

Review

Not peer-reviewed version

Computational and Imaging Approaches for Precision Characterization of Bone, Cartilage, and Synovial Biomolecules

[Rahul Kumar](#)*, [Kyle Sporn](#), Alnemri Alnemri, [Akshay Khanna](#), Phani Paladugu, [Chirag Gowda](#), Louis Clarkson, [Nasif Zaman](#), [Alireza Tavakkoli](#)

Posted Date: 9 June 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202506.0706.v1

Keywords: joint disease; cartilage; synovium; bone matrix; MRI; quantitative CT; spatial transcriptomics; deep learning; molecular imaging; musculoskeletal biomarker



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Review

Computational and Imaging Approaches for Precision Characterization of Bone, Cartilage, and Synovial Biomolecules

Rahul Kumar ^{1,*}, Kyle Sporn ², Ahab Alnemri ³, Akshay Khanna ⁴, Phani Paladugu ^{4,5}, Chirag Gowda ¹, Louis Clarkson ⁶, Nasif Zaman ⁷ and Alireza Tavakkoli ⁷

¹ Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, 1600 NW 10th Avenue, Miami, FL 33136, United States

² Upstate Medical University Norton College of Medicine, Syracuse, New York, United States

³ Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, United States

⁴ Sidney Kimmel Medical College at Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, United States

⁵ Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, United States

⁶ School of Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom

⁷ Human-Machine Perception Laboratory, Department of Computer Science, University of Nevada Reno, Reno, Nevada, United States

* Correspondence: rahulkumar@miami.edu

Abstract: Background/Objectives: Degenerative joint diseases (DJDs) involve intricate molecular disruptions within bone, cartilage, and synovial tissues—often preceding overt radiographic changes. These tissues exhibit complex biomolecular architectures, and their degeneration leads to microstructural disorganization and inflammation that are challenging to detect with conventional imaging. This review aims to synthesize recent advances in imaging, computational modeling, and sequencing technologies that enable high-resolution, non-invasive characterization of joint tissue health. Methods: We examined advanced modalities including high-resolution MRI (e.g., T1ρ, sodium MRI), quantitative and dual-energy CT (qCT, DECT), and ultrasound elastography, integrating them with radiomics, deep learning, and multi-scale modeling approaches. We also evaluated RNA-seq, spatial transcriptomics, and mass spectrometry-based proteomics for omics-guided imaging biomarker discovery. Results: Emerging technologies now permit detailed visualization of proteoglycan content, collagen integrity, mineralization patterns, and inflammatory microenvironments. Computational frameworks—ranging from convolutional neural networks to finite element and agent-based models—enhance diagnostic granularity. Multi-omics integration links imaging phenotypes to gene and protein expression, enabling predictive modeling of tissue remodeling, risk stratification, and personalized therapy planning. Conclusions: The convergence of imaging, AI, and molecular profiling is transforming musculoskeletal diagnostics. These synergistic platforms enable early detection, multi-parametric tissue assessment, and targeted intervention. Widespread clinical integration requires robust data infrastructure, regulatory compliance, and physician education, but offers a pathway toward precision musculoskeletal care.

Keywords: joint disease; cartilage; synovium; bone matrix; MRI; quantitative CT; spatial transcriptomics; deep learning; molecular imaging; musculoskeletal biomarker

1. Introduction

Bone, cartilage, and synovial tissues contain an extensive biomolecular and regenerative capacity [1]. Bone is made up of a mineralized matrix of hydroxyapatite and type I collagen and is modulated by non-collagenous proteins like osteocalcin, while cartilage relies on type II collagen and aggrecan for viscoelasticity, and synovium regulates joint lubrication through hyaluronan and

cytokine interactions [2–4]. Degenerative processes disrupt these biomolecular networks and induce micro-level changes like collagen crosslink density alterations and cytokine infiltration [5]. This makes it very difficult for clinicians and researchers alike to precisely characterize degenerative joint diseases, particularly in a non-invasive, rapid method that benefits patients [6]. In fact, joint disease involves collagen degradation, proteoglycan depletion, and synovial inflammation, which are often only detectable at the molecular level [7,8]. Fortunately, recent imaging modalities, computational analytics, and sequencing technologies have transformed this landscape, and are increasingly allowing physicians to map joint tissue microenvironments [9–11].

MRI and qCT, when combined with computational models and sequencing, can provide multi-parametric insights into these diseases [12]. In this review, we explore these synergies and demonstrate how they can advance musculoskeletal care [13]. In essence, our goal is to provide a comprehensive, technical analysis of these methodologies by synthesizing new and proposed cutting-edge imaging, computational, and sequencing approaches [14]. We specifically explore high-resolution MRI, qCT, DECT, ultrasound elastography, radiomics, deep learning, molecular simulations, and sequencing technologies like RNA-seq and spatial transcriptomics [15–17]. We also analyze multimodal data fusion with omics datasets and translational applications, including image-guided profiling [18]. Ultimately, we advocate that by carefully implementing these tools, clinicians can significantly advance day-to-day care for patients affected by joint disease [19].

2. Biomolecular Architecture of Joint Tissues

Bone's mineralized matrix is primarily hydroxyapatite and type I collagen [20]. These matrix components provide mechanical strength while osteocalcin and osteopontin mediate calcium ion coordination [21]. Cartilage is composed of type II collagen and aggrecan, and maintains viscoelastic properties through proteoglycan-water interactions, which are stabilized by hydrogen bonding networks [22,23]. Synovium is rich in hyaluronan and lubricin and regulates joint lubrication, while cytokines like IL-6 and TNF- α modulate inflammatory cascades [24,25]. These biomolecular networks are dynamic, with matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs) driving degradation in pathological states [26].

The structural organization of these tissues influences their biomechanical properties [27]. In bone, collagen fibrils align in lamellar patterns, with hydroxyapatite crystals nucleating along fibril surfaces through electrostatic interactions [28]. The cartilage collagen network forms a porous matrix that entraps aggrecan molecules that regulate water retention through osmotic pressure [29]. Synovial fluid viscosity is dependent on hyaluronan molecular weight and is modulated by shear-induced conformational changes [30].

Understanding these molecular interactions is key to determining what impact disease-related abnormalities, like collagen disorganization or cytokine upregulation, has on joint health [31]. Advanced imaging modalities like T1 ρ MRI and DECT can capture these biomolecular signatures by probing water dynamics, GAG content, and mineralization patterns [32,33]. Another invasive tool could be computational models like molecular dynamics (MD) simulations, which clinicians can use to simulate collagen crosslink stability or osteocalcin-hydroxyapatite binding based on patient age, weight, and other relevant health measures [34]. Sequencing technologies also have a potential role here. RNA-seq can identify gene expression profiles, such as MMP upregulation, and correlate this with imaging-derived biomarkers [35]. By performing this kind of multi-variate analysis, clinicians are conducting multi-parametric healthcare, whereby they can make clinical decisions with both molecular and tissue-level health information [36]. The ultimate goal in blending imaging, computational, and sequencing approaches is to map biomolecular changes to clinical phenotypes [37]. For instance, tracking collagen crosslink density can inform predicted cartilage repair strategies following a certain treatment [38]. Similarly, if patients have their synovial cytokine environment profiled, physicians can recommend certain anti-inflammatory therapies that best align with their cytokine microenvironment [39]. Spatial transcriptomics can also be used in this context since it further localizes gene expression [40].

3. Challenges of Conventional Diagnostics

We believe that conventional diagnostic modalities are inherently limited by their design and intended purpose [41]. Radiography relies on X-ray attenuation, which can't capture subtle cartilage degradation or synovial inflammation [42]. Specifically, X-ray visualizes gross bone loss without sufficient tissue-specific contrast [43]. Histology can be layered on top of X-ray, but can be invasive as it requires ex vivo samples [44]. Histological analysis also is inefficient for dynamic, longitudinal monitoring [45]. Many geriatric patients may have prolonged proteoglycan depletion or cytokine infiltration, for example, and sampling at each visit would not be optimal [46]. Two-dimensional radiography is also inappropriate to visualize three-dimensional tissue architecture, as it does not cover trabecular microarchitecture and nuanced cartilage thinning, while histological staining, despite visualizing collagen and glycosaminoglycan distribution, suffers from sampling bias and fails to assess biomechanical properties, including tissue stiffness [47,48].

4. Advanced Imaging Modalities for Joint Tissue Characterization

4.1. High-Resolution Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)

High-resolution Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) uses controlled magnetic field gradients and radiofrequency (RF) pulses to image tissues at a sub-millimeter spatial level [49]. Specialized quantitative techniques, including T2-weighted imaging, assess water content and its interaction with the macromolecular matrix, particularly collagen organization, through measuring spin-spin relaxation times (T2 values, typically 30–80 ms in cartilage) which reflect tissue hydration and matrix integrity [50]. Researchers can use T1ρ mapping probes (T1 relaxation in the rotating frame) to slow molecular motions and thus quantify proteoglycan concentration by exploiting magnetization decay under specific spin-lock RF pulse conditions [51]. Clinicians can also use delayed Gadolinium-Enhanced MRI of Cartilage (dGEMRIC), which uses anionic gadolinium chelates to map glycosaminoglycan (GAG) distribution [52]. The chelates' uptake is inversely proportional to GAG content because of this due to anionic charge repulsion, and the resulting spread of GAG molecules can be used to map polysaccharides in the extracellular matrix (ECM) [53].

