

Please cite the Published Version

Noorveriandi, H, Parkes, MJ, Callaghan, MJ, Felson, DT, O'Neill, TW and Hodgson, R (2021) Assessment of bone marrow oedema-like lesions using MRI in patellofemoral knee osteoarthritis: comparison of different MRI pulse sequences. British Journal of Radiology, 94 (1124). ISSN 0007-1285

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1259/bjr.20201367>

Publisher: British Institute of Radiology

Version: Published Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/629470/>

Usage rights:  [Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

Additional Information: This is an Open Access article published in the British Journal of Radiology by British Institute of Radiology.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

Received:
23 November 2020

Revised:
18 June 2021

Accepted:
21 June 2021

© 2021 The Authors. Published by the British Institute of Radiology under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 Unported License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>, which permits unrestricted non-commercial reuse, provided the original author and source are credited.

Cite this article as:

Noorverandi H, Parkes MJ, Callaghan MJ, Felson DT, O'Neill TW, Hodgson R. Assessment of bone marrow oedema-like lesions using MRI in patellofemoral knee osteoarthritis: comparison of different MRI pulse sequences. *Br J Radiol* 2021; **94**: 20201367.

FULL PAPER

Assessment of bone marrow oedema-like lesions using MRI in patellofemoral knee osteoarthritis: comparison of different MRI pulse sequences

¹HENRY NOORVERIANDI, MD, MSc, ²MATTHEW J PARKES, PhD, ^{3,4}MICHAEL J CALLAGHAN, PhD, MPhil, MCSP, ^{5,6}DAVID T FELSON, MD, MPH, ^{6,7,8}TERENCE W O'NEILL, MD and ⁹RICHARD HODGSON, PhD

¹Division of Musculoskeletal & Dermatological Sciences, School of Biological Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine & Health, The University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom

²Division of Population Health, Health Services Research & Primary Care, School of Biological Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, The University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom

³Faculty of Health, Psychology, and Social Care, Department of Health Professions, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, United Kingdom

⁴Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, United Kingdom

⁵Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, Massachusetts, United States

⁶Centre for Epidemiology Versus Arthritis, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom

⁷NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research Centre, Manchester Academic Health Sciences Centre, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, United Kingdom

⁸Department of Rheumatology, Salford Royal NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, United Kingdom

⁹Division of Informatics, Imaging & Data Sciences, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine & Health, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom

Address correspondence to: Dr Henry Noorverandi

E-mail: henry.noorverandi@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk

Objective: To compare bone marrow oedema-like lesion (BML) volume in subjects with symptomatic patellofemoral (PF) knee osteoarthritis (OA) using four different MRI sequences and to determine reliability of BML volume assessment using these sequences and their correlation with pain.

Methods: 76 males and females (mean age 55.8 years) with symptomatic patellofemoral knee OA had 1.5 T MRI scans. PD fat suppressed (FS), STIR, contrast-enhanced (CE) T_1 W FS, and 3D T_1 W fast field echo (FFE) sequences were obtained. All sequences were assessed by one reader, including repeat assessment of 15 knees using manual segmentation and the measurements were compared. We used random-effects panel linear regression to look for differences in the log-transformed BML volume (due to positive skew in the BML volume distribution) between sequences and to determine associations between BML volumes and knee pain.

Results: 58 subjects had PF BMLs present on at least one sequence. Median BML volume measured using T_1 W FFE sequence was significantly smaller (224.7 mm³, interquartile range [IQR] 82.50–607.95) than the other three sequences. BML volume was greatest on the CE sequence (1129.8 mm³, IQR 467.28–3166.02). Compared

to CE sequence, BML volumes were slightly lower when assessed using PDFS (proportional difference = 0.79; 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.62, 1.01) and STIR sequences (proportional difference = 0.85; 95% CI 0.67, 1.08). There were strong correlations between BML volume on PDFS, STIR, and CE T_1 W FS sequences (p s = 0.98). Correlations were lower between these three sequences and T_1 W FFE (p s = 0.80–0.81). Intraclass correlation coefficients were excellent for proton density fat-suppressed, short-tau inversion recovery, and CE T_1 W FS sequences (0.991–0.995), while the ICC for T_1 W FFE was good at 0.88. We found no significant association between BML volumes assessed using any of the sequences and knee pain.

