Comparative Analysis of X-Ray and MRI in Diagnosing Orthopedic Conditions

Mohammed Saleh Alobaidan [1], Asma Saad A Albalawi [2], Omar Saleh Mohammed Almatrafi Alharbi [3], Dalal Hussain Ali Alnakhli [4], Eisa Shaker Naffaa Alharbi [5], Mohammed Dhaher A Albalawi [6], Abdulaziz Aladlam S Alenezi [7], Nawaf Hossain Jaber Khabrani [8], Wafa Ghbash T Al Shammary [9], Afrah Altrqi Alanazi [10]

[1-] Radiology Specialist, Rafha Central Hospital, Rafha, Saudi Arabia
[2-] Radiology Specialist, Maternity and Children Hospital, Tabuk, Saudi Arabia
[3-] Radiology Technician, Miqat General Hospital, Medina, Saudi Arabia
[4-] Radiology Technician, Ohud Hospital, Madinah, Saudi Arabia
[5-] Radiology Technician, Al Bukayriyah Hospital, Al-Qassim, Saudi Arabia
[6-] X-Ray Technician, Abu Rakah General Hospital, Tabuk, Saudi Arabia
[7-] Radiological technology, Jadidat Arar Hospital, Saudi Arabia
[8-] Radiology Technologist, King Faisal Medical Complex, Taif, Saudi Arabia
[9-] Radiological Technology, Hail Health Cluster, Hail, Saudi Arabia
[10-] Radiological Technology Technician, Medical rehabilitation and Care Hospital - Arar, Saudi Arabia

Abstract:

X-ray imaging has long been a standard diagnostic tool in orthopedics, particularly for assessing bone-related issues like fractures, dislocations, or bone tumors. It provides rapid results and is widely accessible, making it ideal for preliminary evaluations. X-rays excel in visualizing dense structures, allowing for clear imaging of bony anatomy, but they have limitations in soft tissue assessment and the ability to detect subtle changes in bone density or cartilage damage. As a result, while they play a crucial role in initial diagnoses, they often require further imaging for comprehensive evaluation. In contrast, Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) offers a more detailed view of soft tissues, including muscles, ligaments, cartilage, and marrow changes in bones, which makes it particularly valuable in diagnosing complex orthopedic conditions such as ligament tears or cartilage defects. MRI does not involve ionizing radiation, making it a safer option for patients requiring multiple follow-up scans. However, MRI is more time-consuming, less available in emergency situations, and more expensive than X-rays. Consequently, a comparative analysis highlights that while X-rays provide critical initial insights into bony structures, MRI offers a superior evaluation of soft tissue pathologies, often complementing each other in the comprehensive diagnostic process.

Keywords: X-ray, MRI, Orthopedic conditions, Bone fractures, Soft tissue assessment, Diagnostic imaging, Cartilage damage, Ligament tears, Radiation, Comparative analysis

Introduction:

The diagnostic landscape in modern medicine is a constantly evolving field, with various imaging techniques playing a vital role in the identification and management of a multitude of conditions. Among these modalities, X-ray and Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) stand out as two of the most important tools employed in the evaluation of orthopedic conditions. Each modality possesses unique strengths and weaknesses, and their usage often depends on the specific clinical scenario, the anatomical region of interest, and patient-specific factors. A comparative analysis of X-ray and MRI in diagnosing orthopedic conditions thus serves as a valuable insight into optimal imaging practices, enhancing the diagnostic accuracy and clinical management of musculoskeletal disorders [1].

X-ray imaging, one of the oldest and most widely available forms of medical imaging, utilizes ionizing radiation to produce images of skeletal structures. This technique excels in providing detailed images of bone abnormalities, such as fractures, arthritis, and bone tumors. Its benefits include wide availability, cost-effectiveness, and accessibility, often making it the first-line imaging modality for suspected orthopedic conditions. However, X-rays have limitations regarding soft tissue visualization, rendering them less effective in assessing injuries involving ligaments, cartilage, and muscles. As such, while X-rays are indispensable in the detection of bony abnormalities, their utility in comprehensive evaluations of orthopedic disorders is somewhat constrained [2].

In contrast, MRI has emerged as a powerful non-invasive imaging modality that excels at visualizing soft tissues, including muscles, ligaments, tendons, and articular cartilage. MRI utilizes powerful magnets and radio waves to generate detailed cross-sectional images of the body's internal structures. It is particularly advantageous in diagnosing conditions that manifest within the soft tissue structures surrounding the musculoskeletal system, such as tears, strains, and lesions. Throughout the orthopedic domain, MRI serves as a critical adjunct to X-ray imaging, facilitating comprehensive assessments of pathology in areas such as the knee, shoulder, and spine. Despite its benefits, MRI is associated with limitations, including higher costs, longer acquisition times, and contraindications in patients with certain implants or devices. Thus, the choice between X-ray and MRI is often founded on clinical judgment, considering patient history, physical examination findings, and the suspected pathology [3].

Orthopedic conditions encompass a vast array of disorders, from traumatic injuries to degenerative diseases, and effective diagnostic imaging is pivotal to achieving accurate diagnoses and successful treatment outcomes. Understanding the comparative diagnostic accuracy, advantages, and limitations of X-ray and MRI in this context is essential for clinicians in formulating tailored approaches to patient care. Moreover, such an analysis aids in enhancing the efficiency of healthcare delivery, optimizing the use of resources, and minimizing patient exposure to unnecessary radiation or prolonged waiting times associated with MRI imaging [4].

Furthermore, the importance of establishing a comprehensive understanding of these imaging modalities extends beyond clinical practice. It informs education for healthcare professionals, shapes clinical guidelines, assists in resource allocation, and raises awareness about the patient journey during the diagnostic process. Given the dynamic nature of orthopedic practice and advancements in imaging technology, ongoing research into the comparative efficacy of X-ray and MRI remains relevant in guiding clinical decision-making and improving patient-centered care [5].

Principles of X-ray Imaging in Bone Assessment:

X-ray imaging has fundamentally transformed the domain of medical diagnostics, particularly in the assessment of bone conditions. Since its discovery by Wilhelm Conrad Röntgen in 1895, X-rays have emerged as an indispensable tool in medicine. The principles underlying X-ray imaging are rooted in physics and imaging technology, enabling healthcare professionals to visualize the internal structures of the body non-invasively [6].

X-rays are a form of electromagnetic radiation that is produced when high-energy electrons are abruptly decelerated, typically in a metal target, such as tungsten. The X-ray machine consists of several components, including an X-ray tube, a collimator, and digital imaging receptors. When the machine is activated, electrons are emitted from a cathode and directed toward an anode. As the electrons collide with the anode, they generate X-rays that are emitted toward the patient [7].

