of material properties, examining fundamental links between processes, structures, and properties at multiple scales and their interactions, materiomics explains system functionality from the level of building blocks. *Biomateriomics* specifically focuses the analysis of the role of materials in the context of biological processes, the transfer of biological material principles towards biomimetic and bioinspired applications, and the study of interfaces between living and non-living systems. Inevitably, materiomics also holds great promise for nanoscience and nanotechnology, where material concepts from biology might enable the bottom-up development of new structures and materials or devices.

The challenges of biological materials are vast, but the convergence of biology, mathematics and engineering as well as computational and experimental techniques have resulted in the toolset necessary to describe complex material systems, from nano to macro. Applying biomateriomics can unlock Nature's secret to high performance materials such as spider silk, bone, or nacre, and elucidate the progression and diagnosis or the treatment of diseases. Similarly, it contributes to develop a *de novo* understanding of biological material processes and to the potential of exploiting novel concepts in innovation, material synthesis and design. With this impetus, the field of biomateriomics attempts to reconcile all aspects of a biological material system—from universal motifs of nano-scale building blocks to macro-scale functional properties—with a focus on studying the mechanisms of deformation and failure by utilizing a multi-scale materials science approach.

This book encompasses the current work reflective of many review articles and journal papers under a common banner, and makes this exciting field of research accessible to the broader engineering and science community. It should provide

a valuable reference for engineers, materials scientists, and researchers in both academia and industry and will hopefully ignite extended discourse and inquiry. Indeed, many technical details are omitted *in lieu* of presenting key concepts and simple ideas. Many of the examples are adapted from studies carried out by the authors of this book, and some of the discussion should therefore not be considered as a comprehensive review with respect to the wider range of available results. Rather, they represent a set of specific illustrative examples of materiomics, including theoretical aspects, associated principles, and applications. The primary text provides an overview of the field of materiomics, including earlier work and future opportunities and intellectual challenges for research, and is organized into three main parts:

Part I: A Materiomics Perspective provides an introduction to biomateriomics. This is especially important given that the entire field is being developed and potential applications explored. The outside resources and investigations we henceforth refer were never intended to encompass materiomics *per se*—but yet contribute to its foundation and future progress. Admittedly, we are standing on the shoulders of others and declaring their work to be in a newfangled (and as yet unproven) field. Therein lays the stimulus for such a paradigm: only by the convergence of disparate fields can materiomics find its worth—from the astute combination of advancements in chemistry, biology, physics, materials science and engineering (further discussed in Chap. 1: Introduction). Such a combination is clearly beyond the capabilities of any individual (including these humble authors) but clearly achievable by the scientific community. The chapters constituting Part I present our interpretation of a *materiomic perspective*. The fundamental goals need only to be defined—our intent is to shed light on those goals.

For these reasons, we base this book's content around our own experience—specifically, the mechanical characterization of biological materials founded at the molecular level. We shall see that this is just one aspect of a complex *materiome*, and far from a complete picture desired (and implied) by the “omics” suffix (there is a more detailed discussion of this in subsequent chapters). Nevertheless, a focus on atomistic and molecular mechanics has various advantages:

1. It is based on fundamental principles of physics and chemistry, which are ultimately defined by quantum mechanics, providing a common starting point regardless of the specific material system(s) considered.
2. It is representative of some of the most relevant and critical topics and, most importantly, challenges in the field of biomaterials.
3. It allows us to present some case studies, which, although based on a particular scale, can easily be used as frameworks for other problems.
4. It enables other researchers to contribute to the field of materiomics, in addition to the molecular perspective emphasized here.

If our objective was to encompass all disciplines, bridge all fields, and tie together all scales of biological materials from the atomistic sequence of amino acids to a functional biological tissue or organ—we would never come to completion. Instead, we hope that through a focus on simple examples, the potential of a more holistic perspective of biological materials—discovering the relations between structure

and function across multiple scales—will be apparent. As such, Part I presents the emerging field with the associated scope, thematic paradigms, and an outline of essential concepts (Chap. 2: The Materiome), as well as an in depth discussion of biological materials as the motivation for the development of a materiomics framework (Chap. 3: The Challenges of Biological Materials), and the unifying categorization and abstraction necessary for modeling and understanding such complex materiomic systems (Chap. 4: Universality-Diversity Paradigm: Music, Materiomics, and Category Theory).

Part II: Methods and Tools discusses the ever-expanding toolset required for materiomic investigations. A selection of the most promising strategies to investigate materiomics and analyze the properties and behavior of complex materials are reviewed, with examples, case studies, and theoretical background when appropriate.

In order to realize the promising opportunities that arise from an improved understanding of complex biological materials several critical challenges must be overcome. Up until now, theories fully describing hierarchical biological materials are still lacking. Only recently has the understanding about how specific features at distinct scales interact, and for example, participate in mechanical deformation, begun to emerge for complex biological systems. In recent years, the development of new quantitative experimental, analytical, and computational methods have lead to advances in understanding of some details of complex biological and synthetic systems. Theoretical, numerical, and experimental methods now enable the investigation of nanoscale mechanics of materials using quantitative analysis techniques—an area referred to as “nanomechanics”. For example, development and application of nanoindentation, atomic force microscopy, and other tools enables scientist to probe the origins of mechanical properties, with forces in the range of piconewtons, and at scales approaching that of individual atoms (Ångstroms) and molecules (nanometers). At the same time, computational methods, computational power, and theoretical approaches have led to significant advances in addressing nanomechanics from a first principles perspective. This combination of experiment, theory, and computation has proven to be very fruitful, and could lead to major advances in materials theories and engineering.

The most recent innovations have occurred in the field of nanotechnology and nanoscience, where cross-disciplinary interactions with the biological sciences present an enormous opportunity for innovative basic research and also technological advancement. Such advances could enable us to provide engineered materials and structures with properties that resemble those of biological systems, in particular the ability to self-assemble, to self-repair, to adapt and evolve, and to provide multiple functions that can be controlled through external cues. However, despite significant advancements in the study of biological materials in the past decade, the fundamental physics of many phenomena in biology continue to pose substantial challenges with respect to model building, experimental studies, and simulation. As materiomics is founded by a combination of multidisciplinary theories and multi-scale techniques, approaches that integrate *experiment* and predictive *simulation* are essential to this new paradigm of materials research.

The behavior of biological materials, in particular their mechanical properties, are intimately linked to the atomic microstructure of the material. Different mechanisms operate at larger length scales, where the interaction of extracellular materials with cells and of cells with one another, different tissue types and the influence of tissue remodeling become more evident. The dominance of specific mechanisms is controlled by geometrical parameters, the chemical nature of the molecular interactions, as well as the structural arrangement of the protein elementary building blocks, across many hierarchical scales, from nano to macro. Thus, materiomimetic investigative approaches must also consider multi-scale schemes, both experimentally and computationally, to link hierarchical effects and mechanisms.

Much of the functionality that biological materials provide occurs through mechanical contact and behavior. Therefore, to completely understand the structure-property-functionality relationships of biological materials it is necessary to quantify the mechanical behavior and influences on biological and *de novo* materials. Thus, Part II includes the means of mechanical investigation, including experimental methods (Chap. 5: Experimental Approaches), computational methods (Chap. 6: Computational Approaches and Simulation), and the interpretation of results (Chap. 7: Mechanical Characterization in Molecular Simulation). Although descriptions of techniques are to be presented, with relevant case studies and applications, specific technical details (*i.e.*, application of molecular dynamics) are only outlined, with commentary of strengths and weaknesses of various approaches, and their applicability at different scales. When appropriate, suggestions will be made for more detailed texts and references in the field. In other words, the objective of the text is not to provide an in-depth handbook for analytical procedures, but rather to discuss the various means of biomateriomimetic investigation. As anticipated, biomateriomimetics requires an extensive “toolbox”.

Part III: Applied Materiomimetics illustrates how we can immediately benefit from biomateriomimetic approaches. Application of materiomimetic principles and approaches has already been undertaken on a variety of biological systems throughout different fields of research. The combination of high-level structural control of matter as achieved in nanoscience and nanotechnology, multiscale analytical techniques, and integration of living and non-living components into systems and interfaces will lead to the development of new technologies that utilize the advantages of both micro and nanotechnology with the principles of biology. With an inevitable merger of material and structure, with increasing complexity, materials start to resemble dynamic systems or machines, so that the borderlines between conventional concepts such as “machine” and “material” also start to disappear. Such approaches have been used systematically by Nature for millions of years. However, their systematic exploitation for technological applications has so far been severely hindered due to lack of understanding of how to link the atomistic scale with material structure and device properties and function. Like all endeavors, we only get better with practice!

Part III discusses practical applications of materiomimetic techniques and approaches with three main focuses. Fundamentally, materiomimetics provides an integrated and holistic approach, advantageous in the investigation of complex biological material

system phenomenon and system characterization (Chap. 8: Unlocking Nature: Case Studies). Moreover, materiomics can facilitate the development of novel diagnostic tools for disease and afflictions with mechanistic symptoms, predicting what components and functionalities “fail” under minute changes in material and structural conditions (Chap. 9: Pathological Materiomics). Finally, biomateriomics has a role in the design of *de novo* materials, or the synthesis and manipulation of biological materials, materiomic engineering, and nanomedical devices (Chap. 10: Synthesis and Design). Using natural processes as a guide, substantial advances have already been achieved at the interface of nanomaterials and biology.

Irrespective of the challenges still present in a thorough investigation and complete characterization of the materiome as discussed by prior chapters, current experimental and practical approaches exist that allow the immediate application of materiomics to real problems. This branch of materiomics, termed *applied materiomics*, is still in its infancy, yet has already demonstrated potential as a valuable basis for material design. A materiomic approach is likely to become an integral part of nanomaterials manufacture—where molecular assembly is control to attain macroscale behavior—requiring a deep understanding of individual molecular building blocks, their potential structures, assembly properties, dynamic behavior, and multiscale propagations. We hence focus discussion on broad areas of application that are becoming increasingly widespread (throughout different disciplines) and can be encompassed by the common field of applied materiomics. The applications, undoubtedly, are as variegated as Nature. The text is closed with an outlook to future opportunities in Chap. 11: The Future of Biomateriomics.