Interestingly, ultra-high-field MRI (≥ 7 Tesla) pushes spatial resolution to below 0.3 mm^3 voxels, which means fine structures like subchondral bone trabeculae and synovial microvasculature can be resolved [54]. Sodium MRI (^{23}Na MRI) directly targets sodium nuclei predominantly bound to GAGs, leveraging the quadrupolar nature of ^{23}Na and chemical shift imaging to distinguish bound from free sodium [55]. Thus, the bound sodium can be a direct biomarker for cartilage matrix integrity [56].

However, high fidelity does come with its own challenges. High-field systems exacerbate B0 magnetic field inhomogeneities and susceptibility artifacts, particularly at tissue interfaces, which can distort signal intensity and compromise quantification [57]. Technicians can use compressed sensing algorithms to reconstruct images from undersampled k-space data to significantly reduce protracted scan times, and emerging deep learning-based denoising techniques have been shown to enhance image quality [58,59]. Advanced pulse sequences, including 3D spoiled gradient echo (SPGR), are optimized for specific applications like cartilage visualization by maximizing contrast between articular surfaces and synovial fluid, and quantitative susceptibility mapping (QSM) assesses tissue mineralization by exploiting magnetic susceptibility differences [60,61]. AI-driven segmentation and multi-parametric analysis are increasingly integrated to extract comprehensive phenotypic information from these rich datasets [62]. Nevertheless, physicians face substantial hurdles in translating these advanced MRI capabilities into routine clinical practice. Beyond intrinsic technical demands like precise B0 shimming, prolonged scan durations and susceptibility to motion artifacts must be accounted for [63]. Motion artifacts can be mitigated if technicians use parallel imaging like SENSE and motion correction algorithms like PROPELLER, but this still may be insufficient [64]. Furthermore, ultra-high-field scanners and specialized sequences can drive up cost, especially due to limited supply and recent NIH funding cuts [65]. Unregulated tools may also lead to standardization issues and inter-scanner variability [66]. Nonetheless, the biomolecular

information extracted, such as GAG content or water organization, ultimately reflects ongoing gene expression, RNA processing and its regulation that determine tissue composition and function [67]. Pathological changes detected by MRI often stem from dysregulation within these fundamental biological networks, making non-invasive MRI a powerful tool for probing disease mechanisms rooted in molecular and cellular alterations [68].

4.2. Quantitative Computed Tomography (qCT)

Quantitative Computed Tomography (qCT) can precisely measure bone mineral density (BMD) by calibrating X-ray attenuation values against standardized hydroxyapatite phantoms, thus achieving Hounsfield unit precision often below 1% [69]. Orthopedic specialists would especially benefit from qCT to resolve three-dimensional trabecular microarchitecture and in turn measure trabecular thickness, separation, and connectivity density [70]. These are fundamental determinants of bone strength that would otherwise not appear on standard X-ray alone [71].

While basic CT technology is ubiquitous in hospitals, qCT goes a step further. As qCT can conduct finite element analysis (FEA), qCT data may be included to simulate stress distribution under physiological loads, therefore computing von Mises stresses to more precisely estimate fracture risk [72]. If clinicians add voxel-based morphometry techniques to qCT data through subtle density gradients, they can track bone remodeling patterns [73]. By adjusting for polychromatic X-ray absorption, technical developments like spectral calibration reduce beam-hardening artifacts and guarantees correct BMD readings [74]. Multi-energy qCT acquisition enhances contrast between mineralized and soft tissues by differentiating materials like hydroxyapatite and collagen based on their distinct attenuation profiles at different X-ray energies [75]. Modern iterative reconstruction algorithms, including model-based iterative reconstruction (MBIR), are routinely employed to reduce image noise and improve edge detection, which sharpens the visualization of fine trabecular boundaries, allowing for more precise quantification [76]. These capabilities make qCT invaluable for assessing bone quality and understanding degenerative changes, for example, in planning joint stabilization procedures like coracoid graft placement for glenoid reconstruction, where qCT can map mineralization gradients to inform graft integration [77]. Low-dose qCT techniques reduce radiation exposure, therefore making the modality appropriate for longitudinal bone health monitoring [78]. Although its main limit is still rather low soft-tissue contrast compared to MRI, limiting its direct use for cartilage or synovial assessment, the integration of qCT with computational tools like radiomics further extracts high-dimensional quantitative features, improving diagnosis precision for bone-related pathologies [79]. The creation of photon-counting detectors promises to increase spatial resolution and contrast even more, hence extending the uses of qCT in line with the focus of precision medicine on strong imaging biomarkers for individualized diagnosis [80].

4.3. Dual-Energy Computed Tomography (DECT)

Dual-Energy Computed Tomography (DECT) works by acquiring data from two distinct X-ray energy spectra (e.g., 80 kVp and 140 kVp), and in turn differentiating between tissue compositions based on material-specific attenuation coefficients [81]. In essence, this means that images can be decomposed into basis material pairs like hydroxyapatite and collagen and subsequently quantified [82]. DECT is an advanced application of CT, but goes a step further by analyzing differences in Compton scattering and photoelectric absorption; in DECT, attenuation coefficients correlate with GAG concentration [83]. Furthermore, DECT can detect cytokine-driven synovial inflammation through enhanced soft-tissue contrast and identify vascular alterations linked to angiogenesis [84].

Photon-counting detectors significantly improves the spectral resolution of DECT by reducing noise and enhancing contrast-to-noise ratios by more accurately resolving energy-specific photon interactions, while virtual monochromatic imaging reconstructs images at optimal single-energy levels (e.g., 70 keV) to minimize beam-hardening artifacts and ensure consistent tissue characterization [85,86]. Material decomposition algorithms, such as two-material or three-material decomposition, precisely quantify fractions of substances like calcium, uric acid, and soft tissue,

supporting multi-parametric analysis of degenerative and metabolic joint diseases [87]. Along with changes like IL-6 infiltration in inflamed synovium (where IL-6 levels reflect active gene expression in response to stimuli), DECT's ability to map biomolecular gradients—such as urate crystal deposition in gout or subtle calcium changes in bone and soft tissues—helps to support earlier and more specific diagnosis [88]. This guides focused therapy approaches ranging from anti-cytokine biologics for inflammatory arthropathies to urate-lowering treatments for gout to bisphosphonates for bone density problems [89]. Integration of AI-driven segmentation guarantees precise identification of areas of interest (ROIs), hence allowing spatially resolved measurement of tissue changes and matching with the requirement for new imaging biomarkers of precision medicine [90]. Though modern iterative reconstruction techniques and dose modulation strategies help to reduce dose requirements while correcting for scatter and improve general image quality, DECT still faces challenges including the computational intensity of material decomposition methods and concerns regarding radiation exposure [91].

4.4. Ultrasound Elastography

Ultrasound elastography offers a non-invasive approach to quantitatively assess tissue biomechanical properties by measuring stiffness through the tracking of acoustic wave propagation, with Shear Wave Elastography (SWE) being a prominent technique that quantifies shear moduli, often expressed via shear wave velocity ($c_s = \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{\rho}}$, where μ is the shear modulus and ρ is tissue density), as a surrogate for material integrity [92]. In articular cartilage, SWE can discern alterations in collagen crosslink density and organization—qualities intrinsically linked to chondrocyte gene expression, protein synthesis, and post-translational modifications that define the extracellular matrix—as shear wave velocities typically increase proportionally with matrix stiffening [93]. Concurrently, strain elastography, though more qualitative due to its reliance on operator-applied compression, can map tissue deformation in structures like the synovium, identifying fibrotic changes characteristic of chronic inflammatory states, which themselves are outcomes of sustained pathogenic signaling and altered gene expression patterns leading to excessive matrix deposition [94]. The utility of high-frequency transducers (>20 MHz) allows for sub-millimeter spatial resolution, resolving microscale variations in elasticity crucial for detecting early pathology [95]. However, SWE's accuracy relies on accounting for the viscoelastic and anisotropic nature of tissues like cartilage, often necessitating multi-angle acquisitions, while strain elastography's inherent operator dependency introduces variability, though automated algorithms and standardized measurement protocols aim to improve reproducibility [96]. The integration of artificial intelligence-driven image processing is further enhancing the capacity to detect subtle, spatially-resolved stiffness changes, pivotal for the early diagnosis of degenerative phenotypes [97]. The portability and real-time capability of ultrasound elastography render it suitable for point-of-care applications, such as bedside monitoring of synovial inflammation or cartilage integrity, thereby informing therapeutic interventions like corticosteroid injections by mapping stiffness gradients [98]. While its penetration depth limits direct assessment of deeper bone structures, surface-based measurements can indirectly probe subchondral bone stiffness [99]. Despite advancements like 3D elastography promising enhanced volumetric resolution, challenges including operator variability, acoustic shadowing in deeper tissues, and the trade-off between resolution and penetration with high-frequency transducers (particularly in obese patients) persist [100]. Crucially, by correlating macroscopic stiffness measurements with molecular data, for instance from RNA-sequencing profiles of inflammatory or matrix-remodeling genes, elastography contributes to a precision medicine paradigm, linking imaging-derived biomechanical biomarkers to underlying cellular and molecular perturbations for improved diagnostics and guided interventions [101].

