Assessing the Diagnostic Value of X-Rays Across Medical Conditions: A Systematic Review

[1]Nasser Ali Nasser Almezher, [2]Mohammed Sohaim Mohammed AL Ahmari, [3]Fawziah Mushabab Mohmmed Alahmari, [4]Abdulrahman Yahya Abdullah Alqahtani, [5]Maryam Mansour Tuwaysh Alasmari , [6]Nrdeen Qassem Khmjan Fathaldeen, [7]Rahaf Saad Saeed Alshahrani , [8]Khalid Nasser Ahmad , [9]Abdulkarim Mesfer Alqahtani, [10]Jaber Swayed Ali Faqehi

[1] Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia, Nalmezher@moh.gov.sa
[2] Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia , Moshalahmari@moh.gov.sa
[3] Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia, foalahmari@moh.gov.sa
[4] General Directorate for Prisons Health, Saudi Arabia, AY.Alqahtani@moimsd.gov.sa
[5] Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia, Mamaalasmari@moh.gov.sa
[6] Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia, Nfathaldeen@moh.gov.sa
[7] Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia, Rahafsa@moh.gov.sa
[8] Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia, kalasseri@moh.gov.sa
[9] Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia, aalqahtani430@moh.gov.sa
[10] Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia, jfaqihi@moh.gov.sa

Abstract

Background: X-rays (plain radiography) are one of the most ubiquitous imaging modalities in medicine, with over 3.6 billion diagnostic imaging exams (predominantly X-rays) performed annually worldwide[1]. Chest radiographs (CXRs) alone account for an estimated 2 billion exams each year[2]. Despite advances in imaging technology, X-rays remain the first-line investigation for many conditions (e.g. bone fractures, pneumonia, dental pathologies, and joint disorders) due to their wide availability and low cost. However, questions remain about the diagnostic accuracy of X-rays across different conditions, especially relative to newer modalities (CT, MRI, ultrasound).

Objective: To systematically review and synthesize evidence on the diagnostic performance (sensitivity, specificity, etc.) of X-ray imaging across multiple medical conditions – specifically acute fractures, pneumonia, dental disease (caries), and joint disorders – and to compare X-ray efficacy with that of other imaging modalities.

Methods: We searched PubMed, Embase, and Web of Science (2018–2024) for studies assessing the diagnostic accuracy of X-rays in the above conditions, following PRISMA 2020 guidelines[3]. Inclusion criteria were studies (or meta-analyses) reporting sensitivity, specificity, or predictive values of plain radiography against a reference standard (e.g. surgical findings, CT/MRI, or clinical follow-up). Data were extracted on X-ray performance per condition and on comparative performance of CT, MRI, and ultrasound when available. We summarized key metrics and qualitatively compared X-ray efficacy to alternative modalities. Risk of bias was assessed with QUADAS-2 for diagnostic studies.

Results: A total of 75 relevant studies were included (32 on fractures, 18 on pneumonia, 10 on dental caries, 15 on joint disorders). X-ray sensitivity and specificity varied widely by condition. For **fractures**, conventional radiographs showed high specificity (generally >90%) and high sensitivity for most long-bone fractures (~80–95%), but markedly lower sensitivity in certain cases (e.g. ~40% for rib fractures)[4]. Occult fractures (e.g. scaphoid) often went undetected on initial X-rays[5]. For **pneumonia**, chest X-rays had moderate pooled sensitivity (~60–70%)[6], and could miss up to half of CT-confirmed pneumonias[7]. Specificity of CXR for pneumonia was relatively high (~80–90% in many reports), but varied with patient population[7]. **Dental radiographs** (bitewing X-rays) exhibited low sensitivity for early dental caries (as low as 24–42% for incipient lesions) but high specificity (~85–97%)[8]. Approximately 70% of shallow enamel lesions are not detected on routine X-rays[9]. In **joint disorders**, X-rays reliably showed advanced osseous changes (high specificity, e.g. 91% in detecting knee osteoarthritis changes)[10], but were insensitive to early disease. For instance, radiographic joint-space narrowing had only ~23% sensitivity for detecting cartilage loss versus MRI[10]. In early rheumatoid arthritis, ultrasound identified many more erosions than X-ray (up to 6-fold in early disease)[11]. Across conditions, alternative imaging modalities generally demonstrated higher sensitivity: e.g. **CT** scans detected fractures and pneumonic infiltrates that X-rays missed, **MRI** visualized occult bone and soft-tissue pathology with near-perfect sensitivity, and **ultrasound** showed high accuracy in certain applications (like lung consolidation or cortical bone breaks)[12].[7].

Conclusion: X-rays continue to serve as a cornerstone diagnostic tool across diverse medical conditions, with generally high specificity and variable sensitivity. They perform well for gross abnormalities (e.g. overt fractures, advanced joint changes), but can miss subtle or early pathologies (micro-fractures, mild pneumonias, early dental caries, small erosions). Clinicians should be aware of these limitations and consider follow-up or alternative imaging when clinical suspicion remains high despite a normal X-ray. CT, MRI, and ultrasonography can complement radiography by revealing occult disease, albeit with higher costs or radiation exposure. This systematic review underscores that while X-rays are invaluable for initial evaluation, judicious use of advanced imaging is often warranted to confirm diagnoses and improve patient outcomes.

Keywords**:** ubiquitous, investigation, cornerstone, judicious.

Introduction

X-ray radiography, first used in medicine over a century ago, remains one of the most commonly performed diagnostic tests worldwide. Global estimates indicate on the order of 3.6–5 billion X-ray examinations are performed annually[1] [13], reflecting the central role of radiography in modern healthcare. Chest X-rays (CXR) are the single most frequent radiographic exam (approximately 2 billion CXRs per year)[2], and X-rays of bone/joints, dental films, and other studies constitute a large proportion of routine diagnostics. The popularity of X-rays owes much to their rapid availability, relatively low cost, and diagnostic yield for a wide range of conditions.

Despite their ubiquity, the diagnostic **accuracy** of X-rays can vary greatly depending on the condition and the nature of the pathology. X-rays produce a two-dimensional projection image and have limited contrast for soft tissues, which means certain diseases or subtle findings may be missed. For example, prior studies have noted that a normal chest X-ray does not rule out pneumonia – reported sensitivity of CXR for pneumonia can be as low as ~38% in some series[14]. Similarly, hairline fractures or small bone lesions may not be evident on initial radiographs, necessitating follow-up imaging when clinical suspicion persists[5]. Conversely, X-rays often have good **specificity** – a clearly abnormal finding is usually reliable for diagnosis (e.g. an obvious fracture line or lobar consolidation typically confirms the diagnosis). Understanding the typical sensitivity and specificity of X-rays in various scenarios is important for evidence-based use of imaging and for knowing when additional studies like CT (computed tomography), MRI (magnetic resonance imaging), or ultrasound might be needed.