The discussions presented in this book are intended to be both a review of current materiomics research as well as a pedagogical discourse. While we embrace the term to encompass our own work, we believe the worth of materiomics will naturally emerge from the shared contributions of many scientists and research groups. It is not a term to lay claim, but a label to encompass a new perspective of chemistry, biology, and materials science. Indeed, any “closed-form” interpretation of materiomics will limit both the growth and potential of materiomics research. As biomateriomics is a relatively new field, it behooves us to include discussion to help define and explicate both the intent and scope with analogous examples, illustrating the integrative nature, universality, and benefits and impact of a materiomics approach. The perspectives and overviews presented throughout this book are intended to provide a broad overview. Further details can be found in the papers cited and recommended readings.

Most importantly, completing this book would not have been possible without the help and support of numerous people and institutions. The authors are indebted to all who have contributed to this book in some way. In particular, sincere gratitude goes to the many students and researchers who have collaborated with the authors within the Laboratory of Atomistic and Molecular Mechanics (LAMM) at MIT, whose enthusiasm and excitement regarding materiomics are unmatched. We are also thankful for many discussions with colleagues and friends that contributed to the development of this book. We gratefully acknowledge the support from the National Science Foundation, Army Research Office, Office for Naval Research,

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), Air Force Office for Scientific Research, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Cambridge, MA, USA

Steven W. Cranford
Markus J. Buehler

Contents

Part I A Materiomics Perspective

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Introduction	3
1.2	The Unpredictable Nature of Materials	4
1.3	Differences Between Material and Structure	5
1.4	Starting at the Bottom	11
1.5	Lessons from Nature: Biological Materials and Biomimetics	13
1.6	Advancement and Convergence	16
1.7	A New Perspective: Materiomics	19
	References	22
2	The Materiome	27
2.1	Introduction	27
2.2	Motivation and Scope	30
2.3	Material Versus Materiome	34
2.4	Functionality Through Architecture	37
2.5	Function Versus Application	41
2.6	Material Behavior Scaling: Multiscale Perspectives	47
2.7	Extending the Materiome: Hierarchies and Complexity	52
2.8	Summary	57
	References	57
3	The Challenges of Biological Materials	61
3.1	Introduction	61
3.2	Proteins, Proteins... Everywhere!	62
3.3	Soft Matter, Entropy, and Folding for Function	69
3.4	Nature's Hierarchies	76
3.5	Mechanistic Insights	86
3.6	'Shaky' Foundations of Biological Materials	91
3.7	Summary	100
3.8	Suggested Readings	101

References	101
4 Universality-Diversity Paradigm: Music, Materiomics, and Category Theory	109
4.1 Introduction	109
4.2 Universality-Diversity Paradigm	111
4.3 Tu(r)ning Weakness into Strength	115
4.4 Music and Nature: Complexity from Common Elements	122
4.5 Comprehension by Analogies: Functional Similes and Abstraction	126
4.6 Category Theoretic Analysis: Linking Hierarchical Structure and Meaning	128
4.7 Language to Ontology Logs (<i>ologs</i>)	130
4.8 Proteins and Communication Networks	135
4.9 Spider Silk and Music	148
4.10 Motivating the Abstraction	155
4.11 A New Merger of Science and Art?	159
4.12 Summary	161
4.13 Key Citations	163
References	164
Part II Methods and Tools	
5 Experimental Approaches	173
5.1 Introduction	173
5.2 Advantages of Experimentation	174
5.3 Overview of Methodologies	176
5.4 One at a Time: Single Molecule Assays	176
5.5 Atomic Force Microscopy: The Molecular Skeleton Key	183
5.6 Microscale Approaches: Cells and Tissues	194
5.7 Summary	202
5.8 Suggested Readings	204
References	204
6 Computational Approaches and Simulation	213
6.1 Introduction	213
6.2 Advantages of Modeling and Computation	216
6.3 Necessity of Atomistic Investigation	219
6.4 Overview of Molecular Dynamics	222
6.5 Atomistic Force Fields: Conventional and Reactive	225
6.5.1 Conventional Force Fields	226
6.5.2 Reactive Force Fields	229
6.6 Limitations of Full Atomistic Simulation	235
6.7 Coarse-Graining and Other Multiscale Methods	238
6.8 Example Coarse-Grain Approaches	242
6.9 Bridging Hierarchies: Coarse-Grain Model Formulation	247
6.9.1 Coarse-Grain Potential Type and Quantity	248
6.9.2 Full Atomistic Test Suite	249

6.9.3	Fitting Coarse-Grain Potentials	249
6.9.4	Validation	251
6.10	Summary	256
6.11	Suggested Readings	258
	References	259
7	Mechanical Characterization in Molecular Simulation	265
7.1	Introduction	265
7.2	Objective: Up-scaling Molecular Mechanics	266
7.3	Caveats and Missing Metrics	270
7.4	Response Based Mechanical Characterization	271
7.4.1	Steered Molecular Dynamics	273
7.5	Rate Dependence	274
7.6	Worm-Like Chain Models	277
7.7	Virial Stress	279
7.8	Energy Methods	280
7.8.1	Similarity to Cauchy-Born Approaches	281
7.8.2	Fixed Configuration System Minimization	283
7.9	Alternative Approaches	285
7.9.1	Wave Front Tracking	285
7.9.2	Normal Mode Analysis	288
7.9.3	Fluctuation Techniques	291
7.10	Summary	292
7.11	Suggested Readings	293
	References	293
 Part III Applied Biomateriomics		
8	Unlocking Nature: Case Studies	299
8.1	Introduction	299
8.2	Spider Silk: From the Molecules to the Web	300
8.2.1	Nanoconfinement and β -Sheet Crystals	303
8.2.2	A Two-Phase Protein Composite	305
8.2.3	Fibrils to Fibers	312
8.2.4	Web Performance	315
8.2.5	A Route to Structural Robustness	322
8.2.6	Beyond the Web: Synthetic Silks	325
8.3	Rethinking ‘Brittle’ Materials: The Cases of Bone and Nacre	326
8.3.1	Bone as a Biocomposite	327
8.3.2	Linking Collagen and Aging	329
8.3.3	Multiple Mechanisms for Toughness	333
8.3.4	General Design Principles	339
8.3.5	Shells, Nacre, Biological Armor	343
8.4	Summary	347
	References	348

- 9 Pathological Materiomics 357**
 - 9.1 Introduction 357
 - 9.2 Mechanics of Disease 358
 - 9.3 Sickle Cell Disease: The “First” Molecular Disease 360
 - 9.4 Malaria and Red Blood Cells 366
 - 9.5 Progeria: A Precocious Mutation 371
 - 9.6 Brittle Bones 375
 - 9.7 Protein Aggregation and Alzheimer’s Disease 382
 - 9.8 Outlook and Summary 388
 - 9.9 Suggested Readings 390
 - References 390

- 10 Synthesis and Design 399**
 - 10.1 Introduction 399
 - 10.2 Materials Inspired by Complex Biology 400
 - 10.3 Benefitting from Nature’s Misfolds 404
 - 10.4 Multipurpose Folding DNA 411
 - 10.5 Piecewise Controlled Self-assembly 416
 - 10.6 Summary 419
 - 10.7 Suggested Readings 420
 - References 421

- 11 The Future of Biomateriomics 425**
 - 11.1 The Inevitability of Complexity and Convergence 425
 - 11.2 The Future of Materiomics 427
 - References 429

- Index 431**

Part I
A Materiomics Perspective

Chapter 1

Introduction

Abstract Biomateriomics refers to the holistic study of biological material systems. We can predict the performance of engineered materials in engineered systems, but there is an inherent disconnect when investigating Nature’s materials, with little understanding of how functionality arises from both the material and complex structure with properties and interactions across scales. New developments enable a new perspective through the convergence of many scientific disciplines, and advancements in nanotechnology empower us to investigate material systems from the “bottom-up”. If we hope to learn from Nature, we need a new holistic perspective: an “omic” approach. We begin with a definition and introduction of biomateriomics, presenting the emerging field with the associated scope, and thematic paradigms, to the tools required for investigations, to ongoing and future applications.

All sciences are connected; they lend each other material aid as parts of one great whole, each doing its own work, not for itself alone, but for the other parts; as the eye guides the body and the foot sustains it and leads it from place to place.

Roger Bacon, *Opus Tertium* (1266–1268)

1.1 Introduction

The introductory quotation from the thirteenth century is ideally suited for an introduction to *biomateriomics* for two reasons. Primarily, it encapsulates the intrinsic cooperativity of modern science. Previously disparate research fields now commonly borrow concepts, ideas and approaches from each other and collaborations are deemed essential for technological innovation and to tackle the greatest challenges. Biological systems, for example, are no longer limited to biologists and chemists—engineers design biomimetic devices, while materials scientists collaborate with medical researchers to develop bio-compatible implants. In the world of academia, interdisciplinary efforts are no longer a rarity, but are the current *status quo*.

Secondly, the words of Roger Bacon—whether referring to sciences in general or the human body—encompasses a popular idiom that most of us take for granted:

the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. It is well agreed that we (as human beings) are more than just a combination of limbs, a cardiovascular system, and a functioning brain (among other things, of course). Even a cursory glance can deduce the difference between a dog and cat, which can be described by similar “components”. Yet, such a high-level perspective is commonly lacking in more technical problems. While we can easily determine the “whole” for some systems, for others we are limited to a view of the “parts”—we are missing the proverbial *forest* to study the *trees*.¹ Such intellectual barriers are present in a wide variety of scientific challenges—the search for a grand unified theory in physics for example—in which each part of the problem is beyond the capabilities of a single researcher or field. The focus of this text is on yet another fundamental problem—the complexity of biological materials.

1.2 The Unpredictable Nature of Materials

Biological materials—neither steel nor concrete—are the most abundantly used materials on earth, yet we know (relatively) little about how they function. They are the main constituents in plant and animal bodies and have a diversity of functions. While biologists and materials scientists alike are impressed by the mechanical properties of silk [1–7] or the toughness of bone [8–11], there are difficulties in replicating the successes of Nature in a synthetic manner. While we can approximate such materials, they are often not as elegant as their natural counterparts. The key difference lies in the long-term “product development” stage of Nature. Whereas we attempt to design a material to suit a particular application (*i.e.*, choosing a material such as silicon to make computer chips due to its semiconducting properties, for example), Nature has implemented the simultaneous development of material and function (more commonly known as *evolution*). A complex biological material like bone was not “selected” to be a supporting structure for our bodies—it has specific material properties and characteristics to serve its own (intended and evolved) function. Unlike engineering materials, the distinction between material *properties* and material *function* is lost. The subtle difference between material function and application is further discussed in Chap. 2: The Materiome.