The emitted X-rays interact with different tissues of the body based on their density and composition. Dense tissues, such as bone, absorb a substantial amount of X-rays, resulting in a radiopaque (light) appearance on the X-ray film. Conversely, less dense tissues, like muscles and fat, permit more X-rays to pass through and appear radiolucent (dark) on the images. This differential absorption is crucial for visualizing anatomical structures in the body and forms the foundation of diagnostic radiology, particularly in assessing the skeletal system [8].

For effective bone assessment, the X-ray tube must be positioned strategically to obtain high-quality images with minimal distortion. The use of collimation – a technique that narrows the X-ray beam – helps reduce radiation exposure to surrounding tissues while enhancing image quality by limiting the scatter of X-rays [8].

Once the X-rays pass through the body and interact with the imaging receptor, whether it's traditional film or a digital detector, an image is created. In analog systems, X-rays cause a chemical change in the film that is later developed in a darkroom. In digital systems, sensors convert the X-ray data into electronic signals, which are then processed by a computer to generate high-resolution images [8].

The images produced can be manipulated, allowing radiologists to adjust contrast, brightness, and sharpness to enhance visibility of specific areas of interest, such as fractures, lesions, or other bone anomalies. Advances in digital imaging technology, such as computed radiography (CR) and direct digital radiography (DR), have significantly improved image quality, speed of processing, and ease of use compared to traditional methods [8].

While X-ray imaging is invaluable, it is essential to consider the biological effects of ionizing radiation. X-rays have enough energy to ionize atoms, which can potentially lead to cellular damage, mutations, and an increased risk of cancer. Thus, the principle of ALARA (As Low As Reasonably Achievable) is adhered to in clinical practice. This principle emphasizes minimizing patient exposure to radiation while obtaining the necessary diagnostic information. Techniques include using the lowest effective dosage, applying proper shielding measures, and employing alternative imaging modalities (such as MRI or ultrasound) when appropriate [9].

Particularly in pediatric patients, where sensitivity to radiation exposure is higher, careful consideration and justified use of X-ray assessments are imperative. Healthcare providers must weigh the benefits of diagnosis against the risks of radiation exposure, involving discussions with patients and guardians when necessary [9].

X-rays play a pivotal role in diagnosing and managing a plethora of bone-related conditions. Radiologists utilize X-ray imaging to assess trauma-related injuries, such as fractures and dislocations, that are crucial to prompt intervention. Fractures, for instance, can be classified as either "simple" (closed) or "compound" (open), and X-rays help determine the exact nature and severity of the injury, which is pivotal for treatment planning [10].

In addition to trauma, X-rays are instrumental in identifying degenerative bone diseases, including osteoarthritis and osteoporosis. For osteoporosis, a condition characterized by decreased bone density leading to fragility fractures, dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) is specifically employed to measure bone mineral density (BMD). A significant deterioration in BMD can indicate increased fracture risk and guides preventative strategies [10].

Furthermore, X-rays assist in evaluating pathological conditions such as tumors or infections affecting the bone. Conditions like osteosarcoma or metastatic lesions can often be detected via X-ray imaging, allowing for timely diagnostic interventions. The presence of osteomyelitis, an infection in the bone, can be inferred through changes seen in bone density and structure within an X-ray image [11].

Magnetic Resonance Imaging: Techniques and Applications in Orthopedics:

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) has revolutionized medical diagnostics and is particularly pivotal in the field of orthopedics. This non-invasive imaging technique helps clinicians evaluate a multitude of musculoskeletal disorders with exceptional detail. By utilizing powerful magnetic fields and radio waves, MRI provides high-resolution images of soft tissues, cartilage, ligaments, muscles, and even bone marrow, allowing for a comprehensive assessment of orthopedic conditions [11].

Overview of Magnetic Resonance Imaging

MRI is based on the principles of nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR), which was first discovered in the 1940s. In an MRI machine, the patient is placed within a strong magnetic field. This field aligns hydrogen protons, primarily found in water and fat, within the body. When radio frequency (RF) pulses are applied, these protons are temporarily knocked out of alignment. As they relax back to their original state, they emit signals that are detected and processed to create detailed cross-sectional images of the internal structures [12].

Techniques in MRI

1. **Conventional MRI:** Conventional MRI typically generates two-dimensional images, which can be reconstructed into three-dimensional datasets. The standard sequences used include T1-weighted, T2-weighted, and proton density imaging. T1-weighted images provide superior anatomical detail and tissue contrast, while T2-weighted images are particularly useful for identifying edema and fluid accumulation [13].

2. **Advanced Imaging Techniques:** Contemporary MRI technology offers advanced imaging techniques such as:
    - **Magnetic Resonance Angiography (MRA):** This is used primarily for visualizing blood vessels and can be particularly useful in assessing vascular or perfusion-related issues in orthopedic conditions.
    - **Diffusion Tensor Imaging (DTI):** This technique enhances visualization of white matter pathways, which can be particularly beneficial when assessing nervous system involvement in orthopedic conditions.
    - **Functional MRI (fMRI):** While more common in neurological settings, fMRI can aid in understanding pain pathways and biomechanics by measuring changes in blood flow, thus offering insights into orthopedic injuries [14].
3. **Contrast-Enhanced MRI:** Gadolinium-based contrast agents may be administered to improve the visualization of certain lesions or structures during MRI. This technique is particularly useful for differentiating between tumors, assessing joint spaces, and evaluating complex injuries.
4. **High-Field vs. Low-Field MRI:** MRI machines can be categorized into high-field (1.5T and above) and low-field (below 1.0T) systems. High-field machines offer higher resolution images and quicker scan times, making them preferable for most orthopedic applications.
5. **Surface Coil Imaging:** Employing surface coils focuses the magnetic field on a particular area of interest, enhancing image resolution and signal-to-noise ratio. This technique is especially beneficial in assessing superficial structures like the knee or shoulder [15].

Advantages of MRI in Orthopedics

MRI is favored in the field of orthopedics for several reasons:

1. **Soft Tissue Visualization:** Unlike X-rays or CT scans, MRI excels in visualizing soft tissues, making it invaluable in detecting conditions involving muscles, tendons, and ligaments.
2. **No Ionizing Radiation:** One of the most significant advantages of MRI is that it does not involve ionizing radiation, making it a safer alternative for repeated imaging, especially in younger patients or those needing longitudinal studies [16].
3. **Multiplanar Imaging:** MRI provides images in multiple planes (axial, sagittal, coronal), allowing clinicians to view the musculoskeletal structures from various orientations. This multiplanar capability is crucial for complex injuries and anatomical relationship assessments.
4. **Detection of Early Pathology:** MRI is capable of identifying pathological changes in early stages, such as cartilage degeneration, bone marrow edema, and subtle ligament injuries, which often go undetected on traditional imaging modalities. [17]

Applications of MRI in Orthopedics

MRI serves a vast array of applications in orthopedics, including the following:

1. **Assessment of Ligament and Tendon Injuries:**
   MRI is the gold standard for diagnosing anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) tears, meniscal injuries, and other ligamentous and tendinous pathologies. The detailed visualization allows for accurate plans for surgical intervention or rehabilitation [18].
2. **Evaluation of Osteochondral Lesions:** MRI is used extensively for characterizing osteochondral lesions, which may lead to

joint dysfunction. By providing insights into the cartilage layer and subchondral bone, MRI helps in planning appropriate treatment options.