Conclusion: T_1 W FFE sequences were less reliable and measured considerably smaller BML volume compared to other sequences. BML volume was larger when assessed using the contrast enhanced T_1 W FS though not statistically significantly different from BMLs when assessed using PDFS and STIR sequences.

Advances in knowledge: This is the first study to assess BMLs by four different MRI pulse sequences on the same data set, including different fluid sensitive sequences and gradient echo type sequence.

INTRODUCTION

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) has been widely used in knee osteoarthritis (OA) research as it permits the evaluation of abnormal changes in the joint associated with disease, including subchondral bone marrow lesions (BMLs). BMLs are common in symptomatic knee OA and are considered to be an important imaging marker which has been associated with pain^{1,2} and progression of disease.^{3–6} Their appearance, however, is influenced by the MRI imaging technique/sequence used. A number of MRI pulse sequences have been used to assess BMLs in clinical and research studies, including: (i) fluid sensitive sequences (T_2 weighted, proton density (PD)-weighted, intermediate-weighted sequences with fat suppression),^{7–10} and short-tau inversion recovery (STIR) sequences,^{8,11,12} (ii) contrast-enhanced T_1 weighted MRI sequences with fat suppression,^{11–15} and (iii) gradient-echo (GRE) sequences such as dual-echo steady-state (DESS), fast low-angle shot (FLASH), or spoiled-gradient recalled acquisition in steady-state (SPGR).^{16,17} There are, however, relatively few data comparing these sequences and those published have looked at BML volume assessed typically using a contrast-enhanced (CE) vs non-CE pulse sequence.^{11–13,15} Further, most studies looked at BML volume on a relatively small number of OA patients or a heterogeneous patient population and used two or three different MRI pulse sequences only. Using data collected as part of a trial of brace therapy in patients with symptomatic patellofemoral OA, we assessed BML volume in the patellofemoral joint using four different pulse sequences including three different fluid sensitive MRI pulse sequences and a fat-suppressed GRE sequence. Our aims were: (i) to determine the reliability of BML volume assessment for each of the sequences, (ii) to compare the proportion of subjects identified with BML, and size of the BMLs, (iii) to determine between sequence correlations in BML volume, and (iv) to determine for each sequence the association between BML volume and knee pain.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

Subjects

This study was a secondary analysis of a completed randomised clinical trial of a patellar brace in participants with painful patellofemoral knee OA (Trial registration number: ISRCTN50380458).¹⁴ The clinical trial was carried out from August 2009 to September 2012. Participants were clinically assessed by an experienced physiotherapist for knee pain on some nominated aggravating activities, such as stair climbing, kneeling, prolonged sitting or squatting¹⁴ and those with pain score of 4 or above on 0–10 cm visual analogue scale (VAS) were enrolled in this trial.

MRI pulse sequences parameters

MR images were obtained on a Philips 1.5 T Scanner (Philips, Best Netherlands) using an eight channel knee coil (SENSE-Knee 8). Images of the patellofemoral joint were obtained in the axial plane using the following MRI sequences: (1) fat suppressed fast spin-echo (FSE) (TR/TE, 1500/15 ms; field of view (FOV), 14 cm; 256 × 256 pixels and 24 slices; slice thickness, 3 mm with 0.3 mm gap), referred as proton density fat-suppressed (PDFS) hereafter; (2) Short tau inversion recovery (TR/TE, ~3700/14 ms; TI, 140 ms; FOV 14 cm; 320 × 320 pixels and 24 slices; slice thickness,