Another major difference between materials from Nature and engineering is in the way they are made. While an engineer selects a material to fabricate a part according to an exact design, Nature goes the opposite direction and grows both the material and the whole organism (a plant or an animal) using the principles of (biologically controlled) self-assembly—this is more commonly referred to as *growth*. Moreover, biological structures are even able to remodel and adapt to changing environmental conditions during their whole lifetime. This control over the structure

¹We note that the reductionist approach of science (studying the *trees*) has continuing success in the explanation of fundamental phenomena in physics, chemistry, and biology, and the current discussion is not intended to be a criticism, but rather a complementary perspective.

at multiple scales is certainly the key to the successful use of (relatively) soft protein materials as robust structural components.

The consequence, of course, is that we must consider intended functionality in the investigation and design of biological systems and novel biomaterials. While easy to say, this task is complicated by the complex, hierarchical nature of such materials [12]. Functionality is ultimately rooted at the molecular scale [13, 14]. Through recent advancements in single-molecular assays, analytical chemistry, and computational approaches, we have made great strides in determining what a biological system is composed from the molecular level. Individual molecules and amino acids can be deduced *via* nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectroscopy and segments of DNA and other protein structures can be sequenced. It is relatively easy to compile such information. We are collecting a vast amount of data on such materials—but how can we combine what we know (*i.e.*, what we measure) with what we think we know (*i.e.*, prediction of function)?

With all these advancements, we are unable to predict the behavior of a particular molecular sequence. As a result, we cannot engineer synthetic proteins designed for a specific function or application (such as attacking cancer cells or tissue regeneration). We have copious amounts data, but are unable (at this point) to use it. Unlike traditional structural engineering systems—we can predict the behavior of a building by the analysis of steel trusses, for example—there is an inherent disconnect in our ability to predict functional and mechanical behavior for biological systems (see Fig. 1.1). This has been exemplified by the difficulties in predicting structures from single protein folding—that is, the prediction of secondary, tertiary, and quaternary structure from a primary protein sequence (further discussed in Chap. 3: The Challenges of Biological Materials). Unlike in engineered structures, at the molecular level, the difference between material properties and structural function is not clear.

1.3 Differences Between Material and Structure

What is the fundamental difference between material and structure? This question can be alternatively posed, from a structural engineering perspective, “*What constitutes a structure?*” Popular answers will undoubtedly encompass bridges and buildings—the Golden Gate Bridge or the Empire State Building are undeniably structures in the traditional sense of the word. At such scales, it is also very easy to label what the “materials” are—a bridge may be build of concrete and steel, for example. Things get a little fuzzier as we reduce the size—where does the structure turn into the material? If we consider the glass sponge *Euplectella*, a deep-sea, sediment-dwelling sponge from the Western Pacific [15–17], we see a sophisticated hierarchical structure that performs a multitude of functions, yet is predominantly composed of the same constituent material—*silica*—which is intrinsically brittle. It has been shown that spicules in siliceous sponges exhibit exceptional flexibility and toughness compared with brittle synthetic glass rods of similar length scales [18, 19]—but why? Function is derived from the structure, but at what scale can we separate the material from the structure?




Fig. 1.1 Example of the inherent disconnect between biological systems and traditional structures. In biology, if we consider a single scale, one phase, with perfect knowledge of composition and sequence, in controlled conditions, we can make predictions. Here, with knowledge of the constitutive amino acids, we can predict an alpha-helical structure for short polypeptide sequences, and its corresponding properties (such as strength). We cannot (yet), however, accurately predict large scale behavior of larger protein assemblies, such as protein networks, let alone the structural role such materials play in a cellular structure (*e.g.*, the nuclear envelope) or in the context of other biological properties. We utterly fail in real-world applications—the exact opposite of the goals of engineering! For engineering, we can design the components of a structure with reliable and repeatable accuracy—the performance of a fabricated steel member can be utilized in the design of a truss, which is subsequently implemented in a structural system

The skeletal system of *Euplectella sp.* (as shown in Fig. 1.2) shows an intricate, cylindrical cage-like structure with lateral (so-called, oscular) openings. At the macroscale, the cylindrical structure is reinforced by external ridges that extend perpendicular to the surface of the cylinder and spiral the cage. The surface of the cylinder consists of a regular square lattice composed of a series of cemented vertical and horizontal struts, each consisting of bundled spicules aligned parallel to one another, with diagonal elements positioned in every second square cell. Cross-sectional analysis of these beams at the micrometer scale reveal that they are composed of collections of silica spicules embedded in a layered silica matrix. The constituent spicules have a concentric lamellar structure with the layer thickness decreasing from the center to the periphery. These layers are arranged in a cylindrical fashion around a central proteinaceous filament and are separated from one another by organic interlayers. At the nanoscale the fundamental construction unit consists of consolidated hydrated silica nanoparticles (50 to 200 nm in diameter). The assembly of a macroscopic, mechanically resistant cylindrical glass cage is possible in a modular, bottom-up fashion comprising at least *seven* hierarchical levels, all contributing to mechanical performance.

Clearly, we need to begin at some fundamental level. The question is at what scale? For the *Euplectella* sponge, we may want to focus on the constitutive ele-




Fig. 1.2 Structural analysis of the mineralized skeletal system of *Euplectella*: (a) Scale: 1 cm; photograph of the entire skeleton, showing cylindrical glass cage; (b) Scale: 5 mm; fragment of the cage structure, showing the square grid lattice of vertical and horizontal struts with diagonal elements; (c) Scale: 100 μm ; scanning electron micrograph (SEM) showing that each strut (enclosed by a *bracket*) is composed of bundled multiple spicules (the *arrow* indicates the long axis of the skeletal lattice); (d) Scale: 20 μm ; SEM of a fractured single beam revealing its ceramic fiber-composite structure; (e) Scale: 25 μm ; SEM of the junction area showing that the lattice is cemented with laminated silica layers; (f) Scale: 10 μm ; contrast-enhanced SEM image of a cross-section through one of the spicular struts revealing that they are composed of a wide range of different-sized spicules surrounded by a laminated silica matrix; (g) Scale: 5 μm ; SEM of a cross-section through a typical spicule in a strut showing its characteristic laminated architecture; (h) Scale: 1 μm ; SEM of a fractured spicule, revealing an organic interlayer; (i) Scale: 500 nm; bleaching of biosilica surface reveals its consolidated nanoparticulate nature. Reprinted with permission from American Association for the Advancement of Science, *Science*, [15] © 2005

ments at the atomistic scale: silica (also known as chemical compound silicon dioxide, or SiO_2). One could subsequently ask, what makes silica a good choice for the sea sponge? Silica, or silicon dioxide, is a material that has been known since antiquity, most commonly found in Nature as *sand* or *quartz*—hardly robust structural materials. Additionally, silica is manufactured in several forms, used in the production of glass, and even optical fibers. We have exploited silica for many uses—but none have the hierarchical structure and intricacy of the skeletal system of a simple sea sponge. It would be trivial to state that the “fundamental” building block for the *Euplectella* sponge is SiO_2 , yet, undoubtedly, it is the constituent material. If we simply begin at the component elements, we may overlook the necessary hierarchical structure necessary for the sponge to achieve such remarkable properties.

In the vast majority of silica-based materials, the silicon atoms are in a tetrahedral crystal configuration, with four oxygen (O) atoms surrounding a central silicon (Si) atom (the most common example is seen in the quartz crystalline form of silica). Thus, the first level of hierarchy can be said to be this crystalline structure (depicted in Fig. 1.3). Silica has a number of distinct crystalline forms in addition to amorphous forms, but, more importantly, any deviations from these common structures constitute structural differences in the resulting material. Crystalline minerals formed in the physiological environment often show exceptional physical properties (*e.g.*, strength, hardness, fracture toughness) and tend to form hierarchical structures that exhibit microstructural order over a range of scales. Such biominerals are crys-

tallized from an environment that is undersaturated with respect to silicon, and under conditions of neutral pH and low temperature. Simply put, the sea sponge exploits hierarchical arrangements to overcome the brittleness of its constituent material, glass, and does so under accessible conditions that require very low energies. Can we employ the same principles for other materials?

Indeed, it is known that the first level is biologically produced glass composed of consolidated silica nanospheres formed around a protein filament. The resultant structure might be regarded as a textbook example in mechanical engineering, because the seven hierarchical levels in the sponge skeleton represent major fundamental construction strategies such as laminated structures, fiber-reinforced composites, bundled beams, and diagonally reinforced square-grid cells, to name a few. Apparently, the sea sponge is well versed in structural engineering practices and methods!

Again, if we consider the fundamental building blocks—consolidated hydrated silica nanoparticles—we see where “bioglass” fabricated by the sea sponge diverges from other silica-based materials: by implementing collections of nanoparticles rather than continuous crystals, for example, the intrinsically low strength of the glass is balanced at the next structural level. The structure is as important as the material. The structural complexity of the glass skeleton in the sponge *Euplectella sp.* is an example of Nature’s ability to improve inherently poor building materials. Moreover, such “bioglass” is not unique to sea sponges, and is also found in diatoms—unicellular algae—able to construct nanoporous silica with 3D precision of tens of nanometers, in a hierarchical manner, and with multifunctional properties [20]. Again, it has been shown that the mechanical properties of such materials can be changed by manipulating the nanostructure [21]. Synthetic mesoporous silica (depicted in Fig. 1.3) is currently being exploited for applications in medicine, biosensors, and imaging [22, 23].