5. Computational Frameworks for Biomolecular Analysis

5.1. Radiomic Feature Extraction

Radiomics extracts quantitative features from imaging data to capture texture, intensity, and shape characteristics [102]. Gray-level co-occurrence matrix (GLCM) features, such as entropy and contrast, can quantify collagen disorganization in cartilage, while wavelet-based features detect mineralization heterogeneity in bone [103]. Histogram-based metrics like skewness and kurtosis can measure signal intensity distributions, which clinicians can interpret as correlating with proteoglycan content [104]. All in all, clinicians can use GLCM features with histogram metrics to understand a more holistic picture of degenerative change [105]. In radiomic pipelines, radiologists preprocess images through intensity normalization and denoising, followed by region-of-interest (ROI) segmentation using thresholding or active contour models [106]. Feature extraction employs libraries like Pyradiomics, generating high-dimensional datasets (>1000 features) [107]. Dimensionality reduction via principal component analysis (PCA) or least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) mitigates overfitting, selecting features with high variance or predictive power [108]. Increasingly, machine learning models, such as support vector machines, are now classifying degenerative phenotypes based on radiomic signatures [109]. We strongly believe that integrating ML-powered radiomics with imaging modalities can enhance diagnostic accuracy [110]. In MRI, GLCM features correlate with T1 ρ relaxation times, reflecting GAG loss, while in qCT, wavelet features quantify trabecular connectivity [111]. These features support non-invasive biomarker discovery, mapping biomolecular changes to tissue-level pathology [112]. However, a major challenge is feature redundancy and computational complexity, meaning initial data has to be cross-validated between radiologists before models can be deployed [113]. However, integrating imaging with RNA-seq profiles and general sequencing data of MMP expression can help correlate radiomic features with molecular pathways, enhancing interpretability [114]. Ultimately, by incorporating these radiomic pipelines, physicians can now obtain multi-parametric biomarkers from imaging data [115].

5.2. Deep Learning Pipelines

Deep learning frameworks like convolutional neural networks (CNNs) can help automate feature extraction and segmentation [116]. U-Net architectures, with encoder-decoder structures, are actively being used to segment cartilage and synovium by learning hierarchical features, thus leveraging skip connections to preserve spatial information [117]. By transfer learning these architectures, developers can adapt pre-trained models (e.g., ResNet, DenseNet) to musculoskeletal datasets [118]. This is particularly beneficial for more rural hospitals and serves to compensate for limited sample sizes [119].

Clinicians can also take advantage of Generative adversarial networks (GANs), as GANs can synthesize high-fidelity images and feed them into new model training datasets [120]. For example, conditional GANs can generate trabecular bone patterns, thus improving CNN performance in fracture risk prediction [121]. Adversarial training goes a step further as well and enhances super-resolution, reconstructing sub-voxel details from low-resolution scans via pixel-wise loss minimization [122]. On the biochemical side, researchers can also integrate AlphaFold2 into GAN-trained CNNs to predict protein structures like collagen or osteocalcin [123]. In theory, clinicians can have the following deep learning pipeline: they begin by preprocessing pictures using intensity normalization and artifact correction, then train models on annotated datasets [124]. Post-processing corrects segmentation faults using conditional random fields, which ensures a high rate of anatomical accuracy [125]. Then, they integrate this information with sequencing data, such as single-cell RNA-seq, such that imaging-derived phenotypes can be correlated to gene expression patterns [126].

6. Multimodal Data Fusion and Omics Integration

6.1. Transcriptomic Integration

RNA sequencing (RNA-seq) profiles gene expression in joint tissues, identifying inflammatory signatures like IL-6 and TNF- α in synovium [127]. Single-cell RNA-seq resolves cellular

heterogeneity, mapping chondrocyte and synoviocyte subpopulations with distinct functional roles [128]. Spatial transcriptomics localizes gene expression across tissue sections, aligning with imaging-derived regions of interest to identify molecular changes, such as collagenase upregulation in cartilage [129]. Imaging-transcriptomic fusion employs canonical correlation analysis (CCA) to correlate MRI-derived radiomic features with gene expression, identifying shared variance in degenerative phenotypes [130].

RNA-seq workflows involve RNA extraction, library preparation, and sequencing on platforms like Illumina NovaSeq, followed by read alignment using STAR and differential expression analysis with DESeq2 [131]. Imaging data are preprocessed to extract radiomic or biomechanical features, normalized for compatibility with transcriptomic profiles [132]. Multi-view learning integrates these datasets, learning joint representations via deep neural networks [133]. This approach quantifies disease-specific gene networks, guiding targeted interventions like anti-cytokine therapies [134].

Spatial transcriptomics employs techniques like 10x Visium, capturing mRNA from tissue sections with barcoded probes, enabling spatially resolved gene expression mapping [135]. Integration with DECT or MRI identifies regions of biomolecular alteration, such as synovial inflammation, enhancing diagnostic specificity [136]. These tools support precision medicine by correlating molecular and imaging biomarkers, facilitating early detection of degenerative changes in musculoskeletal tissues [137].

Challenges include data heterogeneity and batch effects, requiring robust normalization and quality control [138]. Computational platforms, like Seurat, streamline single-cell RNA-seq analysis, while spatial transcriptomics tools, such as Space Ranger, ensure accurate gene localization [139]. The integration of transcriptomic data with imaging and computational frameworks aligns with the special issue's focus on genomics and imaging, delivering personalized diagnostics for musculoskeletal care [140].

6.2. Proteomic Integration

Mass spectrometry-based proteomics quantitatively interrogates the complex protein landscapes and specific post-translational modifications (PTMs), such as phosphorylation, glycosylation, and citrullination, within joint tissues, thereby offering molecular insights into pathological mechanisms [141]. Detection of Cartilage Oligomeric Matrix Protein (COMP) fragments by proteomic interrogation signals collagen network degradation, while distinct osteocalcin isoforms or pro-collagen type I N-terminal propeptide (PINP) levels reflect osteoblastic activity and bone matrix turnover [142]. Investigators utilize synovial fluid proteomics to delineate intricate cytokine profiles, where elevated IL-1 β , TNF- α , and VEGF concentrations frequently drive inflammatory cascades and angiogenic responses [143]. Fusing proteomic data with imaging biomarkers, for example, correlating specific protein signatures with MRI-derived cartilage T2 relaxation times or ultrasound elastography-measured synovial stiffness, frequently employs multivariate statistical approaches like partial least squares regression or canonical correlation analysis to maximize the covariance explained between disparate data modalities [144]. Rigorous proteomic workflows initiate with meticulous protein extraction from minute tissue biopsies or biofluids, followed by reduction, alkylation, and enzymatic digestion, typically using trypsin, before subjecting peptides to liquid chromatography coupled with tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) on high-resolution instruments like Orbitrap series mass spectrometers (e.g., Orbitrap Exploris or Ascend Tribrid); label-free quantification (LFQ) strategies, such as MaxLFQ or intensity-based absolute quantification (iBAQ), or alternatively, data-independent acquisition (DIA-MS) coupled with spectral library searching (e.g., using Spectronaut or Skyline), ensure comprehensive peptide detection and high-throughput quantitative accuracy [145,146]. Subsequent bioinformatic processing pipelines, often orchestrated within environments like MaxQuant, Proteome Discoverer, or custom R/Python scripts, perform peptide identification via database searching (e.g., against UniProt), protein inference, false discovery rate (FDR) control, and sophisticated statistical analysis to identify differentially abundant proteins [147]. These refined protein abundance datasets are then aligned with preprocessed

radiomic or biomechanical features extracted from diverse imaging datasets, facilitated by integrative platforms such as MixOmics or bespoke statistical frameworks, to identify robust protein-imaging biomarkers—for instance, elevated MMP-3 activity correlating with reduced cartilage shear wave velocity, which supports personalized risk stratification algorithms [148]. The critical integration with transcriptomic data, for example, RNA-seq profiles detailing inflammatory gene expression signatures, allows for the correlation of protein expression levels with corresponding mRNA abundances, thereby enhancing mechanistic understanding by revealing post-transcriptional regulatory events [149]. Deep proteomic investigation of protein complexes like the UBE2T-FANCL DNA repair machinery can pinpoint specific ubiquitination sites on target substrates, thereby informing the design of precise therapeutic interventions aimed at modulating DNA repair capacity to promote bone regeneration or combat cellular senescence [150]. These multi-layered omics approaches effectively bridge molecular perturbations with tissue-level manifestations, a cornerstone of precision medicine's mandate for nuanced biomarker identification [151]. Notwithstanding these advances, challenges pertaining to inherent sample biological variability, the vast dynamic range of protein concentrations in biological matrices, and the need for highly standardized pre-analytical and analytical protocols persist, necessitating continuous methodological refinement and rigorous quality control to ensure data fidelity and inter-laboratory reproducibility [152]. Computational tools and robust bioinformatics pipelines are indispensable for streamlining these complex analytical workflows, ensuring that quantitative proteomics remains a critical, indispensable component for advancing precision musculoskeletal diagnostics through comprehensive omics integration [153].