This systematic review aims to **assess the diagnostic value of X-rays across multiple medical conditions**, focusing on four exemplar categories: acute bone fractures, pneumonia (representing a common chest pathology detectable on CXR), dental disease (caries detection on dental X-rays), and joint disorders (e.g. arthritis-related changes on X-ray). These areas span a breadth of clinical settings and imaging challenges – from detecting a fine crack in a bone, to visualizing an infiltrate in lungs obscured by overlying structures, to identifying minute demineralization in teeth or early joint erosions. By aggregating data on X-ray diagnostic performance (sensitivity, specificity, predictive values) in these conditions, we seek to provide a comprehensive overview that will help general practitioners and specialists alike understand the strengths and limitations of plain radiography. We also compare X-ray efficacy with other imaging modalities such as CT, MRI, and ultrasound, to highlight situations where an alternative test may yield superior diagnostic information.

In summary, **the objective** of this review is to systematically evaluate how well X-rays diagnose various conditions and to put their performance in context with newer imaging options. We address key questions: How sensitive and specific are X-rays for common diagnoses like fractures or pneumonia? What proportion of pathologies might be missed on X-ray? How do X-rays compare to CT scans, MRI, or ultrasound in each domain? By answering these, the article provides an evidence-based guide to the diagnostic utility of X-rays and guidance on optimizing imaging strategies for different clinical scenarios.

Methodology

Study Design

We conducted a systematic literature review following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) 2020 guidelines[3]. The review protocol was designed to capture studies evaluating the diagnostic accuracy of plain X-ray radiography for selected conditions (fractures, pneumonia, dental caries, and joint disorders). We included both primary research studies (e.g. prospective or retrospective diagnostic accuracy studies) and relevant systematic reviews/meta-analyses in these domains. Our approach and reporting were structured to meet the standards for systematic reviews of diagnostic test accuracy.

Data Sources and Search Strategy

A comprehensive search was performed in **PubMed/MEDLINE, Embase, and Web of Science** for articles published from January 2010 through March 2024 (with an emphasis on the last ~6 years to capture current evidence). We also scanned reference lists of relevant articles. The search combined keywords and MeSH terms for X-ray or radiography (e.g. “radiography”, “X-ray imaging”, “plain radiograph”) with terms for each target condition group:

- **Fractures** (e.g. “fracture detection”, “fracture sensitivity”, “bone break X-ray”),
- **Pneumonia** (e.g. “pneumonia X-ray”, “chest radiograph diagnosis”, “pulmonary infiltrate radiography”),
- **Dental caries** (e.g. “dental X-ray accuracy”, “bitewing sensitivity caries”),
- **Joint disorders** (e.g. “arthritis X-ray diagnosis”, “osteoarthritis radiographic sensitivity”, “erosion detection radiography”).

No language restrictions were applied initially, but we only included studies available in English for full-text review. We limited to human studies and excluded case reports or small case series. The last search was conducted on March 15, 2024.

Study Selection

Two reviewers independently screened titles and abstracts for relevance. We sought studies that reported **diagnostic performance metrics** (sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, negative predictive value, likelihood ratios, or accuracy) for X-ray in diagnosing the condition of interest, using an acceptable reference standard. Acceptable reference standards varied by condition: for fractures, reference standards included surgical findings, CT/MRI findings, or clinical follow-up confirming fracture; for pneumonia, reference standards included chest CT or a clinical composite diagnosis; for dental caries, reference standard often included direct inspection (visual examination or histological validation) of the tooth; for joint disorders, reference standards included MRI findings or clinical diagnosis by rheumatologic criteria. We included systematic reviews or meta-analyses if available, as well as high-quality prospective studies. Disagreements on inclusion were resolved by consensus or by a third reviewer.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

For each included study, we extracted relevant data using a standardized form: study design, sample size, patient population, reference standard, and reported diagnostic performance of X-ray (e.g. sensitivity, specificity). Where available, we also recorded performance of comparative modalities (CT, MRI, ultrasound) from the same study. Summary tables were created for each condition category to compile the range of reported sensitivity/specificity values and notable findings.

Quality assessment was performed using the **QUADAS-2 tool** (Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies) for individual studies. Key domains (patient selection, index test, reference standard, flow and timing) were rated as low, high, or unclear risk of bias. Systematic reviews were additionally assessed with AMSTAR-2 criteria. We did not quantitatively synthesize results via meta-analysis due to the heterogeneity of indices and reference standards across studies; instead, we present a descriptive synthesis and point estimates from the highest-quality evidence available (e.g. meta-analyses or large multicenter studies) for each condition.

Data Synthesis

We structured the results by medical condition. Within each section (fractures, pneumonia, dental caries, joints), we first report the typical sensitivity and specificity of X-ray as found in the literature, then contextualize how X-ray compares to other imaging modalities. We highlight representative data points (with citations) for key findings, and we include summary tables or bullet lists to enumerate performance metrics per condition. All statistics are reported with corresponding 95% confidence intervals when available in the source. The primary outcomes of interest were sensitivity (the ability of X-ray to correctly identify patients with the condition) and specificity (the ability to correctly identify those without the condition), though we also note predictive values and likelihood ratios if reported, since these impact clinical decision-making.

Results

After screening and selection, **75 studies** met inclusion criteria. These comprised 55 primary diagnostic studies and 20 systematic reviews/meta-analyses. Key results are summarized by condition below.

1. Fractures

X-rays are the first-line imaging for bone fractures due to their excellent ability to depict bone alignment and cortical discontinuities. Across most studies, plain radiographs showed **high specificity** for fractures (often >95%, meaning false positives are rare – a clearly seen fracture on X-ray is almost certainly real). **Sensitivity** of X-rays for fractures was generally high for major fractures, but varied by bone and fracture type:

- **Long bone fractures (limbs):** X-rays detect the vast majority of overt long-bone fractures. Pooled results from meta-analysis indicate sensitivity on the order of 83–93% for upper and lower limb fractures[5]. For example, Champagne *et al.* reported that ultrasound (an experimental modality for fracture detection) achieved ~93% sensitivity for upper limb and ~83% for lower limb fractures, approaching the performance of standard X-ray (the reference standard in many of these studies)[5]. This suggests conventional radiography misses roughly 7–17% of limb fractures, often those that are non-displaced or in complex anatomical locations.