Understanding what a material is composed of and how a material behaves has always been of great importance to enable and advance technologies [24, 25]. As such materials have played a major role in enabling civilization eras, from the stone age to the nano age, and are as such a cornerstone of all engineering disciplines. In the early days materials were obtained and tailored for our purposes from chopping up rocks or using natural resources such as rubber. For example, concrete is a compound material made from sand, gravel and cement. The cement is a mixture of various minerals which when mixed with water, hydrate and rapidly become hard binding the sand and gravel into a solid mass. The Romans found that by mixing a sand-like material (which they obtained from Pozzuoli) with their normal lime-based concretes they obtained a far stronger material. The pink sand turned out to be fine volcanic ash and they had inadvertently produced the first ‘*pozzolanic*’ cement. In the 2,000 or so years since they employed this naturally occurring form of cement to build a vast system of concrete aqueducts and other large edifices, concrete is presently the most widely used construction material in the world, found in large scale structures such as bridges and skyscrapers. Cement is so widely used as a building material that, even in the face of technological advances in materials, it will not be replaced anytime soon. Surely, the chemical details and material properties of such a widely utilized material is well-known from the molecules up?






Fig. 1.3 What defines a material? If we consider the most fundamental atomistic building block—here tetrahedral silica (SiO_4)—we cannot predict the properties of the macrostructure. Depending on how silica is arranged in multiscale hierarchies, the resulting material at the macroscale shows extreme variation—from crystalline quartz, to the skeleton of a sea sponge, to synthetic microporous silica. While such structures can be analyzed to determine the structural hierarchies, the functionality of such hierarchies is difficult to predict and engineer. *Inset* SEM image of sea sponge printed with permission from The National Academy of Sciences [17] © 2004

Oddly enough, the three-dimensional crystalline structure of cement hydrate (*i.e.*, calcium silicate hydrate, or C-S-H)—the paste that forms and quickly hardens when cement powder is mixed with water—has eluded scientific attempts at decoding, despite the fact that concrete is the most prevalent man-made material on earth and the focus of a multibillion-dollar industry. The lack of a fundamental multiscale understanding does *not* preclude successful use of concrete as a building material—indeed, it is because of the improvements of concrete design, knowledge of its chemical reactivity, and keen development of additives that we have achieved high strength and corrosion resistant varieties of concrete, unmatched by anything the Romans may have stumbled upon. Such refinements, however, can only optimize a cement/aggregate/water system to a point. If we wish to develop new, stronger, and “greener” concretes, we must have complete knowledge across scales, from “nano” to “macro” (see Fig. 1.4).

Only recently has the three-dimensional structure of the basic unit of cement hydrate been decoded, resulting in a first step toward a consistent model of the molecular structure of cement hydrate [26]. Scientists have long believed that at the atomic level, cement hydrate closely resembles the rare mineral tobermorite, which has an ordered geometry consisting of layers of infinitely long chains of silica tetrahedra interspersed with neat layers of calcium oxide. But it was determined the hydrates in cement aren’t really crystalline. They are a hybrid that shares some characteristics with crystalline structures and some with the amorphous structure of frozen liquids, such as glass or ice. Concrete is more disordered and porous (like the silica skeleton of the sea sponge), than ordered and crystalline (like quartz).

Fig. 1.4 Concrete, a construction material used for over 2,000 years, and yet only now being fully understood from the atomistic level. *Top:* Photograph of the Pantheon (Rome, Italy, 2008), constructed 126 A.D., an example of Roman concrete construction. *Centre:* TEM image of clusters of C–S–H (courtesy of A. Baronnet, CINaM, CNRS and Marseille Université, France), the *inset* (*upper-right*) is a TEM image of tobermorite. *Bottom:* Atomistic representation of concrete: the molecular model of C–S–H. The gray and white molecules are oxygen and hydrogen atoms of water, respectively; the individual spheres are inter- and intra-layer calcium ions, respectively; connected sticks are silicon and oxygen atoms in silica tetrahedra. Figure adapted from [26]

2nd century construction...



...21st century understanding

This delicate balance between order and disorder within a structure is a concept that resembles many natural biological materials. But why is such disorder beneficial?

It is in this disorder—where breaks in the silica tetrahedra create small voids in the corresponding layers of calcium oxide—that water molecules attach, giving cement its robust quality. These material “flaws” in the otherwise regular geometric structure provide some give to the building material at the atomic scale that transfers up to the macro scale. When under stress, the cement hydrate has the flexibility to stretch or compress just a little, rather than snapping. Whereas water weakens a material like tobermorite, it strengthens the cement hydrate. The *disorder* or *complexity* of its chemistry creates a heterogenic, robust structure. The cement hydrates have a level of hierarchy that helps optimize water content and mechanical performance—analogue to Nature’s hierarchical sea sponge. Serendipity was apparently on the Romans’ side 2,000 years ago when concrete was discovered!

If we are only now beginning to understand the fundamental behavior and multiscale consequences of a material we have been using for thousands of years, how can we be expected to understand, design, or engineer complex biological materials? Materials that are not cast in place like concrete, but materials that grow and adapt to their environment? Clearly, a new approach is not only warranted, but




Fig. 1.5 Characteristic material scales from the Stone Age to nanotechnology and biotechnology. The plot illustrates the trend to create smaller dimensions of materials and structures as the technological frontier progresses. Currently we stand at a crossroads where nanotechnology and biology merge to provide a new bottom-up approach in the development of materials and technologies (Based on graph shown in [27])

necessary to address the challenges we face to support technological advancement and consequent economic growth.

1.4 Starting at the Bottom

The quantitative study of biological protein materials is a critical step towards the development of new technological frontiers through smarter use of (limited) resources. Aside from the Romans use of concrete, classes of materials have been used classify stages of civilizations, ranging from stone age more than 300,000 years ago, to the bronze age, and possibly the silicon age in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century. Figure 1.5 schematically displays the various stages of civilization together with an analysis of the characteristic material scales that were used in each period. The plot illustrates the trend to ever smaller material scales as humankind progressed through the ages, and the analysis may suggest that today we may stand at another cross-road in the advancement of technology. This next frontier involves the rigorous understanding of the properties (*e.g.*, mechanical, physical and chemical properties) and mechanisms (*e.g.*, chemomechanical conformation changes, enzymatic processes, mechanotransduction) of biological matter, which may enable us eventually to integrate concepts from living systems into materials and machine design, seamlessly. Solving these challenging problems may transcend the gap that currently exists between engineering and physical sciences and the life sciences.

We have now entered the era of nanoscience and nanotechnology where materials are made with atomistic precision—enabling advances in the design and synthesis of molecular building blocks that we can (theoretically) design and exploit. This bottom-up approach—designing a material/system through the behavior and combination of each constituent element and atom—was envisioned in the 1960’s by Richard Feynman, the popular physicist and pioneer of nanotechnology. Feynman hypothesized the direct manipulation of individual atoms as the most powerful form of synthetic chemistry—unlocking the blueprints for atomistic construction. The challenge posed by Feynman is simple [28]: *What would happen if we could arrange the atoms one by one the way we want them?* From a biological perspective, this is exactly how natural materials are formed—the piece-wise combination of molecular building blocks.

“Feynman paradigm”: Nanotechnological, bottom-up approach to material design, *via* the direct manipulation of individual atoms and molecules, and precise engineering of functional systems at the molecular scale. In its original sense, Feynman referred to the projected ability to construct items from the bottom-up, whereas the ultimate goal is to control macroscale structure and function from design at the atomistic scale.

The realization of the “Feynman paradigm” (see Fig. 1.6) has opened numerous new opportunities for research, products and development [29]. But its impact for real products and technologies hinges upon a major challenge, the linking of the scales, and to make nanoscale mechanisms visible at larger scales. Indeed, taking a closer look at the vastness of scales in our environment we realize that there are huge opportunities in designing structures and thus functions at multiple length-scales. Developed nanoscale components, once attained, must demonstrate the reproducibility needed to build functional materials and systems, and do so at a size and complexity difficult to achieve by traditional top-down approaches.

We recognize that the scales are separated, and that the scales can be connected by networks in the process of design. This design challenge has been solved by Nature and biology, where scale separation and connection are used effectively to create function from nano to macro through complex functional relations that link seemingly disparate concepts such as individual atoms or amino acids to strength to robustness. This is exemplified in the design of DNA, protein, tissue to organisms, and many others. This paradigm of using hierarchical structures can be used in engineering, to eventually eliminate the border between living and non-living systems. The applications are endless, and include self-healing cement, changeable airplane wings, and others.

But before the realization of what is possible, we first need a complete understanding of what is palpable. One possible approach to improve our understanding of what we can engineer is to turn towards Nature for inspiration. The development of new materials and the discovery of the complexity of existing materials are not




Fig. 1.6 Juxtaposition of the “Feynman paradigm” with “traditional” engineering approaches. Current top-down methodologies have advanced from simple manipulation of available materials (*e.g.*, crude stone age weaponry) to sophisticated exploitation of material properties (*e.g.*, semi-conductors in integrated circuits). Nanotechnology has also developed the ability to investigate and manipulate materials on the atomistic and molecular scale from a bottom-up perspective. Currently, we are at the convergence of both bottom-up and top-down routes, closing the gap between material, structure, and function. As Feynman suggested, precise engineering and control at the nanoscale may dictate the future of material design, but we must also fully understand how nanoscale properties are expressed at the macroscale

mutually exclusive endeavors. Even if a complete and thorough understanding of complex phenomena is not attained, we can still learn lessons and insight from Nature providing guidance for new discoveries and distinct means by which heightened functionality is created in spite of limited resources.