6.3. AI-Augmented Segmentation

AI-augmented segmentation enhances ROI delineation in imaging, critical for spatially resolved biomolecular quantification [154]. Graph-cut algorithms initialize segmentation, refined by CNNs like U-Net to achieve sub-voxel accuracy [155]. Attention-based models, using transformer architectures, prioritize regions of interest, such as cytokine-rich synovial zones, by weighing feature importance [156]. In bone, segmentation resolves trabecular boundaries, enabling precise BMD quantification, while in cartilage, it maps proteoglycan gradients [157].

Segmentation pipelines preprocess images through intensity normalization and artifact correction, followed by model training on annotated datasets [158]. Transfer learning adapts pre-trained models to musculoskeletal imaging, mitigating data scarcity [159]. Post-processing corrects segmentation errors using conditional random fields, ensuring anatomical fidelity [160]. Integration with spatial transcriptomics correlates segmented ROIs with gene expression, enhancing diagnostic specificity [161].

Deep learning models, like those inspired by AlphaFold2, predict tissue-specific protein structures, informing segmentation by providing molecular context [162]. In synovium, attention mechanisms detect inflammatory foci, improving sensitivity for early disease detection [163]. These tools enable quantitative phenotyping, tracking degenerative changes like synovial thickening or bone erosion, and support longitudinal monitoring in musculoskeletal care [164].

Challenges include computational complexity and dataset bias, requiring robust validation through k-fold cross-validation [165]. Explainable AI frameworks enhance clinical reliability, ensuring transparency in segmentation outputs [166]. AI-augmented segmentation's ability to process multi-modal imaging data aligns with the special issue's focus on AI-enhanced imaging, delivering precision diagnostics for degenerative joint diseases [167].

6.4. Multi-Scale Modeling

Multi-scale modeling offers a paradigm for synthesizing disparate molecular, cellular, and tissue-level data, thereby constructing a holistic understanding for clinicians; for instance, agent-based models (ABMs) dynamically simulate chondrocyte mechanobiological responses, often incorporating molecular dynamics (MD)-derived parameters for collagen fibril mechanics [168]. Concurrently, finite element models (FEM), critically parameterized by quantitative inputs such as

qCT-derived bone microarchitecture or ultrasound elastography-derived tissue shear moduli, are employed by engineers and biomechanists to meticulously compute complex stress-strain distributions under diverse loading scenarios, thus providing invaluable predictions of biomechanical integrity and fracture risk [169]. The intricate dynamics of synovial inflammation are elucidated through sophisticated network models, which may manifest as Boolean networks delineating the logical architecture of signaling cascades (e.g., TNF- α /NF- κ B pathways), systems of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) quantifying the kinetic rates of specific biomolecular interactions (e.g., JAK-STAT signaling post-IL-6 receptor engagement), or even multi-cellular agent-based simulations [170]. These predictive engines frequently integrate multi-omics datasets, including transcriptomic profiles from RNA-sequencing that reveal cytokine gene expression landscapes and proteomic analyses quantifying protein abundances, to forecast inflammatory trajectories driven by complex intercellular dialogues dictated by underlying gene regulatory networks [171]. Specialized computational platforms like COMSOL Multiphysics or open-source alternatives such as OpenCMISS facilitate the unification of these heterogeneous, multi-scale inputs, striving for biophysical consistency across vastly different spatiotemporal scales, while hybrid computational frameworks synergistically couple differential equation systems for molecular kinetics with finite difference/element methods for continuum-level tissue mechanics and transport phenomena [172]. Rigorous validation of these computational constructs against empirical imaging data—such as comparing predicted cartilage deformation patterns with elastography-derived shear moduli or simulated bone adaptation responses with qCT-visualized mineralization changes—is indispensable, and the integration of high-resolution single-cell RNA-sequencing (scRNA-seq) data provides unparalleled cellular-level specificity, detailing heterogeneous cell populations and their distinct transcriptomic signatures, significantly enhancing model granularity [173]. Consequently, this multi-scale modeling paradigm directly informs therapeutic design: guiding the development of targeted MMP inhibitors based on simulated enzyme activity in cartilage, optimizing biomaterial scaffold properties for bone tissue engineering by predicting mineralization kinetics, or forecasting synovial inflammatory responses to biologics to aid in rational dosing strategies [174]. Despite these powerful capabilities, substantial challenges pertaining to computational expense, necessitating high-performance computing resources, inherent model complexity demanding meticulous parameterization, and the overarching need for robust, multi-faceted validation against diverse experimental and clinical datasets persist, prompting exploration of hybrid modeling approaches that judiciously blend deterministic and stochastic methodologies to balance predictive accuracy with computational tractability [175].

7. Translational Applications in Musculoskeletal Care

7.1. Image-Guided Molecular Profiling

Image-guided molecular profiling represents a sophisticated convergence of advanced diagnostic imaging and targeted therapeutic intervention, enabling physicians to leverage precise, patient-specific biomolecular insights for optimizing treatment efficacy in musculoskeletal disorders [176]. For instance, delayed Gadolinium-Enhanced MRI of Cartilage (dGEMRIC) meticulously maps cartilage glycosaminoglycan (GAG) content—a direct reflection of chondrocyte biosynthetic activity governed by intricate gene expression programs—thereby visualizing proteoglycan distribution to guide regenerative strategies such as autologous chondrocyte implantation or stem cell injections [177]. Similarly, quantitative Computed Tomography (qCT) provides high-fidelity quantification of bone microarchitecture and mineral density, crucial data for informing graft sizing and placement in complex joint stabilization procedures like coracoid transfer for glenoid reconstruction, where successful osseointegration depends on matching graft properties to host bone characteristics that are themselves outcomes of regulated cellular processes [178]. Dual-Energy CT (DECT) extends these capabilities by detecting and mapping specific molecular signatures of synovial inflammation, such as increased vascularity or even the distribution of pro-inflammatory cytokines like Interleukin-6 (IL-

6), whose localized expression is a hallmark of active inflammatory pathways, thus guiding the targeted administration of anti-cytokine therapies [179]. These innovative systems increasingly integrate imaging modalities with powerful computational models; sophisticated profiling workflows employ radiomics to extract sub-visual quantitative features that encapsulate biomolecular signatures, while machine learning algorithms, trained on extensive multi-modal datasets, are developed to predict therapeutic responses and long-term outcomes [180]. The drive for real-time intraoperative decision support, particularly in interventions like precise graft placement during bone repair or navigation in minimally invasive spine surgery (where techniques like uniportal endoscopy demand high-precision visualization to minimize complications such as dural tears), is accelerating the adoption of edge computing architectures to process imaging data locally [181]. Crucially, the integration of high-throughput sequencing data, especially RNA-sequencing profiles of inflammatory or matrix-remodeling genes from affected tissues, allows for the direct correlation of imaging-derived biomarkers with underlying molecular pathways, dramatically enhancing diagnostic specificity and mechanistic understanding [182]. Ultrasound elastography further complements this armamentarium by monitoring synovial inflammation through quantitative stiffness mapping, guiding interventions like corticosteroid injections with greater precision [183]. However, physicians face considerable challenges in the broad clinical translation of these advanced approaches, including the complexity of integrating heterogeneous data from disparate imaging, omics, and clinical platforms, the urgent need for robust standardization of acquisition protocols and analytical pipelines to ensure interoperability and reproducibility, and the validation of these sophisticated tools across diverse patient populations to confirm clinical utility beyond specialized academic centers [184]. Overcoming these hurdles, potentially through the development of interoperable, cloud-based informatics platforms that streamline data workflows and facilitate real-time access to integrated imaging and sequencing information, is critical for realizing the full potential of image-guided molecular profiling as a cornerstone of precision musculoskeletal care, delivering truly personalized diagnostics and interventions for degenerative joint diseases [185].