3. **Detection of Tumors:** MRI is a critical tool in identifying primary bone tumors and metastatic disease. Its ability to assess the extent of the tumor, its effect on surrounding structures, and vascular involvement is indispensable in treatment planning [18].
4. **Preoperative Planning:** Before commencing surgical procedures such as joint replacements, MRIs help surgeons assess anatomical landmarks, joint space, and any concurrent pathology that may influence surgical outcomes [18].
5. **Evaluation of Arthritis:** In conditions like osteoarthritis and rheumatoid arthritis, MRI aids in the assessment of cartilage loss, bone marrow lesions, and soft tissue involvement. Continuous monitoring of disease progression is facilitated through serial imaging.
6. **Fracture Assessment:** While X-rays are primarily used for fracture diagnosis, MRI helps visualize occult fractures that may not be evident on plain films, such as stress fractures or those associated with significant soft tissue injuries [18].
7. **Assessment of Post-Surgical Changes:** After orthopedic surgeries, MRIs can assess the integrity of repairs, such as tendon reconstructions or joint replacements, providing clinicians with essential information about recovery progress and potential complications [19].

Comparative Accuracy of X-ray and MRI in Diagnosing Orthopedic Injuries:

Orthopedic injuries encompass a wide range of conditions that affect the bones, joints, ligaments, and muscles of the body, often resulting from trauma, overuse, or degenerative processes. Diagnosing these injuries accurately is crucial for effective treatment and rehabilitation, as misdiagnosis can lead to inappropriate management strategies, prolonged recovery times, and ultimately, poorer patient outcomes. Two of the most commonly employed imaging modalities for diagnosing orthopedic injuries are X-ray and Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) [20].

X-ray imaging is a widely used, cost-effective, and readily available diagnostic tool that utilizes ionizing radiation to produce images of dense structures in the body, particularly bones. X-rays are primarily utilized to identify fractures, dislocations, bone tumors, and other bony abnormalities. Their primary strength lies in the ability to visualize cortical bone, allowing for clear identification of breaks and misalignments [20].

The accuracy of X-rays in diagnosing orthopedic injuries is generally high when fractures are present, making them the first-line imaging modality in trauma cases. Studies have shown that conventional X-ray films demonstrate high sensitivity and specificity for detecting acute fractures, often reaching sensitivities greater than 90% in cases involving major traumas. However, the efficacy of X-rays tends to diminish when evaluating non-bony structures, such as ligaments and cartilage, as well as in certain complex anatomical regions [21].

Despite their effectiveness in identifying fractures, X-rays are inherently limited when it comes to soft tissue assessment. Conditions such as ligament tears, tendon injuries, or cartilage damage often require further imaging studies for proper evaluation. Additionally, X-ray images may be affected by factors such as overlapping structures leading to obscured visualization of fractures and limitations in detecting stress fractures or early-stage osteoarthritis.

Furthermore, X-rays present a risk associated with exposure to ionizing radiation, which while minimal for occasional use, can become a concern with repetitive imaging, particularly in younger patients or in situations demanding follow-up evaluations. This necessity for radiation safety considerations can influence the choice of imaging, especially when diagnosing chronic or recurrent orthopedic issues [22].

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) employs a magnetic field and radiofrequency waves to produce detailed images of soft tissues, making it an invaluable tool for orthopedic diagnoses. Unlike X-rays, MRI has a distinct advantage in visualizing not only the bony structures but also the surrounding muscles, ligaments, tendons, and cartilage. This ability helps in evaluating the full extent of an injury, assessing both the skeletal and soft tissue components involved [23] .

MRI is particularly effective in diagnosing conditions such as ligament tears (e.g., anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) injuries), meniscus tears, cartilage damage, and other soft tissue pathologies that are often elusive on X-ray imaging. Studies have indicated that the sensitivity of MRI for detecting ACL tears can exceed 90%, making it a highly reliable option for evaluation in sports medicine and orthopedic trauma [24].

Despite its superior capacity to visualize soft tissues, MRI is not without limitations. First and foremost, it is significantly more expensive and less accessible in comparison to X-ray imaging, which can be a barrier to prompt diagnosis and treatment, particularly in underserved areas or during emergency situations. Additionally, the duration of MRI scans, which can range from 20 minutes to over an hour, may be impractical in urgent settings, where quick decision-making is essential [24].

While MRI does not involve ionizing radiation, it poses other risks, such as limitations for patients with certain implants (e.g., pacemakers or metallic hardware) and potential discomfort caused by claustrophobia during scanning. Additionally, the interpretation of MRI images requires a high level of expertise, as the presence of artifacts could lead to misinterpretation of results [24].

In clinical practice, the choice between X-ray and MRI is often dictated by the nature of the suspected injury, the patient's clinical presentation, and the need for rapid diagnosis. For acute injuries, especially fractures, X-rays remain the gold standard due to their rapid delivery and effectiveness. Conversely, for soft tissue injuries or cases where fractures are suspected but not confirmed through X-ray, MRI serves as a valuable adjunct to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the injury [25].

In noisy clinical environments, studies have shown that a staged approach often emerges as the most effective diagnostic strategy. Initial X-rays are utilized to rule out fractures, allowing for quicker management when results are positive. If concerns regarding soft tissue injuries remain, MRI is then employed for detailed evaluation. This sequential approach not only maximizes the strengths of both imaging techniques but also minimizes unnecessary costs and radiation exposure [25].

Advantages and Limitations of X-ray Imaging in Orthopedic Diagnostics:

X-ray imaging is a foundational tool in the field of medical diagnostics, particularly within the domain of orthopedics. As a diagnostic modality, X-rays utilize radiation to capture images of the internal structures of the body, providing valuable insights into bone integrity, alignment, and the presence of pathologies. Despite the widespread use of X-ray technology, its application comes with both advantages and limitations that orthopedic specialists must navigate to optimize patient outcomes [26].

One of the most significant advantages of X-ray imaging is its non-invasive nature. Unlike surgical procedures or biopsies, X-rays can be performed quickly and without the need for anesthesia and prolonged recovery times. In acute situations, such as trauma cases, instant access to X-ray technology can assist in determining the extent of injuries, enabling timely interventions. The entire process, from patient positioning to image acquisition, usually takes just a few minutes, allowing healthcare providers to make rapid decisions regarding patient care.