1.5 Lessons from Nature: Biological Materials and Biomimetics


Nature exhibits the design guidelines for multi-scale adaption of structure and functionality. An organism evolves to survive because it uses the minimum amount of material to make its structures (be it internal to the organism, such as bone or tissue, or an external structure, such as a spider’s web) and also because it can optimize its use of the available environmental sources. Nature thus provides an array of building materials and aptly chooses suitable means for a multitude of natural functions

	<u>Biological Material</u>	<u>Engineering Material</u>
Building Blocks	Few, light elements: C, H, O, N, S ...	Multitude of elements: Fe, Cr, Ni, Si, Al, Cu, Ag, C, N, O ...
Production	Growth by biologically controlled self-assembly (approximate design)	Fabrication through highly constrained processing (exact design)
		
Scale(s)	Hierarchies and multiscale structuring at all size levels	Forming (of the part) and structuring at single scales
Intent/Purpose	Adaptation of form and structure to the function	Selection of material by properties for application
Lifecycle	Dynamic capability to changing environmental conditions (reactive)	Secure design for maximum possible loads (proactive)
Durability	Healing ; capability of self-repair	Retrofit ; potential to rebuild

Fig. 1.7 Biological and engineering materials are governed by a very different choice of base elements (natural materials consist of relatively light elements few whereas engineering materials are characterized by many more elements) and by a different mode of material production (biological growth versus controlled fabrication). From these basic forms, there arise different strategies for materials choice and development (under the *arrow*) of function. Biological materials are inherently multiscale, whereas the performance of engineering materials are typically limited to a single scale. Biological materials have been adapted for a specific biological role/function, whereas an engineering material is typically selected based on desirable properties. Finally, biological materials are dynamic systems, capability of both self-adaptation and healing, whereas engineered systems are typically limited to the design specifications. Additional requirements and incurred damage necessitate reinforcement or retrofitting of a material or structural system. Extended and adapted from [25]

[15, 30–33]. The elasticity of blood vessels, the toughness of bone [8, 9] or the protection of nacre [11, 34–36] illustrate the *apropos* of Nature’s material selection. Moreover, Nature has developed such materials with a comparatively poor set of base materials. Why can’t we simply copy Nature’s systems and substitute materials to maximize performance? If bone is made of proteins and minerals (*i.e.*, collagen and hydroxyapatite), can we simple replace with synthetic materials? Perhaps nylon (a robust synthetic polyamide) and titanium (a metal with high strength-to-weight ratio)? Unfortunately, we cannot. The design strategies of biological materials are neither immediately applicable to, nor compatible with the design of new engineering materials, since there are some remarkable differences between the strategies common in engineering and those used by Nature (see Fig. 1.7).

Fig. 1.8 A biomimetic “map” to illustrate the idea that the more abstract a concept is, the more adaptable it is within another discipline. Adapted from J.F.V. Vincent, “Stealing ideas from nature” in *Deployable Structures* [37]



A holistic knowledge of biological materials offers a unique opportunity to understand how complex materials science, engineering, and chemical principles arise routinely in Nature. Nature has been the motivation factor in a number of texts and studies, and, concurrently, provides the inspiration and stimulation to scientists and engineers for new material concepts, design strategies, and structural optimization. This field defines biomimetics—using ideas from nature to further technology—or, more colloquially, “... the technological outcome of the act of borrowing or stealing ideas from Nature” [37].

Biomimetics, however, is extending beyond the simple “stealing” of ideas, and evolving to a more didactic role—i.e. learning ideas from Nature. The difference lies not just in the abstraction of useful ideas (the invention of Velcro by the observation of sticking plant burrs is a popular example) but also in the detailed and mechanistic understanding of the processes involved. The transfer of ideas from biology is not limited to the ultimate form and function of a biological system—we are not interested in spider silk so we can swing from skyscrapers like Spiderman. Instead, we should look to Nature and biological systems (nay, models), to serve a technical application of practical purpose. The more this application deviates from the biological system, the more basic the analysis has to be in order to generate useful (practical) knowledge and understanding (see Fig. 1.8).

The general concept, as discussed by J.F.V. Vincent (“Stealing ideas from nature” in *Deployable Structures* [37]), is that the further down one can move from the natural origin, the more general and therefore more powerful the concept will be. The goal is the shift from total mimicry (stealing) to an understanding of the process at its basic level (abstraction), defining that process from an analytical perspective (mechanics and physics) and then exploiting the physical phenomena to our own ends. Throughout this text, investigations and studies discussed can be assigned to such categorizations, from the behavior of spider silk in Chap. 8: Unlocking Nature:

Case Studies (mechanics and physics) to the comparison of biological materials and music in Chap. 4: Universality-Diversity Paradigm: Music, Materiomics, and Category Theory (abstraction). We note that optimization and refinement are key components to allow robust designs and applications, avoiding the idiosyncrasies of idealized experimental conditions not present in Nature. A thorough understanding of the phenomena may result in applications that are completely deviant from the original biological system. We will no longer be an apprentice to Nature, but our own journeyman to the trade.

1.6 Advancement and Convergence

The systematic investigation of biological materials has advanced considerably in recent years, along with the advancement in the tools required for analysis. Indeed, there are constant updates and refinements of techniques providing new, more accurate means to measure, interpret, quantify, and model the relationships between chemistry, structures, design and function. Advances in information technology, imaging, nanotechnology and related fields coupled with advances in computing, modeling and simulation have transformed investigative approaches to material systems. Only recent developments in imaging methods over the past decades have revealed that biology creates intricate hierarchical structures, where initiated at nanoscales, result in macro or physiological multifunctional materials to provide structural support, force generation, catalytic properties or energy conversion [13, 31, 33, 38, 39]. This is exemplified in a wide range of biological materials such as hair, skin, bone, spider silk or cells, which play important roles in providing key functions to biological systems [12].

The motivation has come from a vast assortment of disciplines: medicine (mechanical and physiological properties of soft and hard tissues, including skin, tendons, bone, etc., for prosthetic devices, replacement materials, and tissue engineering applications); biology (material aspects of adaptation, evolution, functionality, etc.); materials science (thermal and electrical properties of novel hierarchical nanosystems, functionality performance of microscale devices, etc.) to name a few. The complexity of biological materials elicits contributions from a multitude of fields, and is an exciting field for biologists, chemists, and engineers alike. Further advancement is hindered, however, by such a “divide and conquer” approach, and dictates the convergence of scientific disciplines.

The historical progression of science has been typified by the continuous evolution of disciplines and subdisciplines. Fundamental advancements—such as the development quantum theory or the discovery of DNA—have paved the way for research directions that were previously unthinkable. Such paradigm shifts frequently defined a new subdiscipline in their fields, and progressed independently alongside their brethren. Quantum mechanics did not negate the need for Newtonian mechanics, for example, it merely gave another (more precise) piece of the puzzle of physics.

Traditionally, the science and engineering of synthetic material systems have been separated into classes of structures, length scales, and functionality that are

used to differentiate disciplines. Nature, however, does not conform to disciplinary boundaries, and effortlessly balances chemistry, materials, structure, and function across a full range of length scales in order to react to a variety of environmental requirements and optimal functionality. Likewise, biomateriomics is inherently multi-disciplinary, borrowing from fundamental physics and chemistry at the atomistic scale, integrating biological mechanisms (such as protein interactions and cellular processes) at the molecular and cellular level, traversing hierarchical scales, and linking a material's components, structure, and mechanical properties with its natural requirements and functionalities. Biomateriomics involves the rigorous understanding of the properties and mechanisms of biological matter. While this is an easy statement, integration of multiple disciplines is difficult in practice. Due to the rich history and unique perspectives of the fields that contribute to advances in fields contribution to materiomics, questions of interest, approaches, tools and even vocabulary particular to each community (the “disciplinary lexicon”, so-to-speak) can impede communication and progress in this inherently interdisciplinary venture.

Recent advances in science and technology have seen the creation of a multitude of biologically “themed” interdisciplinary research areas including bioinformatics, nanobiology, biomaterials, and systems biology. Such fields share a comparable, underlying research paradigm, recently defined as *convergence*.² Convergence extends beyond simple collaboration between disciplines to evoke true disciplinary integration—transcending fields through the integration of approaches typically viewed as distinct and potentially contradictory. The impact that convergence is already having in a broad array of fields. Just as advances in information technology, materials, imaging, nanotechnology and related fields—coupled with advances in computing, modeling and simulation—have transformed the physical sciences, so are they are beginning to transform life science. The result is critical new biology-related fields, such as bioengineering, computational biology, synthetic biology and tissue engineering. At the same time, biological models (understanding complex, self-arranged systems) are already transforming engineering and the physical sciences, making possible advances in biofuels, food supply, viral self-assembly and much more.

Convergence [40]: A broad rethinking of how all scientific research is conducted, involving the integration of disciplinary approaches that were originally viewed as separate and distinct. Through the merging of technologies, processes and devices into a unified whole, new pathways and opportunities for scientific and technological advancements are created inaccessible to any single discipline or knowledge bases. The goal of convergence is not a particular scientific advance, but on a new integrated approach for achieving advances.

²The third revolution: the convergence of the life sciences, physical sciences, and engineering, <http://web.mit.edu/dc/Policy/MIT%20White%20Paper%20on%20Convergence.pdf>.




Fig. 1.9 Statistical mechanical concepts in immunology—the convergence of biology, modeling, and mechanics. Schematic depiction of thymic selection of T cells, and its consequences for the antigen-recognition properties of the T cell repertoire [41]. (a) Immature T cells (thymocytes) develop in the thymus which migrate through the thymus and interact with self peptide major histocompatibility complexes (self-pMHCs) presented on the surface of thymic antigen presenting cells (APCs). A T cell’s receptor (TCR) must bind to at least one of these self-pMHCs weakly to exit the thymus and become a part of the individual’s T cell repertoire (positive selection). Binding with an affinity that exceeds a sharply defined threshold results in negative selection (apoptosis). (b) Schematic representation of the interface between TCR and pMHCs. The region of the TCR contacting the peptide and the peptide itself are modeled by string of amino acids to enable the calculation of binding free energy. (c) A mechanism for the puzzle of how TCR recognition of pathogen-derived peptides is both specific and degenerate emerges from statistical mechanical theory and is illustrated in the schematic. Peptide amino acids of different shades are not identical. Sufficiently strong interactions required for recognition are mediated by several moderate interactions. Adapted from Chakraborty *et al.* [41], used with permission, copyright © 2010 Annual Review of Physical Chemistry

This trend of integration has already been realized in various studies in which engineering theories have been “borrowed” to model biological systems. As an example, we consider the implementation of computational biology to explore complex biological systems such as, for example, our immune response to HIV. Recently, Chakraborty and colleagues combined computer science, physics, and engineering with molecular and genetic biology to elucidate mechanistic principles underlying the adaptive immune response to pathogens [41, 42]. Such investigations are possible by linking statistical mechanics together with an engineering approach to the chemical kinetics, genetic, biochemical, and imaging experiments, as well as clinical data (see Fig. 1.9).

Modern research has already shed the labels in which science was pigeonholed, with traditional disciplines such as physics and chemistry being replaced by modern interdisciplinary fields of biomechanics or nanotechnology, for example. In his “Lectures on Physics” (1964), Richard Feynman quips:

... we humans cut Nature up in different ways, and we have different courses in different departments, such compartmentalization is really artificial...