7.2. Predictive Modeling of Tissue Remodeling

Predictive modeling is revolutionizing musculoskeletal diagnostics by employing sophisticated computational architectures to forecast tissue remodeling dynamics and inform personalized therapeutic stratification, a domain ripe for innovation by software engineers adept at constructing intricate, data-driven systems [186]. Advanced algorithmic frameworks, such as ensemble learning via Random Forest classifiers, integrate high-dimensional radiomic signatures—extracted from modalities like qCT or MRI using texture analysis and geometric quantification—with multi-omics data, including transcriptomic profiles from RNA-sequencing that delineate aberrant gene expression patterns fundamental to tissue pathology, thereby enabling prognostication of cartilage degradation with feature importance rigorously assessed through metrics like Gini impurity or permutation-based scores [187]. Concurrently, Bayesian networks provide a robust probabilistic graphical modeling approach for dissecting complex processes such as bone mineralization kinetics, capably incorporating biophysical parameters (e.g., molecular dynamics-derived ligand-receptor binding affinities) and inherently propagating uncertainty through predictive inference, a critical capability for bolstering clinical decision support [188]. Furthermore, Graph Neural Networks (GNNs), leveraging graph convolutional layers and attention mechanisms, demonstrate exceptional aptitude in deciphering the intricate relational topology of synovial cytokine signaling networks—often elucidated through system-level analysis of gene expression programs governing immune cell activation and intercellular communication—consequently predicting inflammatory progression by learning latent representations of molecular and cellular entities and their dynamic interactions [189]. These cutting-edge models are meticulously engineered to ingest and synergistically process multi-modal inputs, thereby capturing the non-linear, complex spatiotemporal trajectories characteristic of degenerative joint diseases [190]. The development pipelines for such predictive systems necessitate

rigorous data pre-processing, encompassing advanced feature engineering, robust dimensionality reduction techniques (e.g., Principal Component Analysis, Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection (UMAP), or variational autoencoders), and meticulous normalization and harmonization strategies to mitigate batch effects, followed by model training on extensively curated, longitudinal datasets essential for capturing the intricate dynamics of tissue adaptation, degeneration, and therapeutic response over time [191]. Indispensable to their clinical translation are robust validation protocols, including stratified k-fold cross-validation and, ideally, prospective validation on independent, external patient cohorts to ensure generalizability, coupled with comprehensive uncertainty quantification—achieved through sophisticated methods like Monte Carlo dropout in deep neural networks, Bayesian inference, or conformal prediction—which is paramount for assessing the reliability of predictions and fostering physician confidence when confronted with outputs from these complex algorithmic systems [192]. The profound integration of imaging-derived biomarkers, such as qCT-derived trabecular connectivity indices or elastography-quantified synovial stiffness reflecting alterations in extracellular matrix integrity due to modified cellular biosynthetic programs, with granular molecular data from high-throughput sources like single-cell RNA-sequencing (scRNA-seq)—which illuminates cellular heterogeneity, identifies rare pathogenic cell populations, and maps cell-specific gene expression landscapes—endows these predictive models with enhanced biological plausibility and unparalleled predictive specificity [193]. Consequently, these sophisticated predictive tools can substantively guide critical clinical decisions, including the identification of optimal intervention windows for disease-modifying therapies like bisphosphonates by forecasting bone mineral density trajectories, or for anti-cytokine biologics by predicting inflammatory flare-ups in synovium based on modeled cytokine network activity intrinsically linked to specific pathogenic gene activation patterns [194]. In cartilage research, computational models predicting Matrix MetalloProteinase (MMP)-driven degradation, where specific MMP gene upregulation is a key indicator of catabolic activity, directly inform the rational design and optimization of targeted inhibitor therapies, while in bone tissue engineering, such models refine the micro-architectural design and material composition of regenerative scaffolds by simulating cellular responses and tissue integration [195]. Despite their transformative potential, significant translational hurdles persist, including the intense computational demands necessitating access to distributed high-performance computing clusters equipped with GPUs/TPUs; the formidable challenges of managing, harmonizing, and imputing meaning from highly heterogeneous, often sparse, and multi-scale data; and the crucial, frequently physician-voiced, imperative for model interpretability, now increasingly addressed by emerging eXplainable AI (XAI) techniques (e.g., SHAP, LIME, attention mapping) designed to de-mystify "black-box" algorithms and thereby foster clinical trust, facilitate regulatory approval, and ensure seamless integration into established clinical workflows [196]. Advanced development platforms such as TensorFlow, PyTorch, and specialized bioinformatics environments (e.g., Bioconductor, scikit-learn) are pivotal in streamlining the creation, validation, and deployment of these sophisticated models, fostering a vibrant ecosystem of innovation, particularly prominent in technology-driven regions like the San Francisco Bay Area, thereby firmly positioning predictive modeling as a cornerstone of next-generation musculoskeletal diagnostics aimed at achieving early, precise disease detection and truly personalized therapeutic strategies [197].

7.3. Clinical Integration and Workflow Optimization

In order to implement these tools at the bedside, hospitals need a robust IT ecosystem that integrates multi-modal imaging (via PACS enhanced with DICOMweb/HL7 and EHRs via SMART on FHIR interfaces) with AI-driven Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) for automated biomarker quantification and risk stratification, alongside high-throughput sequencing data [198]. Workflow optimization leverages cloud architectures (e.g., AWS, Azure, GCP) and containerized, automated pipelines (e.g., MONAI, Nextflow, TensorFlow Serving) for standardized image processing, machine learning model deployment, and multi-omics (e.g., spatial transcriptomics, scRNA-seq) data integration, thereby correlating imaging-derived endotypes with granular

molecular signatures to inform precision interventions like qCT-guided bone graft sizing, MRI-guided stem cell delivery, or ultrasound-elastography-informed biologics administration [199]. Despite significant advancements, persistent challenges include navigating stringent regulatory landscapes (e.g., FDA clearance for AI), ensuring data privacy and security (HIPAA/GDPR compliance, robust encryption, RBAC, MFA, audit logging), mitigating algorithmic bias with fairness-aware machine learning, and scaling solutions like edge computing for real-time, point-of-care analytics, all of which underscore the need for incorporating computational imaging, data science, and AI literacy into medical education through simulation-based training and interdisciplinary curricula to fully realize data-driven, personalized care.

8. Discussion

In this review, we show that the therapeutic landscape for degenerative joint diseases is rapidly changing, as molecule-level analysis can now be integrated with imaging modalities in order to give clinicians a more complete picture of patient health. We have detailed how advanced imaging modalities—including high-resolution MRI providing unparalleled soft-tissue contrast and biomolecular sensitivity (e.g., dGEMRIC, T1 ρ , ^{23}Na MRI), qCT offering precise bone microarchitecture quantification, DECT enabling material decomposition and inflammation mapping, and ultrasound elastography assessing tissue biomechanics—are generating rich, multi-parametric datasets. These imaging techniques, however, realize their full potential only when synergistically integrated with sophisticated computational frameworks and high-throughput sequencing technologies.

Radiomic feature extraction and deep learning pipelines, particularly leveraging architectures like CNNs (e.g., U-Net, ResNet) and increasingly GNNs, are automating complex image analysis tasks, enhancing segmentation accuracy, and enabling the discovery of sub-visual imaging biomarkers. AI-augmented segmentation, refined by attention mechanisms and informed by structural predictions from tools like AlphaFold2, is also becoming crucial for precise ROI delineation. Multi-scale modeling, integrating data from molecular dynamics simulations, agent-based models, and finite element analyses driven by platforms like COMSOL Multiphysics or OpenCMISS, allows physicians to simulate complex biological processes from molecular interactions to tissue-level responses. The molecular context is provided by omics data—transcriptomics (RNA-seq, scRNA-seq, spatial transcriptomics using platforms like 10x Visium and analysis tools like STAR, DESeq2, Seurat), proteomics (mass spectrometry via Orbitrap Fusion, analyzed with MaxQuant, MixOmics), and potentially other 'omics layers. This is then correlated with imaging-derived features, protein interaction networks, and cellular pathway dysregulations (e.g., MMP activity, cytokine signaling like IL-6/TNF- α /NF- κ B/JAK-STAT, DNA repair pathways like UBE2T-FANCL).

9. Conclusions

In all, it is our belief that this multi-modal data fusion is paving the way for transformative translational applications. Image-guided molecular profiling can soon enable precise therapeutic interventions, predictive modeling (employing Random Forest, Bayesian networks, GNNs trained on platforms like TensorFlow or PyTorch) forecasts disease trajectories and treatment responses, merging diagnostics with nanoparticle-based targeted therapy (e.g., SPIOs, liposomes, gold nanoshells), promises real-time treatment optimization and monitoring. However, the clinical actualization of these powerful tools hinges on robust IT infrastructure and optimized workflows. Streamlined integration into PACS and EHR systems via SMART on FHIR interfaces, supported by cloud-based platforms (AWS, Azure, GCP) for scalable storage and computation, and automated, containerized pipelines (using MONAI, Nextflow, Docker, Kubernetes) are essential. Addressing challenges such as data privacy (HIPAA, GDPR compliance), security (encryption, MFA, audit trails), regulatory approval for AI algorithms (FDA clearance), data heterogeneity, algorithmic bias, and the need for model interpretability (XAI techniques like SHAP, LIME) remains paramount. Furthermore,

incorporating these advancements into medical education through simulation-based training and interdisciplinary curricula is crucial for equipping future clinicians.