3 mm with 0.3 mm gap), referred to as STIR; (3) Fat suppressed post intravenous contrast agent (TR/TE, 500/17 ms; FOV 14 cm; 320 × 320 pixels and 24 slices; slice thickness, 3 mm with 0.3 mm gap) referred to as contrast enhanced T_1 weighted sequence with fat suppression or CE T_1 W FS; and (4) 3D T_1 weighted GRE pulse sequence with fat suppression (TR/TE, 39/~5.2 ms; flip angle, 45°; FOV, 14 cm; 256 × 256 pixels and 53 sections; slice thickness, 3.0 mm; and overlap between adjacent slices, 1.5 mm) referred to as 3D gradient echo T_1 weighted fast field echo sequence (T_1 W FFE). There were small parameter differences in two participants with some changes to the FOV (increased to 15 cm) and matrix size.

BML assessment

BML assessment was performed by a trained reader (HN) who was blinded to the pain score. Images acquired using different sequences in the same participant were not evaluated together. BMLs are defined as ill-defined high signal intensity areas adjacent to articular cartilage or cartilage loss on two or more contiguous slices. We used manual segmentation to calculate BMLs volume and focused on BMLs in the patella and trochlea of the femur (patellofemoral joint). The patella and the opposing region of the anterior femur (trochlea) were defined using regions derived from Boston-Leeds Osteoarthritis Knee Score (BLOKS), the inferior margin of the femur was the intersection between a line drawn parallel to the anterior aspect of the proximal tibia and the femoral surface¹⁸ on sagittal 3D water-selective cartilage scans (WATSc).

Patellofemoral (PF) BMLs were delineated on each MRI slice in Osirix software, and total PF BMLs volume integrated over all slices. In the case of multifocal BMLs, the segmentation was performed for all BMLs and the total PF BML volume (in mm³) was calculated by adding the volume of all PF BMLs in a knee. Figure 1 shows an example of the manual segmentation of multifocal BMLs. Cystic changes within BMLs were included in the BMLs volume measurements. However, simple cysts without associated oedema-like features, solitary cysts, ganglion cysts or high signal intensity within osteophytes were not included in the analysis.

Figure 1. Manual segmentation of BMLs. Axial PDFS image (a) shows BMLs in the patella and trochlea (white arrows) with area of interests were drawn for volume measurement (b). BML, bone marrow lesion; PDFS, proton density fat-suppressed.



Intrareader reliability for manual segmentation of BML volume was investigated by the reader repeating assessment of 15 knees of 4 different MRI sequences with a minimum of 4 weeks between assessments. The reader was not aware which images were repeats.

Statistical analyses

The intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC [3,1 model])¹⁹ was used to determine intrareader reliability in BML volume for each sequence separately. ICC values range from 0 to 1, where <0.5 indicates poor reliability, 0.5 to <0.75 moderate, 0.75–0.9 good, and >0.9 excellent reliability.²⁰ The statistical analyses were limited to those 58 patients who had a BML on at least one of the sequences. PF BML volumes were assessed using each of the four different pulse sequences. We used a random-effects panel linear regression model to look for differences in BML volume assessed using these different sequences. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons were undertaken using Bonferroni-corrected 95% confidence intervals.²¹ As the distribution of the BML volume was positively skewed, the BML volumes were first log-transformed, the model run on these transformed volumes, and the subsequent regression coefficients back-transformed to give coefficients in terms of proportions, and predicted back in mm³. Bivariate analysis was performed using χ^2 and Wilcoxon rank sum test to compare subject characteristics between those with BMLs on all sequences and with BMLs on some but not all sequences. The association in BML volume between pulse sequences was determined using Spearman's correlation coefficient (ρ s).²² We used linear regression to evaluate the association between log BML volume on different MRI pulse sequences and VAS pain scores. A type-I error rate of 0.05 was used to assess statistical significance. All statistical analyses were performed using Stata 14.0 (StataCorp, TX, USA).