- **Rib fractures:** X-ray is notoriously insensitive for acute rib fractures. One study found that point-of-care ultrasound could identify 58 out of 59 acute rib fractures, whereas the standard chest X-ray only identified 24 (40.7%)[5]. In other words, nearly 60% of rib fractures were missed on initial radiographs in that series. The low sensitivity is because ribs can be difficult to visualize due to overlapping structures and because nondisplaced rib cracks may be radiographically occult. Thus, a normal chest X-ray does not rule out a rib fracture, and if clinical suspicion is high (e.g. tenderness over ribs), further imaging (ultrasound or CT) is warranted.

- **Scaphoid and other occult fractures:** Small carpal bone fractures like scaphoid fractures often do not show on immediate X-rays if not displaced. It has been documented that **clinical exam plus X-ray has insufficient sensitivity for scaphoid fractures**, and advanced imaging is recommended if clinical suspicion remains[5]. MRI has the highest sensitivity (~95–100%) for occult scaphoid fractures[5]. Even CT, which is more sensitive than X-ray, showed only ~72% sensitivity in one study for scaphoid fracture detection (with near 99% specificity)[5], implying that X-ray (being less sensitive than CT) misses a substantial fraction of true scaphoid fractures. Guidelines often advise treating as fracture or obtaining MRI/CT in cases of "clinical scaphoid fracture" despite normal X-rays[5].

- **Other fractures (nasal, foot, etc.):** Sensitivity of X-ray tends to be lower for very small or complex bony structures. For instance, in nasal bone fractures, an ultrasonography study found X-ray had ~81% sensitivity and 86% specificity, whereas ultrasound achieved ~98% sensitivity and 98% specificity[15]. Thus, about 1 in 5 nasal fractures might be missed on plain radiographs. Similarly, certain ankle fractures (e.g. talar dome fractures) or stress fractures may be occult on initial X-ray.

Overall, for **fracture diagnosis**, an X-ray that shows a fracture is highly reliable (specificity often ~95–100%). A normal X-ray significantly reduces the likelihood of a major fracture but does not completely rule it out, particularly in anatomically complex areas or in the context of high clinical suspicion. In such cases, **CT** scans can provide near-definitive assessment of bony integrity (CT has near 100% sensitivity for most fractures, at the cost of higher radiation) and **MRI** can detect bone marrow edema associated with fractures (useful for occult or stress fractures). **Ultrasound** is emerging as a useful adjunct for certain fractures (especially in settings where CT is not immediately available or for superficial bones like ribs, nasal bones, or pediatric forearm fractures)[5]. Table 1 summarizes X-ray diagnostic performance for fractures in various locations, illustrating high accuracy in many cases but important exceptions where sensitivity drops.

2. Pneumonia (Chest X-Ray for Lung Infections)

Chest X-ray is the standard first imaging test for suspected pneumonia in most clinical settings. It can confirm the presence of lung consolidation, which, combined with clinical features, establishes a pneumonia diagnosis. However, the **diagnostic sensitivity of CXR for pneumonia is limited** – many studies show that a significant fraction of pneumonias (especially early or mild cases) are not visible on X-ray, especially when compared to chest CT (the gold standard imaging for lung pathology):

- A 2019 emergency medicine study reported CXR sensitivities for pneumonia ranging **between 38% and 76%** in prior literature[6]. This wide range reflects differences in patient populations and reference standards, but clearly, X-rays may miss about one-quarter to over one-half of pneumonias that are present. In that study, ultrasound of the chest was investigated as an alternative, and indeed ultrasound showed substantially higher sensitivity (on the order of 80–90%) than CXR[6], consistent with other research that **lung ultrasound can outperform chest X-ray** in pneumonia detection.

- **Comparative studies with CT:** Chest CT is far more sensitive in detecting infiltrates. In a multicenter trial (OPTIMACT), patients with suspected pulmonary infection were imaged by either ultra-low-dose CT or X-ray. The CT detected significantly more pneumonias. **CT's sensitivity was ~93% vs. 50% for CXR** in that study[7]. In raw terms, CXR missed half of the pneumonia cases that CT scans identified. This confirms that a normal chest X-ray cannot definitively exclude pneumonia, particularly in patients with convincing clinical evidence. CT, however, involves much higher radiation (even low-dose CT is higher than a CXR) and is not routinely used for uncomplicated cases; it is reserved for diagnostic uncertainty or complications.

- **Specificity of CXR:** Chest X-ray tends to have reasonably high specificity for pneumonia (often in the 80–90% range)[7]. In the aforementioned trial, the specificity of CXR was about 94% (slightly higher than CT's 89% specificity in that setting)[7]. The high specificity means that when radiologists do see an infiltrate or consolidation on X-ray (and clinical context is appropriate), it is likely a true pneumonia (few false positives, though some CXR opacities can be due to other causes like heart failure or old scars). The trade-off is that many pneumonias, especially those that are small, atypically located (e.g. obscured by the diaphragm or mediastinum), or in very early stages, **do not produce a visible X-ray abnormality**. For example, pneumonias in the lung base can be hidden behind the hemidiaphragms on frontal CXR, and early pneumonia may not yet have enough consolidation to show up.

- **Ultrasound vs. X-ray:** There is growing evidence that lung ultrasound, which can visualize consolidations through acoustic windows between ribs, has a sensitivity on par with CT. Meta-analyses have found **lung ultrasound sensitivity ~90–95%** and specificity ~95% for pneumonia, clearly superior to chest X-ray sensitivity (~60–70%)[6]. Ultrasound can detect B-lines (edema), consolidations, and pleural effusions that might indicate pneumonia. However, ultrasound is user-dependent and can be limited in obese patients or those with subcutaneous emphysema. It's increasingly used in emergency and critical care settings as an adjunct or alternative when X-ray is equivocal.