Since the physical universe (living and non-living) is subject to the same fundamental physical laws, it follows that this set of laws serves as common ground for the transfer of information between the disciplines. This is one of the primary motivations for the concentration on atomistic and molecular behavior throughout this text. The merger of science and engineering (*i.e.*, discovery and invention), and the convergence of many fields can pave the way for tomorrow's supermaterials. Ultimately, we may unlock new theories and scientific approaches that allow advanced functional, adaptable, and robust materials that exceed those known in the natural world. In the interim, we look to Nature for proven systems and inspiration.

1.7 A New Perspective: Materiomics

Traditional engineering methods encompassing such fields as structural analysis and continuum theory (*e.g.*, continuum mechanics) lack the framework required for the complexities introduced by multi-scale interactions, their discrete hierarchical composition, and structure-property dependencies at all scales, as found in many natural materials. Mechanical notions of stress and strain, fracture and plasticity, toughness and robustness, are inherently linked to material behavior at the macro-scale. Similarly, chemical and biological techniques (including such fields as microbiology, proteomics, and condensed matter physics) shed vast insights on nano-scale phenomena, such as the chemical composition of materials or the interactions of residues, but lack an explicit association with mechanical properties. Significant advances have been made in many disciplines and research areas, ranging throughout a variety of scales, from atomistic, molecular to continuum. In tandem, experimental studies have attained molecular precision, lending insights to molecular defects and mechanisms. As a result of these advances in disparate fields of science, in the spirit of convergence, a fully integrated and holistic paradigm is necessary to elucidate nature's design principles and facilitate the design of materials with exceptional material properties.

The study of material properties of biological protein materials has witnessed an exciting development over the past several years, partly due to the emergence of physical science based approaches in the biological sciences. Specifically, there has been significant effort directed towards the explanation and control of observed macroscopic mechanical and optical behavior of complex polymer composites [43, 44] while concurrently the structure of many protein-based (polymeric) materials are being discovered, motivating the design of novel "*synthetic biological*" materials [45]. The rapid expansion in the scope of materials science and engineering has led to incorporation of such fields as experimental and computational biology, biomedical engineering, and genetics in the context of natural and synthetic materials. Recent progress provides insight into biological mechanisms and

enables us a peek into how biology works at the ultimate, molecular scale, and how this relates to macroscopic phenomena such as cell mechanics, tissue behavior or functions provided by entire organisms. This has resulted in the cross-disciplinary investigation of protein materials and structures, diseases as well as the development of novel treatment and diagnostics methods [32, 33, 46–50]. As discussed in the previous section, there is undoubtedly an accelerated progression and convergence of biology, chemistry, materials science, and engineering, each contributing different aspects of the complexity of Nature’s design. Is it possible for each field to share a common “mission statement”? The merger of such perspectives is mutually beneficial: materials scientists have extensive experience in treating structures, processes and properties of materials systematically and with rigorous mathematical methods, whereas biologists have gained a detailed understanding of biological systems and structures and related functions by utilizing both physiological models and powerful statistical correlations between, for example, genetics, physiology and pathology.

In addition, there is accelerating interest in the discovery and understanding of Nature’s structural design rules, in particular for nanoscopic hierarchical molecular structures and to make them available to engineers in order invent and design tomorrow’s supermaterials (*e.g.*, mechanomutable materials, advanced composites, low density low energy structural materials, etc.), seamlessly blending synthetic materials with biological systems (*e.g.*, tissue and biomedical engineering), and using basic biological systems as templates for design (*e.g.*, biomimetic and bio-inspired materials). There is also a surprising relationship between these material design issues and the understanding (or rather lack thereof) of genetic diseases and disorders, where structural changes are due to mutations on the molecular level which lead to changed chemical and mechanical properties, which in turn lead to a malfunction of the protein network under mechanical load.

This type of effort, the linking of mechanisms across multiple scales by using a materials science approach to provide structure-process-property links characterizes the emerging field of materiomics [51]. The term materiomics has been proposed with various definitions in the past (see Akita *et al.*, [52], Buehler *et al.*, [51, 53–55], and the work of de Boer and van Blitterswijk *et al.* [56–59]), where all of the definitions deal broadly with the complexities of synthesis and function of materials and structures. For example, Akita *et al.* propose materiomics as the systematic study of material composition and structure to determine material properties of metal/metal oxide catalysts [52], whereas de Boer and van Blitterswijk *et al.* proposes materiomics as dealing with the complexities of tissue engineering [56, 57] and high-throughput screening of potential bio-compatible material platforms [59]. It is evident that both definitions encompass the intricacies of complex materials, yet limit scope to specific material systems and applications. We believe, that although slightly different, the definition of materiomics proposed in earlier works fall under a much broader perspective, encompassing even quantum scales [60, 61], or natural porous granular materials such as shale and concrete [26, 62, 63], as examples, and thus incorporates a vast array of potential future applications in science and engineering.




Fig. 1.10 The etymology of biomateriomics can be easily understood as the integration of biology, materials, and the suffix “omics”. Complementary to the field of biomaterials, biomateriomics represents a holistic approach to the investigation of biological material systems, through the integration of natural functions and processes (biological, or “living” interactions) with traditional materials science perspectives (physical properties, chemical components, hierarchical structures, mechanical behavior, etc.)

Materiomics: the holistic study of material systems. Materiomics examines links between physicochemical material properties and material characteristics and function. While typically applied to complex biological systems and biomaterials, materiomics is equally applicable to non-biological systems. Materiomics considers a complete material system and the affect on the macroscopic function and failure in a mechanical context, linking processes, structure and properties at multiple scales, through a materials science perspective, integrating experimental, theoretical, and computational methods. A portmanteau of “*material*” and the suffix “*omics*” which refers to “*all constituents considered collectively*”.

Materiomics can refer to the study of a broad range of materials, which includes metals, ceramics and polymers in addition to biological materials and tissues (and their interactions with synthetic materials), as well as the study of purely biological structures, such as bone, skin, cells, silk, or ectopic materials (such as amyloids). In a material context, materiomics is not limited to protein based materials, but rather includes the whole range of materials in a biological system (*e.g.*, mineralized protein scaffolds, metal-protein material systems, etc.), encompassing the analysis of the role of materials in the context of biological processes, the transfer of biological material principles in biomimetic and bioinspired applications, and the study of interfaces between living and non-living systems.

Thus far, we have only mentioned the term “materiomics”, yet the title of this book is, conspicuously, *biomateriomics*. Biomateriomics can be viewed as a simple juxtaposition of biology, materials, and the Greek suffix *-omics* (see Fig. 1.10). A simple combination of biology and materials naturally yields biomaterials—a relatively well-defined classification in materials science that encompasses Natural materials and synthetic materials that interact with biological systems (biomedical devices, for example). Biological processes introduce complex living interactions to material systems, and thereby require certain tact to analyze mechanistic behavior and material properties. Materials science has been making tremendous advances in this area in recent years. Biomateriomics, however, is not intended to be a trivial

rebranding or subfield of biomaterials (although there is indeed significant overlap). The critical difference—as may have been anticipated—is the addition of that pesky suffix: *-omics*.

Biomateriomics: A *materiomic* approach to biological systems and materials, including biomimetic and bio-inspired materials. Biomateriomics integrates the structure and material properties of *biological* materials with the inherent functionality and environmental adaptation.

The addition of *-omics* adds a subtle layer of complexity to the material systems we are interested in. The term *omics* generally refers to “*all constituents considered collectively*”. For instance, *genomics* and the study of the human genome refers to all of our genes, not just a single subset.

The combination of materials and omics—*materiomics*—thus refers to a similar perspective of a material system: one in which all properties, functions, and interactions are considered collectively, so-to-speak. Biomateriomics applies this perspective to natural and other biomaterials. Such materials—as opposed to more traditional (and benign) engineering materials—are characterized by hierarchical structures, cross-scale interactions, multi-functionality, dynamic feedback, adaptation, and are notoriously difficult to understand, let alone design and exploit (*i.e.*, engineer). While a materials science approach can probe the physical and chemical components and structure of the system—a systematic “blueprint”—the whole is indeed greater than the sum of its parts. Such features (nay, challenges) necessitate a new, holistic and integrated perspective—an *omic* perspective—*biomateriomics*.

References

1. N. Du, X.Y. Liu, J. Narayanan, L.A. Li, M.L.M. Lim, D.Q. Li, Design of superior spider silk: from nanostructure to mechanical properties. *Biophys. J.* **91**(12), 4528–4535 (2006)
2. J.M. Gosline, P.A. Guerette, C.S. Ortlepp, K.N. Savage, The mechanical design of spider silks: from fibroin sequence to mechanical function. *J. Exp. Biol.* **202**(23), 3295–3303 (1999)
3. S. Keten, M.J. Buehler, Atomistic model of the spider silk nanostructure. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **96**(15), 153701 (2010)
4. S. Keten, M.J. Buehler, Nanostructure and molecular mechanics of spider dragline silk protein assemblies. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **7**(53), 1709–1721 (2010)
5. F.G. Omenetto, D.L. Kaplan, New opportunities for an ancient material. *Science* **329**(5991), 528–531 (2010)
6. F. Vollrath, Spider webs and silks. *Sci. Am.* **266**(3), 70–76 (1992)
7. F. Vollrath, Spider silk: evolution and 400 million years of spinning, waiting, snagging, and mating. *Nature* **466**(7304), 319 (2010)
8. P. Fratzel, *Collagen: Structure and Mechanics* (Springer, New York, 2008)
9. S. Weiner, H.D. Wagner, The material bone: structure mechanical function relations. *Annu. Rev. Mater. Sci.* **28**, 271–298 (1998)
10. M.J. Buehler, Nature designs tough collagen: explaining the nanostructure of collagen fibrils. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **103**, 12285–12290 (2006)