RESULTS

Subjects

There were 76 subjects (36 male, 40 female) with 4 suitable MRI pulse sequences that fulfilled the inclusion criteria. Subjects ranged in age from 41 to 70 years (mean 55.8 years; SD 7.4) and BMI 30.4 (SD 5.0) kg/m². Mean visual analogue scale (0–10 cm) pain score at baseline was 6.2 (SD 2.2) cm.

Table 1. Intrareader reliability for manual segmentation of BMLs ($n = 15$)

| MRI pulse sequences | ICC values (95% confidence interval) |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| PDFS | 0.994 (0.981 to 0.998) |
| STIR | 0.995 (0.981 to 0.999) |
| CE T ₁ W FS | 0.991 (0.973 to 0.997) |
| T ₁ W FFE | 0.88 (0.582 to 0.962) |

T₁-w FFE, T₁ weighted fast-field echo; CE T₁-w FS, contrast enhanced T₁ weighted fat-suppressed; ICC, Intraclass correlation coefficient; PDFS, proton density fat-suppressed; STIR, short tau inversion recovery.

Intrareader reliability of BML volume

Table 1 shows the ICC_{3,1} for BML volume in 15 knees for the four sequences. The ICCs were excellent for PDFS, STIR and CE T₁W FS sequences (all 0.99), while the ICC for T₁W FFE was lower at 0.88.

Detection of BMLs and comparison of BML volume between different MRI pulse sequences

Among the 76 subjects with complete data, 58 had PF BMLs present on at least one sequence. BMLs were present in all 58 patients when assessed using PDFS, STIR and CE T₁W FS sequences; the T₁W FFE sequence did not demonstrate BMLs in 4 patients.

Compared to the 54 patients where BMLs were present in all sequences, those in whom a BML was not seen on the T₁W FFE sequence were of similar median age (60.5 vs 55.0 yrs), body mass index (28.9 vs 30.4 Kg/m²), and pain score (5.9 vs 6.3). The volume of BMLs, assessed using the other three sequences, was smaller for these subjects. For example, using the PDFS sequence median BML volume was 206.9 mm³ for 4 subjects without BML (on T₁W FFE) compared to a median BML volume of 1117.9 mm³ for the other 54 subjects.

Examples of BMLs using the four MRI sequences are shown in Figure 2.

The median PF BML volume was greatest using the CE T₁W FS sequence, and smallest using the T₁Ww FFE sequence (Table 2 and Figure 3).

Post-hoc pairwise comparisons following the random-effects panel linear regression established that BML volume was similar when assessed using the PDFS, STIR, or CE T₁W FS sequences (Table 3). BML volumes assessed on T₁W FFE sequence were, on average, between 4 and 6 times lower those from any of the other three pulse sequences.

Correlation between different MRI pulse sequences

The Spearman's correlation coefficients (ρ s)²² of BML volume between sequences was very strong when assessed using PDFS, STIR, and CE T₁W FS (all ρ s = 0.98). The correlation was strong between these sequences and T₁W FFE (ρ s ranging from 0.80 to 0.81) (Table 4).


Association between MRI pulse sequences and pain

In a linear regression featuring severity of knee pain (measured on a 10 cm VAS for a patient-nominated aggravating activity) as the outcome and the log-transformed baseline PF BML volume as a predictor for each of the four sequences, no association was found for any of the MRI pulse sequences (Table 5). The amount of pain variance explained by PF BML volumes was low for all sequences.