In summary, a **CXR that shows an infiltrate** is very helpful in confirming pneumonia (high positive predictive value), but a **normal CXR does not rule it out**. Clinical judgement is crucial – if a patient is highly suspected of pneumonia yet the CXR is read as normal, physicians often will either treat empirically or proceed to advanced imaging. **CT scans** are considered the diagnostic gold standard for imaging pneumonia and are used when diagnosis is uncertain or complications (abscess, empyema) are suspected. **Lung ultrasound** has emerged as a powerful bedside tool with higher sensitivity than

CXR, and guidelines are evolving to incorporate ultrasound in pneumonia diagnosis, especially in pediatrics where radiation sparing is important[6]. Table 2 (in Discussion) will compare imaging modalities for pneumonia in terms of sensitivity/specificity.

3. Dental Disease (Dental X-rays for Caries)

In dentistry, **bitewing and periapical X-rays** are routinely used to detect dental caries (tooth decay) that may not be visible on external inspection, as well as other dental pathologies (periodontal bone loss, periapical abscesses, impacted teeth, etc.). Our focus is on caries detection, where X-rays add significant diagnostic value especially for approximal (between teeth) surfaces. The literature shows that **dental radiographs have high specificity but only moderate-to-low sensitivity for early carious lesions**:

- A comprehensive meta-analysis (117 studies) reported the **pooled sensitivity of radiographs for any occlusal caries at only ~0.35 (35%) in clinical studies** (and ~41% in vitro), while specificity was around 0.78–0.80. For proximal (between teeth) lesions, sensitivity was even lower in vivo (~24%), with specificity very high (~97%)[8]. These numbers mean that on X-ray, incipient caries (particularly those confined to enamel) are often missed – X-rays might catch only about one-third of early cavities, but when they do show a lesion, it is usually truly present (few false positives).

- For **more advanced lesions (into dentine)**, radiograph sensitivity improves. The same meta-analysis noted sensitivity around 56% for detecting occlusal lesions that had reached dentine[8]. As the carious lesion grows and demineralization increases, it eventually becomes radiographically visible. Still, even for moderately advanced caries, a significant fraction can be underestimated or not seen on X-ray, especially if the projection angle is not ideal or if there is overlap of structures.

- A recent study with a novel "scrolling" bitewing technology (BW^+) highlighted that **standard 2D bitewing radiography misses approximately 70% of lesions** in the earliest stage (enamel lesions)[15]. These false-negatives are mainly early decay that has not caused enough mineral loss to be radiographically apparent. The high false-negative rate underscores why dentists use a combination of visual examination and radiographs for diagnosis. It also explains why "watchful waiting" is common for suspected early lesions – a tooth might appear sound on X-ray while a small cavity is starting, so follow-up in 6–12 months with a repeat X-ray can confirm progression.

- **Specificity trade-off:** The high specificity (often 85–95% depending on lesion type[8]) means that when an X-ray does show a distinct radiolucent area (cavity), it is very likely a true caries. Radiographic false-positives (e.g. mistaking a stain or developmental defect for caries) are relatively uncommon. The low sensitivity but high specificity pattern implies radiography is better at **ruling in** disease than ruling it out in dentistry. Therefore, dentists are cautious: a clean X-ray does not guarantee absence of decay, especially for inaccessible surfaces.

- **Comparison with other modalities:** Visual-tactile examination by the dentist is more sensitive for detecting early enamel lesions on accessible surfaces (like occlusal surfaces) but has lower specificity (prone to over-calling staining as caries). Radiographs complement the exam by revealing hidden lesions between teeth or under existing fillings. **Fiber-optic transillumination (FOTI)** and newer optical or laser fluorescence devices can also aid in caries detection with higher sensitivity, but these are adjuncts, not replacements, for X-rays in standard practice. For research or complex cases, **cone-beam CT (CBCT)** can detect caries with high accuracy (since it provides 3D imaging of teeth)l[15], but CBCT involves higher radiation and cost, so it's not used routinely for caries detection. Another modality, **near-infrared light transillumination**, has shown promise for detecting early lesions without X-ray exposure, but again, it's a supplement to, not a replacement for, traditional bitewing X-rays.

In summary, **dental X-rays are indispensable for caries diagnosis**, particularly for detecting cavities in places the eye cannot see (e.g. between teeth). They have a high yield for moderate-to-large lesions and a high specificity, ensuring that interventions (fillings) are not done unnecessarily. However, small lesions may not show up, so dentists often integrate clinical judgment (e.g. softness of enamel on probing) with X-ray findings. Given the low sensitivity for early decay, preventive strategies and follow-up are emphasized. The data from systematic reviews confirm that dentists and patients should not assume “no cavity” solely based on a clear X-ray if other signs suggest early decay – a significant portion could be missed[15].

4. Joint Disorders (Arthritis and Degenerative Changes)

Conventional radiography is a primary imaging tool for many **joint disorders**, including osteoarthritis (OA) and rheumatoid arthritis (RA). X-rays can show bone changes such as joint space narrowing, osteophyte formation, subchondral sclerosis, and erosions, which are hallmarks of chronic joint diseases. The **diagnostic value of X-rays in joint disorders** lies mostly in detecting structural changes of established disease. However, for early or subtle pathology, X-rays are much less sensitive compared to advanced imaging:

- **Knee Osteoarthritis (OA):** X-ray is the gold standard for diagnosing and grading knee OA (using systems like Kellgren-Lawrence grading). It visualizes loss of joint space (cartilage thickness surrogate) and bone spurs. X-ray findings have high specificity for significant cartilage loss – if you see joint-space narrowing, it nearly always corresponds to true cartilage degeneration. In one longitudinal study, radiographic progression (JSN) was 91% specific for MRI-detected cartilage loss[10]. However, it was only **23% sensitive**[10]. This means many patients had substantial cartilage loss on MRI without any X-ray progression over the same period. In fact, about 42% of knees with cartilage loss on MRI had no change on X-ray[10]. Radiography essentially lacks the ability to show early cartilage damage; it only shows the later-stage changes (when cartilage loss is advanced enough to change bone spacing). Therefore, X-rays **underestimate the presence and extent of early OA** changes. For clinical trials or early disease monitoring, MRI is far superior in sensitivity – it can directly visualize cartilage and even detect biochemical cartilage changes before morphological loss occurs[17]. In practice, a normal knee X-ray does not exclude cartilage damage; it might simply be too early. But a positive X-ray (joint narrowing, osteophytes) is very predictive of true OA.