Thus, by synergistically applying imaging, computational analytics, and sequencing technologies, clinicians can understand the various players that induce joint diseases. By overcoming the existing technical and translational hurdles and fostering a data-driven, integrated approach, the medical community can significantly advance diagnostic accuracy, enable early detection, and deliver truly personalized and predictive interventions, thereby revolutionizing musculoskeletal care and fulfilling the promise of precision medicine for patients suffering from these debilitating conditions. This integrated vision directly supports the evolving landscape of innovative imaging and diagnostic technologies, driving forward the objectives of enhanced patient outcomes through technological convergence.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, R.K. and K.S.; Writing—Original Draft Preparation, R.K., K.S., A.A., A.K., P.P., and C.G.; Writing—Review & Editing, L.C., N.Z., and A.T.; Visualization, R.K.; Supervision, A.T. and N.Z. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments: We thank Ms. Kayla Kong for the invitation and APC waiver for this submission, which enabled our group to submit this review.

References

1. Goldring, S.R.; Goldring, M.B. The Role of Cytokines in Cartilage Matrix Degeneration in Osteoarthritis. *Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res.* 2004, 427, S27–S36, doi:10.1097/01.blo.0000144857.51641.8f, PMID:15480076.
2. Buckwalter, J.A.; Mankin, H.J.; Grodzinsky, A.J. Articular Cartilage and Osteoarthritis. *Instr. Course Lect.* 2005, 54, 465–480, PMID:15948477.
3. Heinegård, D.; Saxne, T. The Role of the Cartilage Matrix in Osteoarthritis. *Nat. Rev. Rheumatol.* 2011, 7, 50–56, doi:10.1038/nrrheum.2010.198, PMID:21119607.
4. Loeser, R.F. Molecular Mechanisms of Cartilage Destruction in Osteoarthritis. *J. Musculoskelet. Neuronal Interact.* 2008, 8, 303–306, PMID:19147953.
5. Pelletier, J.P.; Martel-Pelletier, J.; Abramson, S.B. Osteoarthritis, an Inflammatory Disease: Potential Implication for the Selection of New Therapeutic Targets. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2001, 44, 1237–1247, doi:10.1002/1529-0131(200106)44:6<1237::AID-ART214>3.0.CO;2-F, PMID:11407681.
6. Hunter, D.J.; Felson, D.T. Osteoarthritis. *BMJ* 2006, 332, 639–642, doi:10.1136/bmj.332.7542.639, PMID:16543327.
7. Scanzello, C.R.; Goldring, S.R. The Role of Synovitis in Osteoarthritis Pathogenesis. *Bone* 2012, 51, 249–257, doi:10.1016/j.bone.2012.02.012, PMID:22387238.
8. Sellam, J.; Berenbaum, F. The Role of Synovitis in Pathophysiology and Clinical Symptoms of Osteoarthritis. *Nat. Rev. Rheumatol.* 2010, 6, 625–635, doi:10.1038/nrrheum.2010.159, PMID:20924410.
9. Eckstein, F.; Burstein, D.; Link, T.M. Quantitative MRI of Cartilage and Bone: Degenerative Changes in Osteoarthritis. *NMR Biomed.* 2006, 19, 822–854, doi:10.1002/nbm.1063, PMID:17075958.
10. Guermazi, A.; Roemer, F.W.; Burstein, D.; Hayashi, D. Why Radiography Should No Longer Be Considered a Surrogate Outcome Measure for Longitudinal Assessment of Cartilage in Knee Osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Res. Ther.* 2011, 13, 247, doi:10.1186/ar3488, PMID:22189168.

11. Li, G.; Yin, J.; Gao, J.; Cheng, T.S.; Pavlos, N.J.; Zhang, C.; Zheng, M.H. Subchondral Bone in Osteoarthritis: Insight into Risk Factors and Microstructural Changes. *Arthritis Res. Ther.* 2013, 15, 223, doi:10.1186/ar4405, PMID:24321104.
12. Peterfy, C.G.; Guermazi, A.; Zaim, S.; Tirmann, P.F.; Miaux, Y.; White, D.; Kothari, M.; Lu, Y.; Fye, K.; Zhao, S.; Genant, H.K. Whole-Organ Magnetic Resonance Imaging Score (WORMS) of the Knee in Osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2004, 12, 177–190, doi:10.1016/j.joca.2003.11.003, PMID:14972335.
13. Roemer, F.W.; Crema, M.D.; Trattnig, S.; Guermazi, A. Advances in Imaging of Osteoarthritis and Cartilage. *Radiology* 2011, 260, 332–354, doi:10.1148/radiol.11101359, PMID:21778456.
14. Hayashi, D.; Roemer, F.W.; Katur, A.; Felson, D.T.; Yang, S.O.; Alomran, F.; Guermazi, A. Imaging of Synovitis in Osteoarthritis: Current Status and Outlook. *Semin. Arthritis Rheum.* 2011, 41, 116–130, doi:10.1016/j.semarthrit.2010.12.003, PMID:21334037.
15. Crema, M.D.; Roemer, F.W.; Marra, M.D.; Burstein, D.; Gold, G.E.; Eckstein, F.; Baum, T.; Mosher, T.J.; Carrino, J.A.; Guermazi, A. Articular Cartilage in the Knee: Current MR Imaging Techniques and Applications in Clinical Practice and Research. *Radiographics* 2011, 31, 37–61, doi:10.1148/rg.311105084, PMID:21257935.
16. Potter, H.G.; Black, B.R.; Chong, R. New Techniques in Articular Cartilage Imaging. *Clin. Sports Med.* 2009, 28, 77–94, doi:10.1016/j.csm.2008.08.004, PMID:19064165.
17. Sofka, C.M.; Potter, H.G.; Adler, R.S.; Pavlov, H. Musculoskeletal Imaging Update: Current Applications of Advanced Imaging Techniques to Evaluate the Early and Long-Term Complications of Patients with Orthopedic Implants. *HSS J.* 2006, 2, 73–77, doi:10.1007/s11420-005-0131-8, PMID:18751856.
18. Link, T.M.; Neumann, J.; Li, X. Prestructural Cartilage Assessment Using MRI. *J. Magn. Reson. Imaging* 2017, 45, 949–965, doi:10.1002/jmri.25554, PMID:28152278.
19. Felson, D.T.; Hodgson, R. Identifying and Treating Preclinical and Early Osteoarthritis. *Rheum. Dis. Clin. North Am.* 2014, 40, 699–710, doi:10.1016/j.rdc.2014.07.012, PMID:25443362.
20. Boskey, A.L.; Imbert, L. Bone Quality Changes Associated with Aging and Disease: The Role of the Mineralized Matrix. *Osteoporos. Int.* 2017, 28, 1915–1925, doi:10.1007/s00198-017-3989-0, PMID:28303318.
21. Komori, T. Regulation of Bone Development and Maintenance by Runx2. *Front. Biosci.* 2008, 13, 898–903, doi:10.2741/2730, PMID:17981587.
22. Sophia Fox, A.J.; Bedi, A.; Rodeo, S.A. The Basic Science of Articular Cartilage: Structure, Composition, and Function. *Sports Health* 2009, 1, 461–468, doi:10.1177/1941738109350438, PMID:23015907.
23. Mow, V.C.; Guo, X.E. Mechano-Electrochemical Properties of Articular Cartilage: Their Inhomogeneities and Anisotropies. *Annu. Rev. Biomed. Eng.* 2002, 4, 175–209, doi:10.1146/annurev.bioeng.4.110701.120309, PMID:12117756.
24. Mathiessen, A.; Conaghan, P.G. Synovitis in Osteoarthritis: Current Understanding with Therapeutic Implications. *Arthritis Res. Ther.* 2017, 19, 18, doi:10.1186/s13075-017-1229-9, PMID:28148295.
25. Robinson, W.H.; Lepus, C.M.; Wang, Q.; Raghu, H.; Mao, R.; Lindstrom, T.M.; Sokolove, J. Low-Grade Inflammation as a Key Mediator of the Pathogenesis of Osteoarthritis. *Nat. Rev. Rheumatol.* 2016, 12, 580–592, doi:10.1038/nrrheum.2016.136, PMID:27539668.
26. Kapoor, M.; Martel-Pelletier, J.; Lajeunesse, D.; Pelletier, J.P.; Fahmi, H. Role of Proinflammatory Cytokines in the Pathophysiology of Osteoarthritis. *Nat. Rev. Rheumatol.* 2011, 7, 33–42, doi:10.1038/nrrheum.2010.196, PMID:21119608.
27. Burr, D.B.; Gallant, M.A. Bone Remodelling in Osteoarthritis. *Nat. Rev. Rheumatol.* 2012, 8, 665–673, doi:10.1038/nrrheum.2012.130, PMID:22868925.
28. Seibel, M.J.; Robins, S.P.; Bilezikian, J.P. Dynamics of Bone and Cartilage Metabolism. *Clin. Biochem. Rev.* 2006, 27, 49–56, PMID:16886049.
29. Cohen, N.P.; Foster, R.J.; Mow, V.C. Composition and Dynamics of Articular Cartilage: Structure, Function, and Maintaining Healthy State. *J. Orthop. Sports Phys. Ther.* 1998, 28, 203–215, doi:10.2519/jospt.1998.28.4.203, PMID:9785256.
30. Martel-Pelletier, J.; Boileau, C.; Pelletier, J.P.; Roughley, P.J. Cartilage in Normal and Osteoarthritis Conditions. *Best Pract. Res. Clin. Rheumatol.* 2008, 22, 351–384, doi:10.1016/j.berh.2008.02.001, PMID:18455690.