11. H.D. Espinosa, J.E. Rim, F. Barthelat, M.J. Buehler, Merger of structure and material in nacre and bone—perspectives on de novo biomimetic materials. *Prog. Mater. Sci.* **54**(8), 1059–1100 (2009)
12. P. Fratzl, R. Weinkamer, Nature's hierarchical materials. *Prog. Mater. Sci.* **52**, 1263–1344 (2007)
13. M.J. Buehler, T. Ackbarow, Nanomechanical strength mechanisms of hierarchical biological materials and tissues. *Comput. Methods Biomech. Biomed. Eng.* **11**(6), 595–607 (2008)
14. M.J. Buehler, S. Keten, Failure of molecules, bones, and the earth itself. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**(2), 1459–1487 (2010)
15. J. Aizenberg, J.C. Weaver, M.S. Thanawala, V.C. Sundar, D.E. Morse, P. Fratzl, Skeleton of *Euplectella sp.*: structural hierarchy from the nanoscale to the macroscale. *Science* **309**(5732), 275–278 (2005)
16. A. Woesz, J.C. Weaver, M. Kazanci, Y. Dauphin, J. Aizenberg, D.E. Morse, P. Fratzl, Micromechanical properties of biological silica in skeletons of deep-sea sponges. *J. Mater. Res.* **21**, 2068–2078 (2006)
17. J. Aizenberg, V.C. Sundar, A.D. Yablon, J.C. Weaver, G. Chen, Biological glass fibers: correlation between optical and structural properties. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **101**(10), 3358–3363 (2004)
18. C. Levi, J.L. Barton, C. Guillemet, E. Bras, P. Lehuède, A remarkably strong natural glassy rod: the anchoring spicule of the monorhaphis sponge. *J. Mater. Sci. Lett.* **8**(3), 337–339 (1989)
19. M. Sarikaya, H. Fong, N. Sunderland, B.D. Flinn, G. Mayer, A. Mescher, E. Gaino, Biomimetic model of a sponge-spicular optical fiber—mechanical properties and structure. *J. Mater. Res.* **16**(5), 1420–1428 (2001)
20. D. Losic, J.G. Mitchell, N.H. Voelcker, Diatomaceous lessons in nanotechnology and advanced materials. *Adv. Mater.* **21**, 2947–2958 (2009)
21. A. Garcia, M.J. Buehler, Bioinspired silicon nanoporous bulk material provides great toughness at great deformability. *Comput. Mater. Sci.* **48**(2), 303–309 (2010)
22. N.G. Pinto, A. Katiyar, S. Yadav, P.G. Smirniotis, Synthesis of ordered large pore sba-15 spherical particles for adsorption of biomolecules. *J. Chromatogr. A* **1122**(1–2), 13–20 (2006)
23. V.S.Y. Lin, B.G. Trewyn, J.A. Nieweg, Y. Zhao, Biocompatible mesoporous silica nanoparticles with different morphologies for animal cell membrane, penetration. *Chem. Eng. J.* **137**(1), 23–29 (2008)
24. M.F. Ashby, *Materials Selection in Mechanical Design*, 4th edn. (Butterworth–Heinemann, Oxford, 2011)
25. P. Fratzl, Biomimetic materials research: what can we really learn from nature's structural materials. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **4**, 637–642 (2007)
26. R. Pellenq, A. Kushima, R. Shahsavari, K. Van Vliet, M.J. Buehler, S. Yip, F.-J. Ulm, A realistic molecular model of cement hydrates. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **106**(38), 16102–16107 (2009)
27. M.J. Buehler, *Atomistic Modeling of Materials Failure* (Springer, Berlin, 2008)
28. R.P. Feynman, There's plenty of room at the bottom. *Caltech Eng. Sci.* **23**, 22–36 (1960)
29. K.E. Drexler, *Nanosystems: Molecular Machinery, Manufacturing, and Computation* (Wiley, New York, 1992)
30. H. Gao, B. Ji, I.L. Jger, E. Arzt, P. Fratzl, Materials become insensitive to flaws at nanoscale: lessons from nature. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **100**(10), 5597–5600 (2003)
31. U.G.K. Wegst, M.F. Ashby, The mechanical efficiency of natural materials. *Philos. Mag.* **84**(21), 2167–2181 (2004)
32. M.A. Meyers, P.Y. Chen, A.Y.M. Lin, Y. Seki, Biological materials: structure and mechanical properties. *Prog. Mater. Sci.* **53**(1), 1–206 (2008)
33. M.J. Buehler, Y.C. Yung, Deformation and failure of protein materials in physiologically extreme conditions and disease. *Nat. Mater.* **8**(3), 175–188 (2009)
34. S. Kamat, X. Su, R. Ballarini, A.H. Heuer, Structural basis for the fracture toughness of the shell of the conch strombus gigas. *Nature* **405**(6790), 1036–1040 (2000)

35. Z. Tang, N.A. Kotov, S. Magono, B. Ozturk, Nanostructured artificial nacre. *Nat. Mater.* **2**, 413–418 (2003)
36. E. Munch, M.E. Launey, D.H. Alsem, E. Saiz, A.P. Tomsia, R.O. Ritchie, Tough, bio-inspired hybrid materials. *Science* **322**, 1516–1520 (2008)
37. J.F.V. Vincent, Stealing ideas from nature, in *Deployable Structures*, ed. by S. Pellegrino (Springer, Vienna, 2001)
38. R. Lakes, Materials with structural hierarchy. *Nature* **361**, 511–515 (1993)
39. M.J. Buehler, Y.C. Yung, How protein materials balance strength, robustness and adaptability. *HFSP J.* **4**(1), 26–40 (2010)
40. P.A. Sharp, C.L. Cooney, M.A. Kastner, J. Lees, R. Sasisekharan, M.B. Yaffe, S.N. Bhatia, T.E. Jacks, D.A. Lauffenburger, R. Langer, P.T. Hammond, M. Sur, The third revolution: the convergence of the life sciences, physical sciences, and engineering. Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2011)
41. A.K. Chakraborty, A. Kosmrlj, Statistical mechanical concepts in immunology. *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **61**, 283–303 (2010)
42. A. Andrej Kosmrlj, E.L. Read, Y. Qi, T.M. Allen, M. Altfield, S.G. Deeks, F. Pereyra, M. Carrington, B.D. Walker, A.K. Chakraborty, Effects of thymic selection of the T-cell repertoire on HLA class I-associated control of HIV infection. *Nature* **465**(7296), 350–354 (2010)
43. C.K. Ober, S.Z.D. Cheng, P.T. Hammond, M. Muthukumar, E. Reichmanis, K.L. Wooley, T.P. Lodge, Research in macromolecular science: challenges and opportunities for the next decade. *Macromolecules* **42**(2), 465–471 (2009)
44. M.A.C. Stuart, W.T.S. Huck, J. Genzer, M. Muller, C. Ober, M. Stamm, G.B. Sukhorukov, I. Szleifer, V.V. Tsukruk, M. Urban, F. Winnik, S. Zauscher, I. Luzinov, S. Minko, Emerging applications of stimuli-responsive polymer materials. *Nat. Mater.* **9**(2), 101–113 (2010)
45. M.J. Doktycz, M.L. Simpson, Nano-enabled synthetic biology. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* **3**(125) (2007)
46. G. Bao, S. Suresh, Cell and molecular mechanics of biological materials. *Nat. Mater.* **2**(11), 715–725 (2003)
47. K.N. Dahl, P. Scalfidi, M.F. Islam, A.G. Yodh, K.L. Wilson, T. Misteli, Distinct structural and mechanical properties of the nuclear lamina in Hutchinson–Gilford progeria syndrome. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **103**(27), 10271–10276 (2006)
48. S.E. Cross, Y.-S. Jin, J. Rao, J.K. Gimzewski, Nanomechanical analysis of cells from cancer patients. *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **2**, 780–783 (2007)
49. N. Kepper, D. Foethke, R. Stehr, G. Wedemann, K. Rippe, Nucleosome geometry and internucleosomal interactions control the chromatin fiber conformation. *Biophys. J.* **95**, 3692–3705 (2008)
50. M. Dao, C.T. Lim, S. Suresh, Mechanics of the human red blood cell deformed by optical tweezers. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **53**(2), 493–494 (2005)
51. M.J. Buehler, S. Keten, T. Ackbarow, Theoretical and computational hierarchical nanomechanics of protein materials: deformation and fracture. *Prog. Mater. Sci.* **53**, 1101–1241 (2008)
52. T. Akita, A. Ueda, Y. Yamada, S. Ichikawa, K. Tanaka, M. Kohyama, T. Kobayashi, Analytical tem observations of combinatorial catalyst libraries for hydrogen production—as a part of “materiomics”. *Mater. Res. Soc. Proc.* **804**, 211–216 (2004)
53. M.J. Buehler, S. Keten, Elasticity, strength and resilience: a comparative study on mechanical signatures of alpha-helix, beta-sheet and tropocollagen domains. *Nano Res.* **1**(1), 63–71 (2008)
54. M.J. Buehler, Computational and theoretical materiomics: properties of biological and de novo bioinspired materials. *J. Comput. Theor. Nanosci.* **7**(7), 1203–1209 (2010)
55. S. Cranford, M.J. Buehler, Materiomics: biological protein materials, from nano to macro. *Nanotechnology Sci. Appl.* **3**, 127–148 (2010)
56. C.A. van Blitterswijk, D. Stamatialis, H. Unandhar, B. Papenburg, J. Rouwkema, R. Truckenmuller, A. van Apeldoorn, M. Wessling, J. de Boer, Materiomics: dealing with complexity in tissue engineering. *Tissue Eng. A* **14**(5), 796 (2008)

57. J. de Boer, H. Fernandes, L. Moroni, C. van Blitterswijk, Extracellular matrix and tissue engineering applications. *J. Mater. Chem.* **19**(31), 5474–5484 (2009)
58. D. Stamatialis, B.J. Papenburg, J. Liu, G.A. Higuera, A.M.C. Barradas, J. de Boer, C.A. van Blitterswijk, M. Wessling, Development and analysis of multi-layer scaffolds for tissue engineering. *Biomaterials* **30**(31), 6228–6239 (2009)
59. H.V. Unadkat, M. Hulsman, K. Cornelissen, B.J. Papenburg, R.K. Truckenmuller, G.F. Post, M. Uetz, M.J.T. Reinders, D. Stamatialis, C.A. van Blitterswijk, J. de Boer, An algorithm-based topographical biomaterials library to instruct cell fate. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **108**(40), 16565–16570 (2011)
60. J. Hafner, C. Wolverton, G. Ceder, Toward computational materials design: the impact of density functional theory on materials research. *Mater. Res. Soc. Bull.* **31**(9), 659–668 (2006)
61. G. Ceder, B. Kang, Battery materials for ultrafast charging and discharging. *Nature* **458**(7235), 190–193 (2009)
62. F.J. Ulm, Y. Abousleiman, The nanogranular nature of shale. *Acta Geotech.* **1**(2), 77–88 (2006)
63. F.J. Ulm, The nanogranular nature of hydrated porous materials: concrete, shale and bone. *Poro-Mechanics* **IV**, 57–68 (2009)

Chapter 2

The Materiome

Abstract The goal of materiomics is the complete understanding of the materiome—a holistic characterization of a complex material system. The balance of form and function throughout Nature is well recognized, but the materiome must enhance a basic characterization of complex biological phenomena, to enable the prediction and design of new technologies. Analogous to genomics and other “-omic” fields, there is an obvious difference in scope between a gene or genetic sequence, and the human genome. Here, we establish the scope of the materiome beyond the assembly of material components (*e.g.*, architecture or structure), the fundamental difference between application and function, the concept of material behavior scaling, as well as the challenges (and benefits) imposed by material hierarchies and complexity. Material and structure are no longer distinct, and the assembly of building blocks ranges across all scales from the nano to the macro level.