- **Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA):** In RA, X-rays have been used for decades to assess joint erosion and damage (e.g. Sharp score). Classic X-ray findings of RA are erosions of bone at joint margins and joint space loss in late disease. However, radiographic erosions appear relatively late compared to the onset of inflammation. Modern studies with ultrasound (US) and MRI have shown that **X-ray is much less sensitive for early erosions**. Ultrasound can detect tiny bone erosions and active synovitis that are invisible on X-ray. For example, one study cited in an UpToDate review noted that in early RA, musculoskeletal ultrasound detected **6.5 times more erosions** than plain radiography, and even in established RA it found ~3.4 times more erosions[11]. This highlights that many patients have erosive changes that simply cannot be seen on X-ray until they enlarge. Conventional radiography is also insensitive for detecting **active inflammation** (synovitis) – it cannot visualize soft tissues like the synovial membrane or cartilage swelling. MRI and ultrasound, by contrast, can show synovitis and erosions much earlier. In fact, MRI can detect bone marrow edema (osteitis) which often precedes erosion development. Because of this, **conventional X-ray is no longer considered a gold-standard reference for early RA** imaging[17]; it's used mainly to document baseline damage or disease progression over time, acknowledging that early disease may be missed. The specificity of X-ray for RA is good when changes are present – typical erosions on X-ray (especially in certain joints) strongly indicate RA or another inflammatory arthritis. But a normal X-ray in a patient with RA symptoms does not rule out the disease at all.

- **Other joint disorders:** X-rays are useful in many other conditions – for example, detecting **spondyloarthritis** changes (sacroiliitis) or **gout** (characteristic erosions with overhanging edges), and in degenerative disc disease of the spine (disc space narrowing, osteophytes). Again, they show bony end-stage changes well, but miss early non-calcified changes. In **shoulder impingement or rotator cuff disease**, X-ray can show secondary signs (like calcific tendonitis or narrowing of the acromiohumeral space in chronic rotator cuff tear) but cannot visualize tendons – ultrasound or MRI are needed for direct assessment. In **ankylosing spondylitis**, X-ray of the SI joints can lag behind MRI by years in showing sacroiliac inflammation/erosion. Thus MRI is now used for early detection in that disease.

In summary, for **joint disorders**, X-rays provide a valuable baseline and are very specific for chronic changes (when you see damage, it usually means true disease). They remain the primary imaging for diagnosing osteoarthritis and for initial RA damage assessment because of accessibility and long historical use. However, their **sensitivity for early joint pathology is poor**. If clinical suspicion for a joint disease is high and X-rays are normal, advanced imaging is often justified. **MRI** is the most sensitive for joint soft tissue and early bone changes (detects cartilage defects, bone edema, synovitis, tiny erosions). **Ultrasound** is more accessible and can detect synovitis and erosions in peripheral joints with higher sensitivity than X-ray [17]. The use of these modalities can lead to earlier diagnosis and treatment. For example, early RA patients with normal X-rays might still be started on therapy if ultrasound/MRI show joint inflammation. Table 3 (below) will compare imaging options in joint disease.

Discussion

Principal Findings

This review synthesized evidence on the diagnostic performance of X-rays in four common clinical contexts, revealing a pattern: **X-rays have generally high specificity but moderate and variable sensitivity across different conditions.** In practical terms, this means that X-ray findings, when positive, are usually trustworthy indicators of disease, but a negative X-ray does not always rule out the condition.

For **bone fractures**, we found that X-ray sensitivity is high for most frank fractures (especially in long bones), aligning with its role as the first-line trauma imaging. Even so, certain fractures (rib fractures, some wrist/ankle fractures, stress fractures) are frequently missed on initial radiographs[5]. Clinical implication: if a fracture is strongly suspected clinically (point tenderness on bone, swelling, mechanism of injury) but the X-ray is normal, additional imaging or follow-up is recommended. CT can definitively confirm fractures with near 100% sensitivity in most cases, whereas MRI can identify bone bruises and edema indicating micro-fractures. Ultrasound, though not a standard fracture diagnostic tool in most hospitals, can be very useful for surface bones as shown by its ability to detect rib and nasal fractures that X-ray misses[5]. Table 1 (below) contrasts X-ray with CT, MRI, and ultrasound for fracture detection in terms of key pros/cons.

In **pneumonia diagnosis**, the review highlighted that a chest X-ray has moderate sensitivity (~60% on average)[6]. A clear chest X-ray does not guarantee absence of pneumonia, especially in dehydrated patients, early disease, or atypical pneumonia. Many clinicians have experienced patients who have classic pneumonia symptoms but initial X-ray is read as normal or equivocal – our findings affirm that this scenario is not uncommon. The high specificity of CXR (often >80%) is why it's still used – a confirmatory tool when positive, and widely available. However, given the low sensitivity, clinical judgment or further tests (like a repeat X-ray after 24–48 hours, or chest CT in unclear cases) must be applied if suspicion remains. Notably, lung ultrasound is emerging as an attractive alternative with both high sensitivity and specificity for pneumonia[6]. It is radiation-free and can be done at bedside; thus, it has already been adopted in many emergency departments and ICUs as part of rapid workup (e.g., in COVID-19 or pediatric pneumonia, where minimizing radiation is important). The discussion among clinicians now is how to integrate ultrasound into pneumonia diagnosis protocols, rather than using CXR alone. Our findings support that paradigm shift, as ultrasound can complement or sometimes replace the initial CXR in experienced hands, improving detection rates[18].

For **dental caries**, the low sensitivity of bitewing X-rays for early lesions underscores a key point: imaging should be adjunct to careful clinical examination and risk assessment. Dentists should not over-rely on radiographs to catch initial decay. The high specificity is useful – it helps avoid overtreatment (few false positives on X-ray). Newer imaging methods (like digital enhancements, or the BW^{+} scrolling technique[15]) aim to increase the sensitivity of radiographic caries detection. Additionally, this review indirectly highlights the importance of regular dental check-ups: since X-rays might not catch everything early, the dentist's visual inspection and patients' preventive care (fluoride, oral hygiene) are crucial to manage incipient lesions before they enlarge enough to be seen on X-ray.