X-rays are generally less expensive compared to other imaging modalities such as Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) and Computed Tomography (CT) scans. The cost-effectiveness of X-ray imaging makes it accessible in various healthcare settings, from rural clinics to large hospitals. This financial advantage is critical for patients without health insurance or those relying on limited medical budgets, ensuring that essential diagnostic services are available without prohibitive costs [27].

X-rays excel at visualizing bone abnormalities. Their high sensitivity in detecting fractures, bone degeneration, and joint misalignments aids orthopedic practitioners in diagnosing conditions such as osteoarthritis, bone tumors, and infections. The contrast between dense bone tissue and surrounding soft tissue allows for a clear delineation of orthopedic issues, facilitating appropriate treatment planning and management strategies [28].

X-ray machines are widely available in most healthcare facilities, from hospitals to outpatient clinics. This ubiquity adds a layer of convenience for both patients and providers. In many cases, an X-ray can be obtained on the same day of a patient's visit, expediting the diagnostic process. The integration of digital X-ray imaging has also enhanced accessibility, allowing for immediate viewing, sharing, and archiving of images, which streamlines collaboration among specialists.

The use of X-ray imaging in orthopedics is guided by well-established protocols and norms. These guidelines facilitate standard approaches to image acquisition, interpretation, and reporting, thereby enhancing the reliability of diagnostic findings. Experienced practitioners are well-acquainted with typical presentations of orthopedic conditions on X-rays, making it a familiar and effective tool in their diagnostic arsenal [28].

Limitations of X-Ray Imaging

Despite the numerous advantages, there are notable limitations to X-ray imaging in orthopedic diagnostics that should not be overlooked [29].

1. Limited Soft Tissue Visualization

One of the key drawbacks of X-ray imaging is its inability to effectively visualize soft tissues, including muscles, ligaments, and cartilage. This limitation can impede the accurate assessment of soft tissue injuries or conditions such as tendon tears, ligamental sprains, and cartilage degradation. As such, when a condition is suspected to involve soft tissue, clinicians often need to rely on supplementary imaging techniques, such as MRI, to gain a comprehensive understanding of the injury [29].

2. Radiation Exposure

X-ray imaging involves exposure to ionizing radiation, which raises concerns regarding safety, particularly with repeated imaging. Although the levels of radiation in a single X-ray are generally low and within tolerable limits, cumulative exposure can pose potential health risks over time, particularly in vulnerable populations such as children and pregnant women. This necessitates careful consideration and justification for each imaging exam to minimize unnecessary radiation exposure, adhering to the principle of ALARA (As Low As Reasonably Achievable) [29].

3. Two-Dimensional Representation

X-ray images provide a two-dimensional view of three-dimensional structures. Consequently, overlapping bones and pathologies can obscure critical diagnostic information. In complex cases, such as assessing certain fractures or bone deformities, a two-dimensional view may be insufficient. As a result, additional imaging techniques may be required to clarify ambiguous findings, contributing to delays in diagnosis and treatment [30].

4. Interpretation Variability

While X-ray interpretation is generally standardized, it remains an inherently subjective process. Variability in the expertise of radiologists and orthopedic surgeons can lead to differing interpretations of the same X-ray image. Misinterpretations can result in inappropriate treatments, additional unnecessary procedures, or delayed diagnoses, ultimately affecting patient care adversely [31].

5. Limited Functional Assessment

X-rays are static images that do not provide information about the functional status of joints or the biomechanics of movement. Conditions such as instability or functional impairment may not be adequately reflected on X-ray films. In such cases, additional assessments—such as stress X-rays or dynamic imaging techniques—may be necessary to comprehensively evaluate a patient's orthopedic condition [32].

Benefits and Challenges of MRI in Orthopedic Evaluation:

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) has emerged as one of the most valuable imaging techniques in orthopedic evaluation, transforming how medical professionals diagnose and treat musculoskeletal disorders. As a non-invasive method that does not expose patients to ionizing radiation, MRI provides detailed images of soft tissues, cartilages, ligaments, and tendons, allowing for comprehensive assessments of a wide range of orthopedic conditions. However, despite its advantages, MRI is not without its challenges [33].

Benefits of MRI in Orthopedic Evaluation

1. **Superior Soft Tissue Analysis**: One of the most significant advantages of MRI over other imaging modalities is its superior capability to visualize soft tissues. Unlike X-rays and CT scans, which excel in depicting bone structures, MRI provides exceptional detail regarding muscles, ligaments, tendons, and cartilage. This specificity is critical in diagnosing conditions such as tears, strains, and other soft tissue injuries. For instance, in cases of rotator cuff tears or meniscal injuries, MRI helps to determine the extent and precise location of the damage, facilitating tailored treatment plans [33].

2. **Non-Invasive and Radiation-Free**: Being a non-invasive technique, MRI poses minimal risk to patients. It does not use ionizing radiation, making it a safer option, especially for vulnerable populations like children and pregnant women. The absence of radiation exposure also makes MRI a preferred choice for repetitive imaging in chronic conditions, as patients may require multiple scans over time to monitor their ailments [34].

3. **Multiplanar Imaging Capabilities**: MRI provides the unique advantage of acquiring images in multiple planes (axial, coronal, and sagittal) without needing repositioning. This versatility allows clinicians to obtain comprehensive views of the affected area, which is particularly beneficial for intricate joint structures. In the evaluation of complex orthopedic conditions, such as multi-directional instability of the shoulder, this capability enhances diagnostic accuracy [34].

4. **Ability to Assess Bone Marrow Changes**: MRI is adept at visualizing bone marrow edema, an important indicator of various conditions. In cases of osteomyelitis, tumors, or stress fractures, changes in the bone marrow can be detected much earlier than through traditional imaging methods. This early detection allows clinicians to initiate treatment promptly, potentially preventing further complications.

5. **Functional Imaging**: Beyond structural assessment, MRI can incorporate advanced techniques like functional imaging, such as MR arthrograms or dynamic imaging during motion, to evaluate joint function and capture pathology that may not be evident at rest. Such methods enhance diagnostic precision in cases of dynamic instability [35].

Challenges of MRI in Orthopedic Evaluation

1. **Cost and Accessibility**: One of the foremost challenges of MRI is its relatively high cost compared to other imaging modalities. The price of MRI scans necessitates careful consideration by healthcare providers and may limit access for some patients, particularly in economically disadvantaged populations. Moreover, in some regions, the availability of MRI machines may be scarce, leading to long wait times for patients seeking evaluations [36].