DISCUSSION

In this study, intrareader reliability for BML volume measurement was excellent when assessed using PDFS, STIR and CE T₁W FS (ICC_{3,1} = 0.991–0.995) and good for assessment using

Figure 2. Axial PDFS sequence (a) shows BMLs in the patella and femoral trochlea of the knee (yellow arrows). A similar appearance was also visible on STIR (b) and CE T_1 W FS (c). However, T_1 W FFE sequence (d) of the same knee shows only BML in the patella (white arrow) with no BML clearly visible in the femur. BML, bone marrow lesion; FFE, fast field echo; FS, fat-suppressed; PDFS, proton density fat-suppressed; STIR, short tau inversion recovery.




the T_1 W-FFE sequence ($ICC_{3,1} = 0.88$). Approximately three quarters of subjects (58 of 76) had evidence of PF BMLs that were present on PDFS, STIR and CE T_1 W FS sequences. BMLs were not seen in four of these subjects when assessed using the T_1 W FFE sequence. We found that BML volume was larger using the contrast enhanced sequence though was not statistically significantly different from BMLs assessed using the PDFS or STIR sequences after Bonferroni correction. On T_1 W FFE images, the BML volume was significantly smaller than the other three sequences. Significant correlations were observed between BMLs measured with all sequences. Correlations between PDFS, STIR and CE T_1 W FS were very strong ($p_s = 0.98$); correlations

Table 2. Summary of PF BML volumes (mm^3) on different MRI pulse sequences

| MRI pulse sequences | Number of patients | Median BML volume (IQR) |
|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| PDFS | 58 | 960.30 (316.47; 2705.34) |
| STIR | 58 | 1056.33 (369.60; 2645.61) |
| CE T_1 W FS | 58 | 1129.76 (467.28; 3166.02) |
| T_1 W FFE | 58 | 224.70 (82.50; 607.95) |

IQR, interquartile range; PDFS, proton density fat-suppressed; PF, patellofemoral; STIR, short tau inversion recovery.

Figure 3. Comparison of BML volumes between MRI pulse sequences, taken from the panel linear regression model, after back-transformation onto the mm^3 scale. BML, bone marrow lesion; FFE, fast field echo; FS, fat-suppressed; PDFS, proton density fat-suppressed; STIR, short tau inversion recovery.



between T_1 W FFE and the other sequences were lower ($p_s \sim 0.80$).

Several studies have compared BML volume in subjects with knee OA assessed using different MRI sequences, although to our knowledge there are no studies which have looked at BML volume using both STIR and PDFS sequences. Most have compared contrast enhanced sequences with one or two other sequences.^{11–13,15} Roemer *et al*¹³ in a study of 32 patients with knee OA reported that BMLs assessed using PD-w FS were larger (38%) than when assessed using T_1 -w FS CE sequences, though as in our study there was a strong correlation between them. Nielsen *et al*¹⁵ found BML volume measured from STIR images of the tibiofemoral compartments was slightly larger (~3%) compared to T_1 post-contrast sequences using manual segmentation. Other studies with relatively small proportions of OA patients have also shown small differences between STIR and contrast enhanced T_1 W FS sequences.^{11,12} In our study, BML

Table 3. Comparison of BMLs volume between MRI pulse sequences

| Comparison between pulse sequences | Proportional difference (Exponentiated coefficient) | Bonferroni-corrected (95% Confidence Interval) |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| PDFS vs STIR | 0.94 | (0.74; 1.19) |
| PDFS vs CE T_1 W FS | 0.79 | (0.62; 1.01) |
| PDFS vs T_1 W FFE | 4.45 | (3.48; 5.70) |
| STIR vs CE T_1 W FS | 0.85 | (0.67; 1.08) |
| STIR vs T_1 W FFE | 4.75 | (3.71; 6.09) |
| CE T_1 W FS vs T_1 W FFE | 5.61 | (4.38; 7.19) |

BML, bone marrow lesion; FFE, fast field echo; PDFS, proton density fat-suppressed; STIR, short tau inversion recovery.

Table 4. Association between BML volume assessed using different MRI sequences: Spearman's correlation coefficients (ps)

| Pulse Sequences | STIR | CE T1-w FS | T1-w FFE |
|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| PDFS | 0.98 ^a | 0.98 ^a | 0.81 ^a |
| STIR | | 0.98 ^a | 0.80 ^a |
| CE T ₁ W FS | | | 0.81 ^a |

BML, bone marrow lesion; FFE, fast field echo; PDFS, proton density fat-suppressed; STIR, short tau inversion recovery.