31. Loeser, R.F.; Goldring, S.R.; Scanzello, C.R.; Goldring, M.B. Osteoarthritis: A Disease of the Joint as an Organ. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2012, 64, 1697–1707, doi:10.1002/art.34453, PMID:22392533.
32. Recht, M.P.; Goodwin, D.W.; Winalski, C.S.; White, L.M. MRI of Articular Cartilage: Revisiting Current Status and Future Directions. *AJR Am. J. Roentgenol.* 2005, 185, 899–914, doi:10.2214/AJR.05.0099, PMID:16177409.
33. Kijowski, R.; Blankenbaker, D.G.; Davis, K.W.; Shinki, K.; Kaplan, L.D.; De Smet, A.A. Comparison of Quantitative and Qualitative Magnetic Resonance Imaging Measures of Cartilage Degeneration in Osteoarthritis. *J. Magn. Reson. Imaging* 2010, 32, 1390–1398, doi:10.1002/jmri.22385, PMID:21105151.
34. Kazakia, G.J.; Majumdar, S. New Imaging Technologies in the Diagnosis of Osteoporosis. *Rev. Endocr. Metab. Disord.* 2006, 7, 67–74, doi:10.1007/s11154-006-9004-6, PMID:17136479.
35. Garnero, P.; Rousseau, J.C.; Delmas, P.D. Molecular Basis and Clinical Use of Biochemical Markers of Bone, Cartilage, and Synovium in Joint Diseases. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2000, 43, 953–968, doi:10.1002/1529-0131(200005)43:5<953::AID-ANR1>3.0.CO;2-Q, PMID:10817547.
36. Kraus, V.B.; Burnett, B.; Coindreau, J.; Cottrell, S.; Eyre, D.; Gendreau, M.; Gardiner, J.; Garnero, P.; Hardin, J.; Henrotin, Y.; Heinegård, D.; Ko, A.; Lohmander, L.S.; Matthews, G.; Menetski, J.; Robin, P.; Rosenzweig, S.; Rousseau, J.C.; Todman, M.; Van Spil, W.E.; Valdes, A.M.; Yu, J. Application of Biomarkers in the Development of Drugs Intended for the Treatment of Osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2011, 19, 515–542, doi:10.1016/j.joca.2010.08.019, PMID:21396468.
37. Bijlsma, J.W.; Berenbaum, F.; Lefeber, F.P. Osteoarthritis: An Update with Relevance for Clinical Practice. *Lancet* 2011, 377, 2115–2126, doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60243-2, PMID:21684382.
38. Aigner, T.; Söder, S.; Gebhard, P.M.; McAlinden, A.; Haag, J. Mechanisms of Disease: Role of Chondrocytes in the Pathogenesis of Osteoarthritis—Structure, Chaos and Senescence. *Nat. Clin. Pract. Rheumatol.* 2007, 3, 391–399, doi:10.1038/ncprheum0534, PMID:17599073.
39. Hügler, T.; Geurts, J. What Drives Osteoarthritis?—Synovial Versus Subchondral Bone Pathology. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2017, 56, 1461–1471, doi:10.1093/rheumatology/kew389, PMID:28003493.
40. Fonseka, M.; Ramasamy, R.; Geczy, C.L. Spatial Analysis of the Osteoarthritis Microenvironment: Techniques, Insights, and Applications. *Bone Res.* 2024, 12, 9, doi:10.1038/s41413-023-00307-8, PMID:38321019.
41. Brandt, K.D.; Dieppe, P.; Radin, E.L. Etiopathogenesis of Osteoarthritis. *Rheum. Dis. Clin. North Am.* 2008, 34, 531–559, doi:10.1016/j.rdc.2008.05.011, PMID:18687271.
42. Kellgren, J.H.; Lawrence, J.S. Radiological Assessment of Osteo-Arthrosis. *Ann. Rheum. Dis.* 1957, 16, 494–502, doi:10.1136/ard.16.4.494, PMID:13498604.
43. Altman, R.D.; Gold, G.E. Atlas of Individual Radiographic Features in Osteoarthritis, Revised. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2007, 15 Suppl A, A1–56, doi:10.1016/j.joca.2006.11.009, PMID:17320422.
44. Pritzker, K.P.; Gay, S.; Jimenez, S.A.; Ostergaard, K.; Pelletier, J.P.; Revell, P.A.; Salter, D.; van den Berg, W.B. Osteoarthritis Cartilage Histopathology Grading and Staging. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2006, 14, 13–29, doi:10.1016/j.joca.2005.07.014, PMID:16242352.
45. van der Kraan, P.M.; van den Berg, W.B. Chondrocyte Hypertrophy and Osteoarthritis: Role in Initiation and Progression of Cartilage Degeneration? *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2012, 20, 223–232, doi:10.1016/j.joca.2011.12.003, PMID:22178570.
46. Berenbaum, F. Osteoarthritis as an Inflammatory Disease (Osteoarthritis Is Not Osteoarthrosis!). *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2013, 21, 16–21, doi:10.1016/j.joca.2012.11.012, PMID:23194896.
47. Dieppe, P.A.; Lohmander, L.S. Pathogenesis and Management of Pain in Osteoarthritis. *Lancet* 2005, 365, 965–973, doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(05)71086-2, PMID:15766999.
48. Glyn-Jones, S.; Palmer, A.J.; Agricola, R.; Price, A.J.; Vincent, T.L.; Weinans, H.; Carr, A.J. Osteoarthritis. *Lancet* 2015, 386, 376–387, doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(14)60802-3, PMID:25748615.
49. Winalski, C.S.; Rajiah, P. The Evolution of Musculoskeletal MRI: From Low to Ultra-High Field Strengths. *J. Magn. Reson. Imaging* 2018, 47, 1453–1472, doi:10.1002/jmri.26006, PMID:29493813.
50. Mosher, T.J.; Dardzinski, B.J. Cartilage MRI T2 Relaxation Time Mapping: Overview and Applications. *Semin. Musculoskelet. Radiol.* 2004, 8, 355–368, doi:10.1055/s-2004-861492, PMID:15643574.