2. **Patient Compatibility**: While MRI is largely safe, there are specific patient populations that present particular challenges. The presence of contraindications, such as ferromagnetic implants (certain types of pacemakers, cochlear implants, etc.), can preclude patients from undergoing MRI. Additionally, patients suffering from claustrophobia or anxiety may find it difficult to remain still during the scan, thus complicating the imaging process and potentially requiring sedation [37].

3. **Artifact and Motion Sensitivity**: MRI images can be affected by artifacts caused by patient movement, hardware, or metal implants. Such artifacts can obscure critical anatomical details and may lead to misinterpretation of images. In orthopedic evaluations, where precision is essential, these artifacts may hinder accurate diagnosis and appropriate treatment decisions [38].

4. **Interpretation Expertise**: The interpretation of MRI scans requires specialized training and experience. Unlike X-rays, which can often be evaluated by

general practitioners, accurate MRI interpretation typically falls under the purview of radiologists and orthopedic specialists. This reliance on expert interpretation can create bottlenecks and delay diagnosis and treatment when specialist referral or consultation is necessary [39].

5. **Overreliance and False Positives**: With the increasing availability and use of MRI, there is a risk of overreliance on this imaging modality. In some cases, incidental findings that appear on MRIs may not correlate with the actual clinical problem, leading to unnecessary procedures, treatments, and patient anxiety. The challenge lies in discerning clinically relevant findings from incidentalomas to prevent potential overtreatment [39].

Cost-Effectiveness of X-ray versus MRI in Orthopedic Care:

In the realm of orthopedic care, a critical aspect of diagnosis and treatment planning involves imaging modalities. X-ray and Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) are two of the most commonly used imaging techniques, each with its own advantages, limitations, and associated costs. The cost-effectiveness of these imaging modalities is essential for healthcare providers and institutions to determine, especially in an era of rising healthcare costs and the demand for efficient resource allocation [40].

X-ray imaging is a quick, widely available, and cost-effective method of capturing images of bones and certain types of soft tissue. It utilizes ionizing radiation to create images that assist in the diagnosis of fractures, dislocations, and some conditions affecting the joints and bone structures. The prevalence and convenience of X-rays make them a first-line diagnostic tool in orthopedic settings [40].

In contrast, MRI employs powerful magnets and radio waves to generate detailed images of soft tissues, including muscles, ligaments, cartilage, and nerves as well as bones. MRI does not utilize ionizing radiation, making it a safer alternative for certain patient populations. However, the procedure is more time-consuming, requires more expensive equipment, and generally incurs higher operational costs [41].

From a strictly economic perspective, X-ray is significantly less expensive than MRI. The average cost of an X-ray can range from $100 to $1,000, depending on the complexity, the type of view required, and geographical location. On the other hand, MRI costs can range from $1,000 to $3,000 per scan. Factors influencing MRI costs include the need for specialized equipment, the professional expertise required to interpret the images, and the extended time necessary for scanning and processing the results [41].

The stark difference in costs does not capture the whole picture, as other factors also come into play when assessing cost-effectiveness. The cost of each imaging modality should also be considered relative to its diagnostic utility and the subsequent impact on patient management. For example, if a more expensive MRI scan can accurately diagnose a condition that would lead to an effective and timely treatment plan, the initial higher cost may be justified by the potential for improved health outcomes and reduced long-term costs related to complications or extended recovery times [42].

One of the most critical aspects of evaluating the cost-effectiveness of imaging modalities is their diagnostic accuracy. While X-rays excel in visualizing bone-related conditions, their ability to detect soft tissue injuries is limited. Consequently, if a clinician suspects a ligament tear or cartilage damage, reliance solely on X-ray can lead to misdiagnosis or delayed treatment, which may result in increased medical costs related to further imaging or prolonged patient suffering.

MRI, with its highly detailed imaging capabilities, provides a comprehensive view of soft tissues and is often the go-to tool for diagnosing complex musculoskeletal conditions. This advanced diagnostic capability can lead to earlier and more accurate treatment interventions, potentially resulting in more favorable clinical outcomes for patients. Such accuracy can diminish the need for repeat imaging and reduce overall healthcare expenditure [43].

Moreover, accurate diagnoses can expedite rehabilitation and return-to-work timelines, thus alleviating associated socio-economic burdens. A study evaluating the cost-effectiveness of MRI in the diagnosis of knee injuries indicated that while the upfront costs were higher, the quicker and more precise diagnosis resulted in overall lower costs when factoring in follow-up treatments and recovery times [44].

The choice between X-ray and MRI also has implications on patient management strategies. In orthopedic care, proper imaging can significantly alter treatment protocols. For instance, an accurate diagnosis of a fracture through X-ray may lead to orthopedic immobilization, while an unclear diagnosis may warrant further imaging with MRI, extending the timeline for appropriate treatment [45].

Moreover, healthcare providers must consider patient safety and comfort when choosing imaging modalities. The lack of ionizing radiation in MRI scans presents a significant advantage when dealing with pediatric populations or patients requiring repeated imaging, such as those with chronic conditions. This safety profile not only enhances patient experience but also contributes to long-term cost savings by reducing the risk of radiation-induced complications [46].

Conclusion and Future Directions in Diagnostic Imaging for Orthopedic Conditions:

The field of orthopedic medicine has undergone a significant transformation over the past few decades, largely due to advancements in diagnostic imaging techniques. The ability to visualize, diagnose, and monitor musculoskeletal disorders through imaging has not only enhanced the accuracy of diagnoses but has also improved treatment planning, patient outcomes, and overall clinical efficiency [47].

Current State of Diagnostic Imaging in Orthopedics

Diagnostic imaging encompasses a variety of modalities, each with its unique strengths and application contexts. The primary imaging techniques employed in orthopedics include X-ray, computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), ultrasound, and nuclear medicine imaging [48].

1. **X-Ray:** As one of the most commonly used imaging modalities, X-rays are the first-line investigation for many orthopedic conditions. They are highly effective for assessing bone integrity, detecting fractures, and identifying degenerative changes such as arthritis. However, X-rays have limitations in visualizing soft tissues, making follow-up imaging necessary for comprehensive assessments.
2. **CT:** Computed tomography offers detailed cross-sectional images of the body and excels in assessing complex fractures, particularly in areas like the pelvis and spine. CT scans are especially valuable in pre-surgical planning and providing detailed anatomical insights, although they expose patients to higher doses of radiation compared to conventional X-rays [48].
3. **MRI:** Magnetic resonance imaging has revolutionized the evaluation of soft tissue structures, including ligaments, tendons, cartilage, and muscles. MRI's superior contrast resolution provides critical information in diagnosing conditions such as tears, inflammations, and tumors. Despite being more expensive and time-consuming than other modalities, MRI remains indispensable in orthopedic assessments.
4. **Ultrasound:** This modality has gained traction in orthopedic imaging due to its real-time imaging capabilities and lack of ionizing radiation. It is frequently utilized for guiding injections, evaluating soft tissue injuries, and monitoring conditions like tendonitis. Advances in portable ultrasound devices have further enhanced its applicability in outpatient and sports medicine settings [49].
5. **Nuclear Medicine Imaging:** While not routinely used for specific orthopedic conditions, nuclear imaging modalities such as bone scans play a pivotal role in detecting metastatic diseases, inflammatory processes, and occult fractures. Their role is particularly crucial in complex cases where traditional imaging fails to provide conclusive results [50].