^ap value <0.05.

volume was greater when assessed using CE T₁W FS compared to other sequences. There are a number of possible reasons for the apparent difference from previous studies. In our study, TR values were shorter than the study by Roemer et al¹³ on both PDFS (1500 vs 5080 ms) and CE T₁W FS (500 vs 720 ms) which could potentially result in BMLs appearing relatively smaller on PDFS and larger on CE T₁W FS images. Because the edge of BMLs is inherently poorly defined, delineation is subjective and other details of the imaging sequence may also be important in determining the precise BML volume. These details include timing of scan post-contrast administration,²³ relaxivity, and dose of contrast agent,¹² efficacy of fat suppression, and signal to noise ratio.²⁴ This highlights the importance of using standardized protocols including both image sequence and imaging parameters when assessing BML volume in research settings. Given the greater potential for variability using CE sequences, there may be advantages to using PDFS and STIR sequences for routine assessment.

In our study, we found that T₁W-FFE sequences detected BMLs in a smaller number of people (54 vs 58) and that the full extent of BMLs shown on other sequences was not captured by the T₁W FFE sequences. Furthermore, the correlation between BML volume measured on T₁W FFE and other sequences was lower (~0.80) and the intrareader reliability

Table 5. Association between baseline pain score and log-transformed PF BMLs volume assessed using different MRI sequences

| MRI Sequences | Proportional change (Exponentiated coefficient) (95% CI) | R ² | ρ _s (95% CI) |
|------------------------|--|----------------|-------------------------|
| PDFS | 0.91 (0.62; 1.35) | 0.004 | -0.07 (-0.32; 0.20) |
| STIR | 0.90 (0.59; 1.36) | 0.005 | -0.06 (-0.31; 0.21) |
| CE T ₁ W FS | 0.95 (0.64; 1.43) | 0.001 | -0.03 (-0.29; 0.23) |
| T ₁ W FFE | 1.30 (0.82; 2.06) | 0.025 | 0.10 (-0.17; 0.35) |

BML, bone marrow lesion; FFE, fast field echo; PDFS, proton density fat-suppressed; p_s, Spearman's Correlation Coefficient; STIR, short tau inversion recovery.

was also lower. There is little literature on the value of these sequence for assessing BMLs in OA. DESS sequences, however, have been studied and have also shown much lower volumes than intermediate-weighted fat suppressed images (median BML volume: DESS = 191 mm³; IW FS = 1840 mm³), though there was a good correlation between both sequences with a Spearman's correlation coefficient of 0.83.²⁵ While both DESS and T₁W FFE sequences have been used to segment articular cartilage volumes, neither appears suitable for segmenting the full extent of BMLs visualized on other sequences. However, it is possible that as with DESS, T₁W FFE sequences may be valuable for discriminating cystic components.^{16,26}

Among our subjects, we found no significant association between BMLs volume and a patient nominated VAS pain score. Further, there was no significant difference in pain scores between those with BMLs compared to the smaller number of people (*n* = 18) without BMLs (data not shown). The small sample size means we can not exclude Type 2 error. Also, all of those who took part in the original clinical trial had significant knee pain (≥4 cm VAS) at baseline.

There are some limitations to consider in interpreting the results of the study. The sample size was relatively small, yet we were able to show differences in BML volume across the different sequences assessed and the number of subjects studied was larger than in many previous studies.^{11-13,15} Because of the standardised imaging protocol, we did not look at the influence of contrast dose or timing on BML volume and other imaging sequence parameters which may potentially have an impact on outcome and for which further studies are needed. Our study was cross-sectional and we did not look at sensitivity to change or correlation with treatment response factors which may be important in determining an optimum imaging sequence. Finally, our data relate to BMLs assessed at the patellofemoral compartment and caution is required before generalizing the findings to other sites.