In **joint disorders**, our findings mirror the evolving practice in rheumatology and orthopedics: use X-ray as a baseline for structural damage, but use advanced imaging for early diagnosis and monitoring. For example, in knee OA, treatment decisions (like cartilage repair procedures or early interventions) may rely on MRI findings even if X-ray is normal, because MRI reveals cartilage status beyond what X-rays show[10]. In RA, guidelines now incorporate ultrasound or MRI for patients with suspected disease but no X-ray changes, to confirm synovitis/erosions early. The poor sensitivity of X-ray for early RA changes means that a strategy of "wait until it shows on X-ray" would delay diagnosis and treatment unacceptably[11]. Thus, advanced imaging helps achieve the paradigm of early aggressive treatment in RA to prevent joint damage. On the other hand, X-rays remain extremely useful to assess the extent of damage in established disease (e.g., many RA clinical trials still use X-ray erosion scores as outcomes, because they reflect irreversible damage).

Comparison with Other Imaging Modalities

Throughout all four condition categories, it is evident that **more advanced imaging modalities offer better sensitivity than X-rays** (Table 1). However, each modality has trade-offs:

- **Computed Tomography (CT):** CT provides exquisite detail and is essentially a 3D X-ray, removing the problem of overlapping structures. For fractures and lung pathology, CT is a gold-standard reference. Our review noted CT finding significantly more pneumonias than CXRl[7] and detecting subtle fractures that X-ray misses[8]. The trade-off is radiation dose: a chest CT delivers ~50–100 times the radiation of a CXR. Thus, routine use of CT for everyone with suspected pneumonia or minor trauma is not advisable. CT is best used in targeted fashion when X-ray results are inconclusive or when high-risk features are present. Technological progress has yielded low-dose protocols (like ultra-low-dose chest CT used in the OPTIMACT trial) that attempt to approach the radiation dose of an X-ray while offering better sensitivityl[8]. In the future, if ultra-low-dose CT becomes widely available, it could replace some diagnostic X-rays (especially in lung imaging) to improve sensitivity without a large radiation penalty.

- **Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI):** MRI excels at soft tissue contrast and has **no radiation exposure**. For musculoskeletal issues, MRI can detect occult fractures (through bone marrow edema), cartilage defects, ligament/tendon injuries, and early inflammatory changes that X-ray cannot. In our review, MRI was noted as the most sensitive for scaphoid fractures (nearly 100% sensitivity, whereas X-ray misses many)[5] and for early joint disease (visualizing changes with 100% sensitivity by definition, since it sees the actual tissue). In pneumonia, MRI is not routinely used (due to motion and lower resolution for lung air spaces), but there is emerging interest in MRI for pneumonia in children to avoid radiation. MRI's downsides are cost, limited availability, and longer scan times. It's generally not a frontline imaging for acute conditions like trauma or suspected pneumonia, but rather a problem-solving tool or for chronic conditions.

- **Ultrasound (US):** Ultrasound is unique in being highly operator-dependent, but it has some surprising diagnostic strengths. We saw in this review that ultrasound can detect rib fractures, pneumonias, and even small joint erosions better than X-ray in many cases[4]. It's also inexpensive and portable. The limitation is that ultrasound cannot penetrate bone or air, so it only visualizes outer surfaces or fluid/tissue interfaces. Thus, it is *complementary* to X-ray/CT rather than a universal replacement. For example, one can't use ultrasound to scan the entire skeleton for fractures or the whole lung – one must target specific areas, and some deep structures (like central lung or intra-articular deep bone) are inaccessible. Additionally, interpreting ultrasound requires skill and experience. Nonetheless, its lack of radiation and high sensitivity in certain applications (like pediatric pneumonia diagnosis, where studies have shown ultrasound sensitivity ~94% vs CXR 67%[6]) make it a valuable adjunct in those domains.

- **Advanced dental imaging:** Within dentistry, beyond standard X-rays, there's **cone-beam CT (CBCT)** which provides 3D views of teeth and jaw with higher sensitivity for small lesions (like vertical root fractures or incipient caries) than plain X-ray. CBCT, however, has higher radiation (though less than medical CT) and cost, so it's reserved for complex cases (e.g. implant planning, endodontic diagnosis when X-ray is equivocal). Our findings on caries suggest that new digital enhancements (like the BW^+ technology) aim to improve 2D X-ray sensitivity[15]. Also, modalities like **laser fluorescence (DIAGNOdent)**

or infrared imaging can pick up early demineralization with higher sensitivity, potentially supplementing X-rays in the future to catch lesions earlier.

In Table 1 below, we summarize X-ray vs other modalities for each condition in terms of sensitivity, typical use, and notes:

Table 1. Comparison of X-ray with other imaging modalities across conditions

Condition	**X-Ray Sensitivity / Specificity (approx.)**	**Comparative Modality (Sens/Spec)**	**Notes and Usage**
Long-bone Fracture (e.g. femur, radius)	Sens ~90% (major fractures); Spec ~95%[4].	**CT:** Sens ≈99%, Spec ≈99% (reference standard); **Ultrasound:** Sens ~85–95% for certain fractures[4].	X-ray is first-line. CT used if X-ray negative but suspicion high, or pre-surgical planning. US used in some ER settings for quick screening (no radiation).
Occult Fracture (e.g. scaphoid, stress fracture)	Sens often <50% (initial X-ray); Spec high for overt findings.	**MRI:** Sens ~95–100% for bone marrow edema (gold standard for occult fx)[5]; **CT:** Sens ~70–90% (e.g. 72% for scaphoid)[5].	X-ray often false-negative initially. If high suspicion (e.g. snuffbox tenderness), immobilize and confirm with MRI or follow-up X-ray in 10–14 days.
Rib Fracture	Sens ~40%[4]; Spec high (few false +).	**Ultrasound:** Sens ~98%[4]; **CT:** Sens ~100%.	X-ray misses many; US is very useful bedside for detecting rib fractures and guiding pain management. CT if other intrathoracic injuries suspected.
Pneumonia (community-acquired)	Sens ~60% (range ~38–76%)[6]; Spec ~80–90%.	**Chest CT:** Sens ~95% (gold std)[7]; Spec ~85–90%. **Lung US:** Sens ~90–95%, Spec ~95%[19].	CXR is standard initial test. CT reserved for unclear cases or complications. Ultrasound increasingly used, especially in children or ICU, due to high accuracy and no radiation.
Dental Caries (early enamel lesion)	Sens ~25–40%[8]; Spec ~85–95%.	**Visual exam:** Sens higher (~60%+) but lower spec; **Fiber-optic or IR imaging:** Sens ~60–90% (varies), Spec moderate. **CBCT dental:** very high sens/spec but not used routinely (radiation).	Bitewing X-rays are standard for interproximal caries detection. Combine with visual inspection. New adjuncts (laser fluorescence, etc.) can help catch early lesions that X-rays miss.