Key Conclusions Derived from Advancements in Imaging Techniques

The evolving landscape of diagnostic imaging in orthopedics brings forth several conclusions:

- **Multimodal Imaging Approach:** One notable trend is the increased reliance on multimodal imaging strategies. By combining different imaging modalities, clinicians can leverage the strengths of each to obtain a more comprehensive view of the condition at hand. For instance, using MRI to evaluate soft tissue injuries alongside X-ray imaging to assess bony structures provides valuable diagnostic insights [51].

- **Personalized Imaging Protocols:** The customization of imaging protocols based on individual patient characteristics, clinical history, and specific conditions is emerging as a paradigm shift. This personalized approach aims to enhance the utility of imaging studies while minimizing unnecessary exposure to radiation and reducing healthcare costs [52].
- **Integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI):** The advent of AI in medical imaging holds immense promise for the orthopedic field. AI algorithms can assist in interpreting images, identifying abnormalities, and predicting outcomes. These tools can augment radiologist efforts, streamline workflows, and improve diagnostic accuracy. The early integration of AI-driven applications is indicative of a larger trend toward increased automation in image analysis [53].
- **Emphasis on Point-of-Care Imaging:** The growing use of point-of-care ultrasound devices allows for rapid bedside assessments, facilitating quicker decision-making and immediate therapeutic interventions. This trend is particularly relevant in emergency and sports medicine, where timely diagnosis is critical [54].

Future Directions in Diagnostic Imaging for Orthopedic Conditions

As technology and methodologies continue to evolve, several promising directions may further shape the future of diagnostic imaging in orthopedics:

1. **Enhanced Imaging Techniques:** The ongoing enhancement of existing imaging modalities, such as the development of high-resolution MRI sequences and CT scans with lower radiation doses, will continue to refine diagnostic precision. The introduction of hybrid imaging, such as positron emission tomography (PET) combined with CT or MRI, may lead to significant breakthroughs in assessing complex orthopedic issues [55].
2. **AI and Machine Learning Innovations:** As data sets grow, AI and machine learning technologies are likely to become more integrated into diagnostic workflows. Continued development in image recognition, diagnostics, and predictive analytics will further augment personalized imaging protocols and diagnosis, improving patient outcomes through early detection and intervention [56].
3. **Telemedicine Implications:** The ongoing integration of telemedicine in healthcare will push for remote diagnostics and virtual consultations, including the evaluation of diagnostic images. This will provide real-time support for clinicians in rural or underserved areas, disseminating expertise and enhancing access to orthopaedic care [57].
4. **Patient-Centric Approaches:** As patients play an increasingly active role in their healthcare decisions, there will be a push toward patient-centered imaging practices. Involvement in shared decision-making regarding imaging choices, awareness of risks, and discussing the implications of findings will become standard practice [58].
5. **Regulatory and Ethical Considerations:** With any burgeoning technology, there comes a necessity to address regulatory and ethical concerns. Ensuring data privacy, the integrity of AI model training, and standards for telemedicine practices will be paramount in fostering safe and effective use of imaging technologies in orthopedics [59].

Conclusion:

The comparative analysis of X-ray and MRI in diagnosing orthopedic conditions highlights the strengths and limitations of each imaging modality, underscoring the need for an integrated approach in patient evaluation. X-rays remain a fundamental tool for initial assessments due to their speed, accessibility, and efficacy in visualizing bony structures, making them invaluable for diagnosing fractures, dislocations, and certain bone pathologies. However, their inability to adequately assess soft tissues and subtle changes in bone integrity necessitates further imaging in complex cases.

MRI, on the other hand, excels in providing detailed information about soft tissue structures, including ligaments, tendons, and cartilage, thus enabling the accurate diagnosis of conditions not visible on X-rays. While the cost and time required for MRI scans may pose challenges, its non-invasive nature and lack of ionizing radiation make it a safer option, particularly for patients requiring ongoing monitoring. Ultimately, the optimal management of orthopedic conditions lies in utilizing both modalities effectively, with X-ray serving as the initial screening tool and MRI providing comprehensive insights for complex diagnoses. Future advancements in imaging technology and techniques may further enhance diagnostic accuracy and efficiency, leading to improved patient outcomes in orthopedic care.

References:

1. Hunter DJ, Zhang YQ, Tu X, Lavalley M, Niu JB, Amin S, et al. Change in joint space width: hyaline articular cartilage loss or alteration in meniscus? Arthritis Rheum. 2006;54(8):2488–95. doi: 10.1002/art.22016.
2. Zhang W, Doherty M, Peat G, Bierma-Zeinstra MA, Arden NK, Bresnihan B, et al. EULAR evidence-based recommendations for the diagnosis of knee osteoarthritis. Ann Rheum Dis. 2010;69(3):483–9. doi: 10.1136/ard.2009.113100.
3. Madan-Sharma R, Watt I, Bloem JL, Kruijsen MW, Marijnissen AC, Meulenbelt I, et al. Characteristics at magnetic resonance imaging of knees of a healthy population compared to knees with early osteoarthritis-related complaints: the CHECK cohort. RSNA. 2009 LL-MK2083-R02.
4. Recht MP, Kramer J, Marcelis S, Pathria MN, Trudell D, Haghighi P, et al. Abnormalities of articular cartilage in the knee: analysis of available MR techniques. Radiology. 1993;187(2):473–8. doi: 10.1148/radiology.187.2.8475293.
5. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control Clin Trials. 1986;7(3):177–88. doi: 10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2.
6. Li KC, Higgs J, Aisen AM, Buckwalter KA, Martel W, McCune WJ. MRI in osteoarthritis of the hip: gradations of severity. Magn Reson Imaging. 1988;6(3):229–36. doi: 10.1016/0730-725x(88)90396-7.
7. Heinegard D, Saxne T. The role of the cartilage matrix in osteoarthritis. Nat Rev Rheumatol. 2011;7(1):50–6. doi: 10.1038/nrrheum.2010.198.
8. Disler DG, McCauley TR, Kelman CG, Fuchs MD, Ratner LM, Wirth CR, et al. Fat-suppressed three-dimensional spoiled gradient-echo MR imaging of hyaline cartilage defects in the knee: comparison with standard MR imaging and arthroscopy. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 1996;167(1):127–32. doi: 10.2214/ajr.167.1.8659356.
9. Hunter D, Arden N, Conaghan PG, Eckstein F, Gold G, Grainger A, et al. Definition of osteoarthritis on MRI: results of a Delphi exercise. Osteoarthr Cartilage. 2011 doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2011.04.017.
10. Guccione AA, Felson DT, Anderson JJ, Anthony JM, Zhang Y, Wilson PW, et al. The effects of specific medical conditions on the functional limitations of elders in the Framingham Study. Am J Public Health. 1994;84(3):351–8. doi: 10.2105/ajph.84.3.351.
11. Schiphof D, Boers M, Bierma-Zeinstra SM. Differences in descriptions of Kellgren and Lawrence grades of knee osteoarthritis. Ann Rheum Dis. 2008;67(7):1034–6. doi: 10.1136/ard.2007.079020.
12. Hanley JA, McNeil BJ. The meaning and use of the area under a receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. Radiology. 1982;143(1):29–36. doi: 10.1148/radiology.143.1.7063747.