In conclusion, we found that T₁W FFE sequences were less reliable and measured considerably smaller BML volume compared to other sequences. BML volume was larger when assessed using the contrast enhanced T₁W FS sequence though not statistically significantly different from BMLs when assessed using PDFS and STIR sequences.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Henry Noorverandi is supported by a grant from the Indonesian Government (Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education). The authors acknowledge the support of the NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research Centre at the University of Manchester for funding support. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health. The research was supported also by Versus Arthritis (Grant number= 21755).

REFERENCES

1. Felson DT, Chaisson CE, Hill CL, Totterman SMS, Gale ME, Skinner KM, et al. The association of bone marrow lesions with pain in knee osteoarthritis. *Ann Intern Med* 2001; **134**: 541–9. doi: <https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-134-7-200104030-00007>
2. Felson DT, Niu J, Guermazi A, Roemer F, Aliabadi P, Clancy M, et al. Correlation of the development of knee pain with enlarging bone marrow lesions on magnetic resonance imaging. *Arthritis Rheum* 2007; **56**: 2986–92. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/art.22851>
3. Felson DT, McLaughlin S, Goggins J, LaValley MP, Gale ME, Totterman S, et al. Bone marrow edema and its relation to progression of knee osteoarthritis. *Ann Intern Med* 2003; **139**(5 Pt 1): 330–6. doi: https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-139-5_Part_1-200309020-00008
4. Hunter DJ, Zhang Y, Niu J, Goggins J, Amin S, LaValley MP, et al. Increase in bone marrow lesions associated with cartilage loss: a longitudinal magnetic resonance imaging study of knee osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Rheum* 2006; **54**: 1529–35. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/art.21789>
5. Roemer FW, Guermazi A, Javaid MK, Lynch JA, Niu J, Zhang Y, et al. Change in MRI-detected subchondral bone marrow lesions is associated with cartilage loss: the most study. A longitudinal multicentre study of knee osteoarthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2009; **68**: 1461–5. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/ard.2008.096834>
6. Javaid MK, Lynch JA, Tolstykh I, Guermazi A, Roemer F, Aliabadi P, et al. Pre-radiographic MRI findings are associated with onset of knee symptoms: the most study. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* 2010; **18**: 323–8. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joca.2009.11.002>
7. Peterfy CG, Guermazi A, Zaim S, Tirman PFJ, Miaux Y, White D, et al. Whole-Organ magnetic resonance imaging score (worms) of the knee in osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* 2004; **12**: 177–90. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joca.2003.11.003>
8. Roemer FW, Guermazi A, Lynch JA, Peterfy CG, Nevitt MC, Webb N, et al. Short tau inversion recovery and proton density-weighted fat suppressed sequences for the evaluation of osteoarthritis of the knee with a 1.0 T dedicated extremity MRI: development of a time-efficient sequence protocol. *Eur Radiol* 2005; **15**: 978–87. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-004-2608-6>
9. Kornaat PR, Bloem JL, Ceulemans RYT, Riyazi N, Rosendaal FR, Nelissen RG, et al. Osteoarthritis of the knee: association between clinical features and MR imaging findings. *Radiology* 2006; **239**: 811–7. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2393050253>
10. Lo GH, McAlindon TE, Niu J, Zhang Y, Beals C, Dabrowski C, et al. Bone marrow lesions and joint effusion are strongly and independently associated with weight-bearing pain in knee osteoarthritis: data from the osteoarthritis initiative. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2009; **17**: 1562–9. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joca.2009.06.006>
11. Schmid MR, Hodler J, Vienne P, Binkert CA, Zanetti M. Bone marrow abnormalities of foot and ankle: stir versus T1-weighted contrast-enhanced fat-suppressed spin-echo MR imaging. *Radiology* 2002; **224**: 463–9. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2242011252>