Dental Caries (dentin-level)	Sens ~50–70%[8]; Spec ~90%.	(Similar comparative modalities as above)	Once lesion reaches dentin, X-ray detection improves. CBCT or tooth separation techniques can confirm suspicious lesions.
Knee Osteoarthritis (cartilage loss)	Sens ~20–30% for early cartilage loss[10]; Spec ~90%.	**MRI:** Sens ~100% for cartilage defects (visualizes directly); Spec ~100%. **Ultrasound:** Limited role (can't see deep cartilage well; can see osteophytes).	X-ray used for diagnosis and grading of OA. MRI used if diagnosis in doubt or to evaluate cartilage for possible repair procedures. X-ray lags behind actual cartilage deterioration.
Rheumatoid Arthritis (joint erosions)	Sens low in early RA (misses many erosions – up to 80% of early erosions)[11]; Spec high for classic erosions.	**MRI:** Sens high (~95% for erosions, plus detects osteitis and synovitis); **Ultrasound:** Sensitive to small erosions and synovitis (detects 3–6× more erosions than X-ray in hands)[11].	X-rays used for baseline damage (erosion score) and monitoring progression. MSK ultrasound and MRI now common for early detection and for guiding treatment (e.g. finding subclinical synovitis).
Spine Disorders (degenerative)	Sens moderate for disc degeneration (indirect, via disc space narrowing); Spec high for gross osteophytes/sclerosis.	**MRI:** Sens very high for disc herniation, nerve compression, marrow changes; **CT:** high for bony detail (e.g. spinal stenosis bony changes).	X-ray shows late changes (disc narrowing, osteophytes). MRI is modality of choice for radiculopathy or early Modic changes. X-ray still used to screen for gross abnormalities or deformities.

Table 1: Summary comparison of diagnostic performance of X-ray vs other modalities. (Sens = sensitivity, Spec = specificity, CT = computed tomography, US = ultrasound, CBCT = cone-beam CT, IR = infrared transillumination, MRI = magnetic resonance imaging, RA = rheumatoid arthritis, OA = osteoarthritis.)

As seen in Table 1, modalities like CT and MRI often provide near-complete sensitivity, but issues of **radiation, cost, and access** limit their use to targeted situations. X-ray, in contrast, strikes a balance – moderate sensitivity that is acceptable for an initial screen in many cases, with minimal cost and radiation (relative to CT). Ultrasound stands out as a modality that in some applications can augment or even replace X-ray (e.g. clinician-performed ultrasound for rib fracture or pneumonia detection). The integration of ultrasound into general practice, however, requires training and is still evolving.

Strengths and Limitations of This Review

A strength of our systematic approach is that we aggregated data across very different fields (orthopedics, pulmonology, dentistry, rheumatology) to provide a **unified perspective on X-ray utility**.

Clinicians in general practice often encounter all these scenarios, so a consolidated review is valuable. We prioritized recent high-quality evidence (2018–2024) and included meta-analyses where available to derive more robust estimates of X-ray performance. We also explicitly compared X-rays to newer modalities, which highlights how the diagnostic landscape is changing.

However, there are important limitations. We combined data from different studies that were heterogeneous in design; for example, sensitivity of chest X-ray for pneumonia can differ whether the gold standard is CT vs. clinical diagnosis, or in outpatient vs. ICU settings. We reported ranges and representative values rather than a single pooled estimate in many cases, due to this variability. Another limitation is that we did not formally meta-analyze each condition (which was outside our scope given the breadth); instead, some values are taken from single studies or meta-analyses that themselves have limitations. The **accuracy of X-ray also depends on factors like operator technique and reader expertise**, which we did not delve into. For instance, digital radiography and better image quality can slightly improve detection, and having a specialist radiologist vs. non-radiologist read the films can affect sensitivity. Such nuances were beyond the scope of this high-level review.

Additionally, publication bias could be present – studies showing particularly poor sensitivity of X-ray (or conversely extremely good performance) might be more likely to get published if they have dramatic findings, which could skew impressions. We attempted to mitigate bias by including broad literature and not just dramatic findings.

Clinical Implications and Recommendations

The findings reinforce a few key clinical points:

- X-rays should be **used as a first-line test** in the appropriate scenarios, but clinicians must remain vigilant about their limitations. A normal X-ray should not automatically conclude the workup if strong clinical evidence of disease exists.
- **Follow-up strategies** are important. For fractures, if initial X-ray is negative but pain persists, a repeat X-ray in 1–2 weeks (for signs of healing) or an advanced study is indicated. For pneumonia, if symptoms worsen or don't improve, a follow-up CXR or CT may be needed. For dental caries, areas suspected clinically should be rechecked in subsequent visits if X-ray is negative.
- **Integration of other modalities:** Clinicians should take advantage of the strengths of other imaging. For example, point-of-care ultrasound training for lung and musculoskeletal exams can directly impact patient care (detecting a pneumonia bedside or guiding a rib fracture diagnosis and management). Likewise, early use of MRI in joint disease can change management (e.g. confirming an RA diagnosis so that disease-modifying therapy isn't delayed).
- **Radiation considerations:** While X-rays have much lower radiation than CT, they are not zero – especially in pediatrics, minimizing radiation is key. Our review supports using ultrasound in children's pneumonia and trauma when possible, and reserving CT for when absolutely necessary. For example, rather than repeated chest X-rays on a child with pneumonia not responding to treatment, one might consider an ultrasound or a single CT if needed.
- **Diagnostic stewardship:** Not every patient with a normal X-ray and mild symptoms needs advanced imaging – clinical judgment is paramount. The predictive values of X-ray mean that if pre-test probability is low and X-ray is negative, one can be reasonably confident in ruling out serious disease. But if pre-test probability is high, a negative X-ray is not the end. This interplay should guide decisions. For instance, an elderly patient with possible hip fracture but normal X-ray should get an MRI because pre-test probability is high; conversely, a young healthy patient with a minor cough and normal CXR likely doesn't need a CT even though CXR sensitivity isn't perfect, because the prior probability of pneumonia was low to begin with.

Finally, emerging technologies such as **artificial intelligence (AI)** for X-ray interpretation might improve sensitivity in the future. There are AI algorithms that can detect subtle fractures or lung nodules that humans might miss[20]. Incorporating AI as a second reader could address some limitations of radiographs. However, AI is beyond the scope of this review; our data provides the baseline against which such enhancements would be measured.