13. Eckstein F, Burstein D, Link TM. Quantitative MRI of cartilage and bone: degenerative changes in osteoarthritis. NMR Biomed. 2006;19(7):822–54. doi: 10.1002/nbm.1063.

14. Reichenbach S, Guermazi A, Niu J, Neogi T, Hunter DJ, Roemer FW, et al. Prevalence of bone attrition on knee radiographs and MRI in a community-based cohort. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2008;16(9):1005–10. doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2008.02.001.

15. Downs SH, Black N. The feasibility of creating a checklist for the assessment of the methodological quality both of randomised and non-randomised studies of health care interventions. J Epidemiol Community Health. 1998;52(6):377–84. doi: 10.1136/jech.52.6.377.

16. Hodler J, Haghighi P, Pathria MN, Trudell D, Resnick D. Meniscal changes in the elderly: correlation of MR imaging and histologic findings. Radiology. 1992;184(1):221–5. doi: 10.1148/radiology.184.1.1609084.

17. Marsh M., Souza R.B., Wyman B.T. Differences between X-ray and MRI-determined knee cartilage thickness in weight-bearing and non-weight-bearing conditions. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2013;21(12):1876–1885. doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2013.09.006.

18. Ahlback S. Osteoarthrosis of the knee. A radiographic investigation. Acta Radiol Diagn. 1968;(Suppl 277):7–72.

19. Wirth W., Duryea J., Hellio Le Graverand M.P. Direct comparison of fixed flexion, radiography and MRI in knee osteoarthritis: responsiveness data from the Osteoarthritis Initiative. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2013;21(1):117–125. doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2012.10.017.

20. Kellgren J.H., Lawrence J.S. Radiological assessment of osteo-arthrosis. Ann Rheum Dis. 1957;16(4):494–502. doi: 10.1136/ard.16.4.494.

21. Papernick S., Dima R., Gillies D.J., Appleton C.T., Fenster A. Reliability and concurrent validity of three-dimensional ultrasound for quantifying knee cartilage volume. Osteoarthritis and Cartilage Open. 2020:100127. doi: 10.1016/j.ocarto.2020.100127.

22. Mortensen J.F., Kappel A., Østgaard S.E., Rasmussen L.E., Odgaard A. 2021. The Rosenberg View Compared to Coronal Stress Views for Measurements of Articular Cartilage Height in Knees with Osteoarthritis. Unpublished.

23. Vasso M., Antoniadis A., Helmy N. Update on unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: current indications and failure modes. EFORT open reviews. 2018;3(8):442–448. doi: 10.1302/2058-5241.3.170060.

24. Hamilton T.W., Pandit H.G., Lombardi A.V. Radiological Decision Aid to determine suitability for medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: development and preliminary validation. The bone & joint journal. 2016;98-b(10 Supple B):3–10. doi: 10.1302/0301-620x.98b10.bjj-2016-0432.r1.

25. Kottner J., Audige L., Brorson S. Guidelines for reporting reliability and agreement studies (GRRAS) were proposed. J Clin Epidemiol. 2011;64(1):96–106. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.03.002.

26. Schober P., Boer C., Schwarte L.A. Correlation coefficients: appropriate use and interpretation. Anesth Analg. 2018;126(5):1763–1768. doi: 10.1213/ane.0000000000002864.

27. von Elm E., Altman D.G., Egger M., Pocock S.J., Gøtzsche P.C., Vandenbroucke J.P. The strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. Int J Surg. 2014;12(12):1495–1499. doi: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2014.07.013.

28. Landis J.R., Koch G.G. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. Biometrics. 1977;33(1):159–174.

29. Aagesen A.L., Melek M. Choosing the right diagnostic imaging modality in musculoskeletal diagnosis. Prim Care. 2013;40(4):849–861. doi: 10.1016/j.pop.2013.08.005.

30. Rosenberg T.D., Paulos L.E., Parker R.D., Coward D.B., Scott S.M. The forty-five-degree

posteroanterior flexion weight-bearing radiograph of the knee. The Journal of bone and joint surgery. American volume. 1988;70(10):1479–1483.

31. Inglis D.P.D., Pui M.M.D., Ioannidis G.M.S. Accuracy and test–retest precision of quantitative cartilage morphology on a 1.0 T peripheral magnetic resonance imaging system. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2006;15(1):110–115. doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2006.08.006.

32. Bland J.M., Altman D.G. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. Lancet (London, England) 1986;1(8476):307–310.

33. Mortensen J.F., Kappel A., Østgaard S.E., Rasmussen L.E., Odgaard A. 2021. The Rosenberg View Compared to Coronal Stress Views for Measurements of Articular Cartilage Height in Knees with Osteoarthritis. Unpublished.

34. Zhang Y, Mandelli F, Mündermann A, Nüesch C, Kovacs B, Schären S, et al. Association between fatty infiltration of paraspinal muscle, sagittal spinopelvic alignment and stenosis grade in patients with degenerative lumbar spinal stenosis. N Am Spine Soc J. (2021) 5:100054. 10.1016/j.xnsj.2021.100054.

35. Yasuhara T, Sasada S, Date I. Lumbar degenerative disease: key for diagnosis. No Shinkei Geka. (2021) 49(6):1233–45, (in Japanese). 10.11477/mf.1436204510.

36. Kim HJ, Yang JH, Chang DG, Suh SW, Jo H, Kim SI, et al. Impact of preoperative total knee arthroplasty on radiological and clinical outcomes of spinal fusion for concurrent knee osteoarthritis and degenerative lumbar spinal diseases. J Clin Med. (2021) 10(19):4475. 10.3390/jcm10194475.