12. Mayerhoefer ME, Breitenhofer MJ, Kramer J, Aigner N, Norden C, Hofmann S. Stir vs. T1-weighted fat-suppressed gadolinium-enhanced MRI of bone marrow edema of the knee: computer-assisted quantitative comparison and influence of injected contrast media volume and acquisition parameters. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging* 2005; **22**: 788–93. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmri.20439>
13. Roemer FW, Khad H, Hayashi D, Jara H, Ozonoff A, Fotinos-Hoyer AK, et al. Volumetric and semiquantitative assessment of MRI-detected subchondral bone marrow lesions in knee osteoarthritis: a comparison of contrast-enhanced and non-enhanced imaging. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* 2010; **18**: 1062–6. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joca.2010.05.006>
14. Callaghan MJ, Parkes MJ, Hutchinson CE, Gait AD, Forsythe LM, Marjanovic EJ, et al. A randomised trial of a brace for patellofemoral osteoarthritis targeting knee pain and bone marrow lesions. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2015; **74**: 1164–70. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/annrheumdis-2014-206376>
15. Nielsen FK, Egdun N, Jørgensen A, Peters DA, Jurik AG. Assessment of subchondral bone marrow lesions in knee osteoarthritis by MRI: a comparison of fluid sensitive and contrast enhanced sequences. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2016; **17**. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12891-016-1336-9>
16. Hayashi D, Guermazi A, Kwok CK, Hannon MJ, Moore C, Jakicic JM, et al. Semiquantitative assessment of subchondral bone marrow edema-like lesions and subchondral cysts of the knee at 3T MRI: a comparison between intermediate-weighted fat-suppressed spin echo and dual echo steady state sequences. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2011; **12**: 198. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2474-12-198>
17. Wluka AE, Teichtahl AJ, Maulana R, Liu BM, Wang Y, Giles GG, et al. Bone marrow lesions can be subtyped into groups with different clinical outcomes using two magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) sequences. *Arthritis Res Ther* 2015; **17**: 270. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13075-015-0780-5>
18. Hunter DJ, Lo GH, Gale D, Grainger AJ, Guermazi A, Conaghan PG. The reliability of a new scoring system for knee osteoarthritis MRI and the validity of bone marrow lesion assessment: BLOKS (Boston–Leeds osteoarthritis knee score). *Ann Rheum Dis* 2008; **67**: 206–11. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/ard.2006.066183>
19. Shrout PE, Fleiss JL. Intraclass correlations: uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychol Bull* 1979; **86**: 420–8. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.86.2.420>
20. Koo TK, Li MY. A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients for reliability research. *J Chiropr Med* 2016; **15**: 155–63. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012>
21. Armstrong RA. When to use the Bonferroni correction. *Ophthalmic and Physiological Optics* 2014; **34**: 502–8. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/opo.12131>
22. Schober P, Boer C, Schwarte LA. Correlation coefficients: appropriate use and interpretation. *Anesthesia & Analgesia* 2018; **126**: 1763–8.
23. Lee JH, Dyke JP, Ballon D, Ciombor DM, Tung G, Aaron RK. Assessment of bone perfusion with contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging. *Orthopedic Clinics of North America* 2009; **40**: 249–57. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jocl.2008.12.003>
24. Mirowitz SA, Apicella P, Reinus WR, Hammerman AM. Mr imaging of bone marrow lesions: relative conspicuousness on T1-weighted, fat-suppressed T2-weighted, and stir images. *American Journal of Roentgenology* 1994; **162**: 215–21. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2214/ajr.162.1.8273669>
25. Zhang M, Driban JB, Price LL, Lo GH, McAlindon TE. Magnetic resonance image sequence influences the relationship between bone marrow lesions volume and pain: data from the osteoarthritis initiative. *Biomed Res Int* 2015; **2015**: 1–5. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/731903>
26. Peterfy CG, Gold G, Eckstein F, Cicuttini F, Dardzinski B, Stevens R. MRI protocols for whole-organ assessment of the knee in osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage* 2006; **14**: 95–111. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joca.2006.02.029>