The structure of tissues and their functions are two aspects of the same thing. One cannot consider them separately. Each structural detail possesses its functional expression. It is through physiological aptitudes of their anatomical parts that the life of the higher animals is rendered possible. . . . Tissues are endowed with potentialities far greater than those which are apparent.

Alexis Carrel, Science, Vol. 73, No. 1890, pp. 297–303 (1931)

2.1 Introduction

The above quote indicates a fundamental principal of materials science central to materiomics: the inherent (and reciprocal) relation between a material’s *structure* and material’s *function*. Superficially, in many applications—both engineering and biological—one can be directly inferred from the other. For example, a steel cable supporting a suspension bridge is constructed to withstand tension, while the bones in our bodies are relatively stiff to provide our limbs and muscles with structural support. The problem arises, of course, when one wishes to optimize and develop (in other words, *engineer*) both structure and function simultaneously. This, as indicated by Chap. 1: Introduction, is the approach Nature astutely implements through *growth*.

Growth is a complex process that can be influenced by the external conditions including temperature, mechanical loading, and supply of light, water or nutrition. As such, biological materials are not produced in the same manner as engineering materials—the process is highly adaptive and responsive. Moreover, critical factors may differ not only in time, but in scale—what a material system “sees” at the nanoscale may be quite different than at the macroscale. Organisms must necessarily possess the ability of adaptation to external needs, while possible external influences on a technical system must be typically anticipated in its design. Multiscale response, temporal changes, and the need for robustness (applying “survival of the fittest” principle to materials science) are the primary culprits resulting in complex biological materials and systems. Even if you think you have a complete physiological and mechanistic understanding, the system can evolve. This usually means back to the metaphorical drawing board! Clearly, a biological material differs from common static and benign materials such as aluminum or glass (as everyday examples). For this reason, complex materials (in particular complex biological materials such as tissues and cells) need a more comprehensive and holistic framework to completely understand (and exploit) physical, chemical, biological and mechanical characteristics and properties. Such a holistic framework is known as the *materiome*.

Materiome: A holistic characterization of a material system, consisting of the material constituents (elemental building blocks and/or structural units), the cross-scale structure-property-process relations, and the resulting functionalities/requirements across *all* levels of hierarchy, from nano to macro.

An integrated and holistic perspective of biological materials is particularly fascinating for the materials scientist—and has likewise been approached in the past with various motivations. For example, the classical book by D.W. Thompson *On Growth and Form* relates the “form” (or shape) of biological objects to their physiological role [1]—an early insight into the integration of structure and function. Thompson quotes:

An organism is so complex a thing, and growth so complex a phenomenon, that for growth to be so uniform and constant in all the parts as to keep the whole shape unchanged would indeed be an unlikely and an unusual circumstance. Rates vary, proportions change, and the whole configuration alters accordingly.

A recurrent theme of *On Growth and Form* is that contemporary biologists (circa 1919) overemphasized evolution as the fundamental determinant of the form and structure of living organisms, and underemphasized the roles of physical laws and mechanics. Thompson advocated *structuralism* as an alternative to survival of the fittest in governing the form of species. Yet a purely mechanistic approach is also limited in scope, failing to encompass adaptive physiological and environmental aspects of biological systems. From an integrated perspective, evolution and structuralism go hand-in-hand—they are aspects of the same “development” process, contributing to the materiome.





Fig. 2.1 Galileo’s illustration of the same bone (femur) of a human (*top*) and a giant (*bottom*). Whereas the length of the bones differ by about three times, the width of the bones differ ninefold. Typically, “Galileo’s bones” are used as an example of scaling of strength and weight (the so-called cube-square law). Here, the bones represent a variation in structure with function—the material (bone) is constant, but the *materiome* varies from human to giant. From *Discorsi e Dimonstrazioni Matematiche intorno a Due Nuove Scienze*, 1638

Even earlier, the relationships between anatomy (*i.e.*, structure) and function of living systems had been explored by Leonardo da Vinci and Galileo Galilei. One of the first to apply fundamental physics to biological systems, Galileo is often considered the father of biomechanics (albeit the modern approach to biomechanics is largely credited to the pioneering work of Y.C. Fung). Among his many other discoveries, Galileo recognized that the shape of an animal’s bones are to some extent adapted to its weight. Long bones of larger animals typically have a smaller aspect ratio (see Fig. 2.1).

Galileo’s explanation is the basis for the simple cube-square law: the weight of an animal scales with the cube of its linear dimension, while the structural strength of its bones scales with the square. Hence, the aspect ratio of long bones has to decrease with the body weight of the animal. Indeed, for this reason, large animals do not look like small animals: an elephant cannot be mistaken for a mouse scaled-up in size. The bones of an elephant are necessarily proportionately much larger than the bones of a mouse, because they must carry proportionately higher weight. Because of this, the giant animals seen in movies (*e.g.*, Godzilla or King Kong) are unrealistic, as their sheer size would break their bones! While the material properties of bone are similar from animal to animal (the composition of human bones is similar to mouse bones is similar to elephant bones, for example), the structure adapts to function. In other words, the *materiome* changes.

Beyond material properties (*e.g.*, strength or mass), early insights further linked biological processes—such as walking, running, and the flight of birds—using a mechanistic framework (see Fig. 2.2). It was a radical paradigm that all living systems, including the human body, could be described as simple machines ruled by the same mechanical laws. More recently, the works of Steven Vogel [2–6] has introduced the field of comparative biomechanics—application of biomechanics to non-human organisms and reducing the biomechanical universe to a set of simple tubes, surfaces, flows, beams, and levers, all amenable to simple calculation and estimation. In simplest terms, quantifying how living things stack up against non-biological physical reality. Biomechanics is closely related to engineering, because

Fig. 2.2 Biology provides more than just materials, but functional mechanical systems. Illustration is a page of one of the first works of biomechanics, *De Motu Animalium* by Giovanni Alfonso Borelli (1608–1679). Borelli studied walking, running, jumping, the flight of birds, the swimming of fish, and even the piston action of the heart within a mechanical framework. Influenced by the work of Galileo, he had an intuitive understanding of static equilibrium in various joints of the human body well before Newton published the laws of motion



it often uses physical engineering sciences to analyze biological systems. Currently, the study of biomechanics ranges from the inner workings of a cell to the movement and development of limbs, to the mechanical properties of soft tissue, and bones, and the transport of fluids and nutrients *via* cellular mechanisms and large-scale vasculature.

In a similar manner, the challenges of understanding the relationship between material system, function, and adaptation are the focus of materiomics. The goal is not only to understanding such complex biological phenomena, but to enable the prediction and design of new technologies. Materiomics is a unifying field, attempting to merge the efforts of biologists, material scientists, and engineers alike. Indeed, many of the overarching themes and principles have been investigated under different motivations. In this chapter, we introduce and discuss the fundamental concepts of materiomics, such as the *materiome* (depicted schematically in Fig. 2.3), as well as guiding principles and nuances, such as the fundamental difference between function and application, structure-property-process relations, the prevalence of hierarchies and complexity, and the concept of material behavior scaling.

2.2 Motivation and Scope

Materiomics is defined as the systematic study of the complete material system and the effect on the macroscopic function and failure in their mechanical context,




Fig. 2.3 Schematic representation of materiomic information, consisting of the material constituents (elemental building blocks and/or structural units), the cross-scale structure-property-process relations (structural geometry, stress and strain transfer, failure mechanisms), and the resulting functionalities/requirements (strength, robustness, toughness, and other mechanical properties)

linking processes, structure and properties at multiple scales, from nano to macro, through a materials science perspective, integrating experimental, theoretical, and computational methods. The term has been coined in analogy to genomics—the study of an organism’s entire genome—where, indeed, the suffix “omics” refers to “all constituents considered collectively”. The development of genomics is a direct result of the *Human Genome Project* [7, 8]—an ongoing international scientific research project with a primary goal of to identify and map approximately three billion base pairs that form the chemical rungs in DNA’s signature double-helical shape, from both a physical and functional standpoint. It is a gross oversimplification to state that the aim of the project is to simply map the nucleotides contained in a human genome in a sort of extensive database. Rather, the ultimate goal is to understand the human genome—detailing a genetic instruction set, finding the genetic roots of disease, and providing a scaffold for future work. A common idiom states that the “whole is greater than the sum of its parts” (originating from Aristotle¹), and the Human Genome Project is the attempt to discover the “whole” of our genetic make-up, assigning meaning to:

...ACCGTAAATGGGCTGATCATGCTTAAACCCTGTGCATCCTACTG...

beyond a seemingly random sequences of nucleobases (where A refers to adenine, C to cytosine, G to guanine, and T to thymine, the four base pairs of DNA). Moreover, the effort to create a comprehensive map of the human genetic sequence was more than just a breakthrough for geneticists. Genomics marked the launch of a new era of “-omic”-based research [9, 10]. The focus was shifted from individual parts within a system, to the system itself (a holistic approach). In the field of systems theory, this integrative view is sometimes referred to as *emergence* [11]—the way complex systems and patterns arise out of a multiplicity of relatively simple interactions. Biological systems consist of a large number of mutually interacting and interwoven parts, but complex and adaptive systems are not limited to biology. Examples

¹“...the totality is not, as it were, a mere heap, but the whole is something besides the parts.”, Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Book H, 1045a:8–10.