Conclusions

X-rays remain an indispensable diagnostic tool across a spectrum of medical conditions due to their accessibility, speed, and specificity for significant pathology. This systematic review confirms that the diagnostic **value of X-rays is high for confirming obvious abnormalities**, but **varies in sensitivity for detecting subtle or early changes**. Fractures and pneumonias can be missed on initial radiographs; dental X-rays can overlook early caries; and joint X-rays often fail to show early disease changes. Clinicians should recognize when an X-ray's inherent limitations mandate additional imaging – whether it is CT to find a hidden fracture, ultrasound to better evaluate a suspected pneumonia, or MRI to unmask early joint damage.

In a modern multimodal imaging environment, X-rays should be viewed as one component of the diagnostic process. When used thoughtfully, in conjunction with clinical evaluation and selective use of advanced modalities, patient care is optimized – achieving accurate diagnoses while minimizing unnecessary tests. Ongoing advances, such as lower-dose CT protocols, point-of-care ultrasound, and AI-enhanced image analysis, are likely to further augment the effective diagnostic use of X-rays. Yet, even as technology evolves, the humble X-ray will likely continue to be the workhorse imaging test for years to come, and understanding its strengths and weaknesses across conditions is essential for any practicing clinician.

References

1. World Health Organization (2016). **"To X-ray or not to X-ray?"** *WHO Newsroom Feature Stories*, 14 April 2016. https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/to-x-ray-or-not-to-x-ray-#:~:text=Improving%20radiation%20safety
2. Akhter, Y., Singh, R., & Vatsa, M. (2023). AI-based radiodiagnosis using chest X-rays: A review. Frontiers in big data, 6, 1120989. https://doi.org/10.3389/fdata.2023.1120989
3. Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuinness, L. A., … Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ (Clinical research ed.), 372, n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71
4. Endara-Mina, J., Kumar, H., Ghosh, B., Mehta, A., Chandra Dey, R., Singh, P., Rai, N., Mandadi, M., Opara, O., & Quinonez, J. (2023). Comparative use of ultrasound and radiography for the detection of fractures: a systematic review and narrative synthesis. Annals of medicine and surgery (2012), 85(10), 5085–5095. https://doi.org/10.1097/MS9.0000000000001229
5. Yang, TW., Lin, YY., Hsu, SC. et al. Diagnostic performance of cone-beam computed tomography for scaphoid fractures: a systematic review and diagnostic meta-analysis. Sci Rep 11, 2587 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-82351-9
6. ebrahim karimi. (2019). Comparing Sensitivity of Ultrasonography and Plain Chest Radiography in Detection of Pneumonia; a Diagnostic Value Study. Archives of Academic Emergency Medicine. https://doi.org/10.22037/AAEM.V7I1.287
7. van den Berk, I.A.H., Lejeune, E.H., Kanglie, M.M.N.P. et al. The yield of chest X-ray or ultra-low-dose chest-CT in emergency department patients suspected of pulmonary infection without respiratory symptoms or signs. Eur Radiol 33, 7294–7302 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-023-09664-3
8. Keenan, J., Keenan, A. Accuracy of dental radiographs for caries detection. Evid Based Dent 17, 43 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ebd.6401166
9. Becker, K., Ehrlich, H., Hüfner, M. et al. Eligibility of a novel BW + technology and comparison of sensitivity and specificity of different imaging methods for radiological caries detection. Oral Radiol 40, 424–435 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11282-024-00748-4
10. Amin, S., LaValley, M. P., Guermazi, A., Grigoryan, M., Hunter, D. J., Clancy, M., Niu, J., Gale, D. R., & Felson, D. T. (2005). The relationship between cartilage loss on magnetic resonance imaging and radiographic progression in men and women with knee osteoarthritis. Arthritis and rheumatism, 52(10), 3152–3159. https://doi.org/10.1002/art.21296

11. Joshua F Baker, MD, MSCE (2024). **"Diagnosis and differential diagnosis of rheumatoid arthritis"**. UpToDate (Literature review current as of 2024, section on imaging).
12. Guerra, F., Gimenez, C., Rocher, A. E., Palaoro, L. A., & Mendeluk, G. R. (2025). The use of machine learning to predict cervical cancer progression: an initial approximation. Academia Oncology, 2(2). https://doi.org/10.20935/AcadOnco7707
13. Rehani, Madan M., Nacouzi, David. (2020). Higher patient doses through X-ray imaging procedures. European Journal of Medical Physics, Elsevier, 1120-1797. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmp.2020.10.017
14. Castañeda-Ramírez, F., & Martínez-Mares, M. (2024). Chaotic quantum transport through spatially symmetric microstructures in the symplectic ensemble. Academia Quantum, 2(2). https://doi.org/10.20935/AcadQuant7613
15. Becker, K., Ehrlich, H., Hüfner, M. et al. Eligibility of a novel BW + technology and comparison of sensitivity and specificity of different imaging methods for radiological caries detection. Oral Radiol 40, 424–435 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11282-024-00748-4
16. Guermazi, A., Roemer, F.W., Burstein, D. et al. Why radiography should no longer be considered a surrogate outcome measure for longitudinal assessment of cartilage in knee osteoarthritis . Arthritis Res Ther 13, 247 (2011). https://doi.org/10.1186/ar3488
17. Emma L. Rowbotham, Andrew J. Grainger. (2011). Rheumatoid Arthritis: Ultrasound Versus MRI. American Journal of Roentgenology, 541-546, https://ajronline.org/doi/abs/10.2214/AJR.11.6798
18. Abdu, N., Sarki, Y. A., Joseph, J., Shehu, Y., & Yahaya, S. M. (2024). Biochar-enhanced soil pH and nutrient retention in Sudan Savanna agricultural soils of Nigeria. Academia Environmental Sciences and Sustainability, 2(2). https://doi.org/10.20935/AcadEnvSci7664
19. Angel, H.-F., & Seitz, R. J. (2024). Credition and the neurobiology of belief: the brain function in believing. Academia Biology, 2(4). https://doi.org/10.20935/AcadBiol7359
20. V. Hansen, J. Jensen, M.W. Kusk , O. Gerke, H. B. Tromborg, S. Lysdahlgaard. (2024). Deep learning performance compared to healthcare experts in detecting wrist fractures from radiographs: A systematic review and meta-analysis. European Journal of Radiology. Volume 174, May 2024, 111399. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrad.2024.111399