37. Hasegawa K, Okamoto M, Hatsushikano S, Shimoda H, Sato Y, Watanabe K. Etiology and clinical manifestations of double-level versus single-level lumbar degenerative spondylolisthesis. J Orthop Sci. (2020) 25(5):812–9. 10.1016/j.jos.2019.11.004.

38. Hasegawa K, Okamoto M, Hatsushikano S, Shimoda H, Sato Y, Watanabe K. Etiology and clinical manifestations of double-level versus single-level lumbar degenerative spondylolisthesis. J Orthop Sci. (2020) 25(5):812–9. 10.1016/j.jos.2019.11.004.

39. Li J, Zhang D, Shen Y, Qi X. Lumbar degenerative disease after oblique lateral interbody fusion: sagittal spinopelvic alignment and its impact on low back pain. J Orthop Surg Res. (2020) 15(1):326. 10.1186/s13018-020-01837-w.

40. Lord EL, Ayres E, Woo D, Vasquez-Montes D, Parekh Y, Jain D, et al. The impact of global alignment and proportion score and bracing on proximal junctional kyphosis in adult spinal deformity. Global Spine J. (2021):21925682211001812. 10.1177/21925682211001812.

41. Kim WJ, Shin HM, Lee JS, Song DG, Lee JW, Chang SH, et al. Sarcopenia and back muscle degeneration as risk factors for degenerative adult spinal deformity with sagittal imbalance and degenerative spinal disease: a comparative study. World Neurosurg. (2021) 148:e547–55. 10.1016/j.wneu.2021.01.053.

42. Oikonomidis S, Meyer C, Scheyerer MJ, Grevenstein D, Eysel P, Bredow J. Lumbar spinal fusion of low-grade degenerative spondylolisthesis (Meyerding grade I and II): do reduction and correction of the radiological sagittal parameters correlate with better clinical outcome? Arch Orthop Trauma Surg. (2020) 140(9):1155–62. 10.1007/s00402-019-03282-9.

43. Benditz A, Boluki D, Weber M, Zeman F, Grifka J, Völlner F. Comparison of lumbar lordosis in lateral radiographs in standing position with supine MR imaging in consideration of the sacral slope. Rofo. (2017) 189(3):233–9, English. 10.1055/s-0042-120112.

44. Sun Z, Zhou S, Wang W, Zou D, Li W. Differences in standing and sitting spinopelvic sagittal alignment for patients with posterior lumbar fusion: important considerations for the changes of unfused adjacent segments lordosis. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. (2020) 21(1):760. 10.1186/s12891-020-03777-2.

45. Diebo BG, Henry J, Lafage V, Berjano P. Sagittal deformities of the spine: factors influencing the outcomes and complications. Eur Spine J. (2015) 24(Suppl 1):S3–15. 10.1007/s00586-014-3653-8.

46. Ravindra VM, Senglaub SS, Rattani A, Dewan MC, Härtl R, Bisson E, et al. Degenerative lumbar spine disease: estimating global incidence and worldwide volume. Global Spine J. (2018) 8(8):784–94. 10.1177/2192568218770769.

47. Lippi L, de Sire A, Desilvestri M, Baricich A, Barbanera A, Cattalani A, et al.

48. Kawahara Y, Uetani M, Nakahara N, Doiguchi Y, Nishiguchi M, Futagawa S, et al. Fast spin-echo MR of the articular cartilage in the osteoarthrotic knee. Correlation of MR and arthroscopic findings. Acta Radiol. 1998;39(2):120–5. doi: 10.1080/02841859809172164.

49. Thambyah A, Broom N. On new bone formation in the pre-osteoarthritic joint. Osteoarthritis and Cartilage. 2009;17(4):456–63. doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2008.09.005.

50. Mutimer J, Green J, Field J. Comparison of MRI and wrist arthroscopy for assessment of wrist cartilage. J Hand Surg Eur Vol. 2008;33(3):380–2. doi: 10.1177/1753193408090395.

51. Saadat E, Jobke B, Chu B, Lu Y, Cheng J, Li X, et al. Diagnostic performance of in vivo 3-T MRI for articular cartilage abnormalities in human osteoarthritic knees using histology as standard of reference. Eur Radiol. 2008;18(10):2292–302. doi: 10.1007/s00330-008-0989-7.

52. Oda H, Igarashi M, Sase H, Sase T, Yamamoto S. Bone bruise in magnetic resonance imaging strongly correlates with the production of joint effusion and with knee osteoarthritis. J Orthop Sci. 2008;13(1):7–15. doi: 10.1007/s00776-007-1195-1.

53. Yoshioka H, Stevens K, Hargreaves BA, Steines D, Genovese M, Dillingham MF, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging of articular cartilage of the knee: comparison between fat-suppressed three-dimensional SPGR imaging, fat-suppressed FSE imaging, and fat-suppressed three-dimensional DEFT imaging, and correlation with arthroscopy. J Magn Reson Imaging. 2004;20(5):857–64. doi: 10.1002/jmri.20193.

54. Plotz GM, Brossmann J, Schunke M, Heller M, Kurz B, Hassenpflug J. Magnetic resonance arthrography of the acetabular labrum. Macroscopic and histological correlation in 20 cadavers. J Bone Joint Surg Br. 2000;82(3):426–32. doi: 10.1302/0301-620x.82b3.10215.

55. Bruyere O, Genant H, Kothari M, Zaim S, White D, Peterfy C, et al. Longitudinal study of magnetic resonance imaging and standard X-rays to assess disease progression in osteoarthritis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2007;15(1):98–103. doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2006.06.018.

56. Trattnig S, Huber M, Breitenseher MJ, Trnka HJ, Rand T, Kaider A, et al. Imaging articular cartilage defects with 3D fat-suppressed echo planar imaging: comparison with conventional 3D fat-suppressed gradient echo sequence and correlation with histology. J Comput Assist Tomogr. 1998;22(1):8–14. doi: 10.1097/00004728-199801000-00002.

57. Li W, Du H, Scheidegger R, Wu Y, Prasad PV. Value of precontrast T(1) for dGEMRIC of native articular cartilage. J Magn Reson Imaging. 2009;29(2):494–7. doi: 10.1002/jmri.21658.

58. Uhl M, Allmann KH, Tauer U, Laubenberger J, Adler CP, Ihling C, et al. Comparison of MR sequences in quantifying in vitro cartilage degeneration in osteoarthritis of the knee. Br J Radiol. 1998;71(843):291–6. doi: 10.1259/bjr.71.843.9616238.

59. Bachmann GF, Basad E, Rauber K, Damian MS, Rau WS. Degenerative joint disease on MRI and physical activity: a clinical study of the knee joint in 320 patients. Eur Radiol. 1999;9(1):145–52. doi: 10.1007/s003300050646.