

1  
2  
3  
4 **Supplemental Data**  
5  
6

7  
8 **Figure Legend:**  
9

10  
11 **Figure S1.** Degradation of modulus in cortical beams loaded in bending fatigue. To compare  
12 change in modulus during fatigue loading, secant modulus ( $E$ ) at a given cycle was normalized  
13 by  $E_i$  and plotted against normalized fatigue cycles ( $N/N_f$ ). (a) Typical  $E/E_i$  history during  
14 fatigue loading of a beam illustrating the three distinct regions of response, and (b)  $E/E_i$  history  
15 of medial and lateral beams from the VEH, ALN0.2 and ALN1.0 groups tested at each of the six  
16 stress amplitudes. The lines represent polynomial fits to the pooled data for each group.  
17  
18 According to the distinct transitions in  $E$  with cyclic loading, the responses were divided into  
19 three regions. Overall, beams from the drug-treated groups exhibited a faster reduction in  $E$   
20 compared to those from the VEH. These differences were evident from the onset of fatigue  
21 loading, but were most pronounced towards the end of fatigue life, i.e., region III.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Tables:**

	Cortex	VEH	ALN0.2	ALN1.0
# of beams	M	17	23	21
	L	12	9	10
# of beams reaching 2.5 mm limit	M	3	10	8
	L	8	9	8
$E_i$ (GPa)	M	11.0±1.2	10.3±1.4	8.8±1.1 <sup>a,b</sup>
	L	7.2±1.4 <sup>c</sup>	7.0±0.8 <sup>c</sup>	6.0±0.9 <sup>c</sup>
$E_f$ (GPa)	M	6.2±1.9	5.1±1.4	4.3±1.7 <sup>a</sup>
	L	4.1±1.0 <sup>c</sup>	3.8±0.8 <sup>c</sup>	3.8±0.7
$\Delta E$ (GPa)	M	4.8±1.7	5.2±1.4	4.7±0.9
	L	3.1±1.4	3.2±1.0	2.3±1.1
$\Delta E$ (%)	M	44.1±14.7	50.7±12.5	54.1±9.1
	L	42.0±15.5	44.6±12.2	36.5±14.3 <sup>c</sup>
On.Ar (%)	M	58.3±6.5	53.7±9.1	50.4±8.8 <sup>a</sup>
	L	53.1±7.1	48.7±10.8	47.1±9.1
On.Dn (#/mm <sup>2</sup> )	M	48.6±9.2	44.3±9.1	48.9±10.2
	L	45.8±9.7	39.9±8.8	44.8±8.0
On.Ar (x10 <sup>3</sup> μm <sup>2</sup> )	M	12.2±1.6	12.4±2.5	10.5±1.8 <sup>a</sup>
	L	12.3±4.5	12.3±1.5	10.8±2.7
Ca.Ar (%)	M	2.0±0.5	2.4±0.5	2.3±0.6
	L	3.2±1.0 <sup>c</sup>	3.0±1.0 <sup>c</sup>	3.1±2.1
Ca.Ar (x10 <sup>3</sup> μm <sup>2</sup> )	M	0.41±0.11	0.51±0.16	0.46±0.18
	L	0.68±0.40 <sup>c</sup>	0.74±0.45 <sup>c</sup>	0.63±0.40

**Table S1.** Comparison of biomechanical and micro-architectural traits for beams machined from medial (M) and lateral (L) cortices. Data represented as mean ± SD were analyzed by ANOVA followed by Tukey HSD: vs. control (VEH), <sup>a</sup> p<0.05; vs. ALN0.2, <sup>b</sup> p<0.05; vs. M, <sup>c</sup> p<0.05. Only 2 (both VEH-treated, medial beams, see Figure 3) reached 250,000 cycles prior to failure.

$\sigma_a$ (MPa)	Cortex	VEH	ALN0.2	ALN1.0
52	M	$7.77 \times 10^4$	$6.06 \times 10^4$	$1.95 \times 10^4$
	L	$1.45 \times 10^4$	$7.43 \times 10^3$	$5.00 \times 10^3$
60	M	$1.91 \times 10^4$	$1.41 \times 10^4$	$4.11 \times 10^3$
	L	$2.65 \times 10^3$	$6.00 \times 10^2$	$1.03 \times 10^3$
67	M	$6.48 \times 10^3$	$4.56 \times 10^3$	$1.24 \times 10^3$
	L	$4.90 \times 10^1$	$1.50 \times 10^2$	$1.01 \times 10^3$
75	M	$2.14 \times 10^3$	$1.44 \times 10^3$	$3.63 \times 10^2$
	L	$5.60 \times 10^1$	$3.29 \times 10^2$	$8.35 \times 10^1$
85	M	$6.28 \times 10^2$	$4.03 \times 10^2$	$9.32 \times 10^1$
	L	$6.00 \times 10^1$	$2.73 \times 10^2$	$3.40 \times 10^1$

**Table S2.** Average number of cycles to failure for a given applied stress ( $\sigma_a$ ) for beams machined from medial (M) and lateral (L) cortices.

	VEH	ALN0.2	ALN1.0
Tb.Th ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	$47 \pm 5$	$47 \pm 4$	$49 \pm 5$
Tb.Sp ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	$287 \pm 117$	$244 \pm 50$	$190 \pm 29^{a,b}$
Tb.N ( $\text{mm}^{-1}$ )	$3.3 \pm 0.9$	$3.5 \pm 0.6$	$4.3 \pm 0.6^{a,b}$
Tb.Pf ( $\text{mm}^{-1}$ )	$2.4 \pm 1.8$	$2.1 \pm 0.9$	$1.6 \pm 1.7$
Tb.Ar/Ma.Ar (%)	$15.3 \pm 4.6$	$16.5 \pm 3.6$	$20.5 \pm 1.9^{a,b}$
Tb.BMD ( $\text{g}/\text{cm}^3$ )	$0.21 \pm 0.03$	$0.24 \pm 0.03$	$0.24 \pm 0.02$

**Table S3.** Trabecular bone traits, as measured by X-ray micro-computed tomography of ribs (n=6/group). Data represented as mean  $\pm$  SD were analyzed by ANOVA followed by Tukey HSD: vs. control (VEH), <sup>a</sup> p<0.05; vs. ALN0.2, <sup>b</sup> p<0.05.