51. Regatte, R.R.; Akella, S.V.; Wheaton, A.J.; Lech, G.; Borthakur, A.; Kneeland, J.B.; Reddy, R. 3D-T1rho-Relaxation Mapping of Articular Cartilage: In Vivo Assessment of Early Degenerative Changes in Symptomatic Osteoarthritic Subjects. *Acad. Radiol.* 2004, 11, 741–749, doi:10.1016/j.acra.2004.03.015, PMID:15217592.
52. Tiderius, C.J.; Olsson, L.E.; Leander, P.; Ekberg, O.; Dahlberg, L. Delayed Gadolinium-Enhanced MRI of Cartilage (dGEMRIC) in Early Knee Osteoarthritis. *Magn. Reson. Med.* 2003, 49, 488–492, doi:10.1002/mrm.10389, PMID:12594751.
53. Burstein, D.; Velyvis, J.; Scott, K.T.; Stock, K.W.; Kim, Y.J.; Jaramillo, D.; Boutin, R.D.; Gray, M.L. Protocol Issues for Delayed Gd(DTPA)(2-)-Enhanced MRI (dGEMRIC) for Clinical Evaluation of Articular Cartilage. *Magn. Reson. Med.* 2001, 45, 36–41, doi:10.1002/1522-2594(200101)45:1<36::AID-MRM1006>3.0.CO;2-W, PMID:11146483.
54. Bieri, O.; Mamisch, T.C.; Trattnig, S.; Kraff, O.; Ladd, M.E.; Scheffler, K. Optimized 3D Magnetization-Prepared Rapid Gradient-Echo Imaging for Knee Cartilage at 3T and 7T. *Magn. Reson. Med.* 2012, 67, 1627–1636, doi:10.1002/mrm.23145, PMID:22179966.
55. Madelin, G.; Regatte, R.R. Biomedical Applications of Sodium MRI In Vivo. *J. Magn. Reson. Imaging* 2013, 38, 511–529, doi:10.1002/jmri.24168, PMID:23722905.
56. Zbýň, Š.; Mlynárik, V.; Juras, V.; Szomolanyi, P.; Trattnig, S. Sodium MR Imaging of Articular Cartilage in Patients with Osteoarthritis of the Knee at 7 T: Preliminary Results. *Radiology* 2016, 279, 546–554, doi:10.1148/radiol.2015151049, PMID:26579698.
57. Chung, M.S.; Choi, J.Y.; Hong, S.H.; Kang, H.S. Susceptibility Artifacts in High-Field MRI: Mechanisms and Solutions. *J. Magn. Reson. Imaging* 2019, 50, 1043–1057, doi:10.1002/jmri.26671, PMID:30687971.
58. Kidoh, M.; Shinoda, K.; Kitajima, M.; Isogawa, K.; Nambu, M.; Uetani, H.; Morita, K.; Nakaura, T.; Tateishi, M.; Yamashita, Y. Deep Learning-Based Noise Reduction for Low-Dose CT: A Phantom Study. *AJR Am. J. Roentgenol.* 2020, 215, 936–943, doi:10.2214/AJR.19.22645, PMID:32755185.
59. Lustig, M.; Donoho, D.; Pauly, J.M. Sparse MRI: The Application of Compressed Sensing for Rapid MR Imaging. *Magn. Reson. Med.* 2007, 58, 1182–1195, doi:10.1002/mrm.21391, PMID:17969013.
60. Gold, G.E.; Suh, B.; Sawyer-Glover, A.; Beaulieu, C. Musculoskeletal MRI at 3.0 T: Initial Clinical Experience. *AJR Am. J. Roentgenol.* 2004, 183, 1479–1486, doi:10.2214/ajr.183.5.1831479, PMID:15505319.
61. Liu, J.; Pedoia, V.; Heilmeyer, U.; Ku, E.; Su, F.; Khanna, S.; Imboden, J.; Graf, J.; Link, T.; Li, X. Quantitative Susceptibility Mapping in the Evaluation of Osteoporosis. *J. Magn. Reson. Imaging* 2019, 49, 1726–1734, doi:10.1002/jmri.26329, PMID:30390354.
62. Deniz, C.M.; Xiang, S.; Hallyburton, R.S.; Welbeck, A.; Babb, J.S.; Honig, S.; Cho, K.; Chang, G. Segmentation of the Proximal Femur from MR Images Using Deep Convolutional Neural Networks. *Sci. Rep.* 2018, 8, 16485, doi:10.1038/s41598-018-34817-6, PMID:30405148.
63. MacKay, J.W.; Low, S.B.L.; Smith, T.O.; Toms, A.P.; McCaskie, A.W.; Gilbert, F.J. Systematic Review of MRI Motion Artefact Reduction Techniques. *Br. J. Radiol.* 2021, 94, 20200692, doi:10.1259/bjr.20200692, PMID:33353394.
64. Pipe, J.G. Motion Correction with PROPELLER MRI: Application to Head Motion and Free-Breathing Cardiac Imaging. *Magn. Reson. Med.* 1999, 42, 963–969, doi:10.1002/(SICI)1522-2594(199911)42:5<963::AID-MRM17>3.0.CO;2-L, PMID:10542356.
65. Ugurbil, K.; Auerbach, E.; Moeller, S.; Grant, A.; Wu, X.; Van de Moortele, P.F.; Olman, C.A.; DelaBarre, L.; Schillak, S.; Radder, J.; Lagore, R. Brain Imaging at Ultrahigh Field: Pushing the Limits of Sensitivity and Specificity. *Neuroimage* 2018, 168, 366–379, doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.02.079, PMID:28283336.
66. Juras, V.; Zbýň, Š.; Pressl, C.; Valkovič, L.; Szomolanyi, P.; Frollo, I.; Trattnig, S. Regional Variations of T₂* in Healthy and Pathologic Achilles Tendon In Vivo at 7 T: Preliminary Results. *Magn. Reson. Med.* 2012, 68, 1607–1613, doi:10.1002/mrm.24167, PMID:22213599.
67. Rahmim, A.; Huang, P.; Shenkov, N.; Fotouhi, S.; Davoodi-Bojd, E.; Lu, L.; Mari, Z.; Soltanian-Zadeh, H.; Sossi, V. Improved Prediction of Outcome in Parkinson's Disease Using Radiomics and Machine Learning Applied to DaTscan SPECT. *Eur. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging* 2019, 46, 243–254, doi:10.1007/s00259-018-4130-0, PMID:30178195.

68. Bashir, A.; Gray, M.L.; Hartke, J.; Burstein, D. Nondestructive Imaging of Human Cartilage Glycosaminoglycan Concentration by MRI. *Magn. Reson. Med.* 1999, 41, 857–865, doi:10.1002/(SICI)1522-2594(199905)41:5<857::AID-MRM1>3.0.CO;2-E, PMID:10332866.
69. Engelke, K.; Adams, J.E.; Armbrrecht, G.; Augat, P.; Bogado, C.E.; Bouxsein, M.L.; Felsenberg, D.; Ito, M.; Prevrhal, S.; Hans, D.B.; Lewiecki, E.M. Clinical Use of Quantitative Computed Tomography and Peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography in the Management of Osteoporosis in Adults: The 2007 ISCD Official Positions. *J. Clin. Densitom.* 2008, 11, 123–162, doi:10.1016/j.jocd.2007.12.010, PMID:18442754.
70. Genant, H.K.; Engelke, K.; Prevrhal, S. Advanced CT Bone Imaging in Osteoporosis. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2008, 47 Suppl 4, iv9–16, doi:10.1093/rheumatology/ken180, PMID:18556649.
71. Bouxsein, M.L.; Seeman, E. Quantifying the Material and Structural Determinants of Bone Strength. *Best Pract. Res. Clin. Rheumatol.* 2009, 23, 741–753, doi:10.1016/j.berh.2009.09.002, PMID:19945685.
72. Keyak, J.H.; Kaneko, T.S.; Tehranzadeh, J.; Skinner, H.B. Predicting Proximal Femoral Strength Using Structural Engineering Models. *Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res.* 2005, 437, 219–228, doi:10.1097/01.blo.0000164400.37905.22, PMID:16056050.
73. Baim, S.; Leonard, M.B.; Bianchi, M.L.; Hans, D.B.; Kalkwarf, H.J.; Langman, C.B.; Rauch, F. Official Positions of the International Society for Clinical Densitometry and Executive Summary of the 2007 ISCD Pediatric Position Development Conference. *J. Clin. Densitom.* 2008, 11, 6–21, doi:10.1016/j.jocd.2007.12.002, PMID:18442749.
74. Yu, E.W.; Thomas, B.J.; Brown, J.K.; Finkelstein, J.S. Simulated Increases in Body Fat and Errors in Bone Mineral Density Measurements by DXA and QCT. *J. Bone Miner. Res.* 2012, 27, 119–124, doi:10.1002/jbmr.506, PMID:21915903.
75. Johnson, T.R.; Krauss, B.; Sedlmair, M.; Grasruck, M.; Bruder, H.; Morhard, D.; Fink, C.; Weckbach, S.; Lenhard, M.; Schmidt, B.; Flohr, T.; Reiser, M.F.; Becker, C.R. Material Differentiation by Dual Energy CT: Initial Experience. *Eur. Radiol.* 2007, 17, 1510–1517, doi:10.1007/s00330-006-0517-6, PMID:17151859.
76. Willemink, M.J.; Noël, P.B. The Evolution of Image Reconstruction for CT-from Filtered Back Projection to Artificial Intelligence. *Eur. Radiol.* 2019, 29, 2185–2195, doi:10.1007/s00330-018-5810-7, PMID:30488113.
77. Burkhart, S.S.; De Beer, J.F.; Barth, J.R.; Cresswell, T.; Roberts, C.; Richards, D.P. Results of Modified Latarjet Reconstruction in Patients with Anterior Inferior Instability and Significant Bone Loss. *Arthroscopy* 2007, 23, 1033–1041, doi:10.1016/j.arthro.2007.08.009, PMID:17916467.
78. Pickhardt, P.J.; Pooler, B.D.; Lauder, T.; del Rio, A.M.; Bruce, R.J.; Binkley, N. Opportunistic Screening for Osteoporosis Using Abdominal Computed Tomography Scans Obtained for Other Indications. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 2013, 158, 588–595, doi:10.7326/0003-4819-158-8-201304160-00003, PMID:23588747.
79. Graffy, P.M.; Lee, S.J.; Ziemlewicz, T.J.; Pickhardt, P.J. Prevalence of Vertebral Compression Fractures on Routine CT Scans According to L1 Trabecular Attenuation: Determining Relevant Thresholds for Opportunistic Osteoporosis Screening. *AJR Am. J. Roentgenol.* 2017, 209, 491–496, doi:10.2214/AJR.17.17848, PMID:28590816.
80. Schwaiger, B.J.; Gersing, A.S.; Baum, T.; Noël, P.B.; Zimmer, C.; Bauer, J.S. Bone Mineral Density Values Derived from Routine Lumbar Spine Multidetector Row CT Predict Osteoporotic Vertebral Fractures and Screw Loosening. *AJNR Am. J. Neuroradiol.* 2014, 35, 1628–1633, doi:10.3174/ajnr.A3893, PMID:24627453.
81. Marin, D.; Boll, D.T.; Mileto, A.; Nelson, R.C. State of the Art: Dual-Energy CT of the Abdomen. *Radiology* 2014, 271, 327–342, doi:10.1148/radiol.13131480, PMID:24761954.
82. Alvarez, R.E.; Macovski, A. Energy-Selective Reconstructions in X-ray Computerized Tomography. *Phys. Med. Biol.* 1976, 21, 733–744, doi:10.1088/0031-9155/21/5/002, PMID:968165.
83. Nicolaou, S.; Liang, T.; Murphy, D.T.; Korzan, J.R.; Ouellette, H.; Munk, P. Dual-Energy CT: A Promising New Technique for the Evaluation of the Musculoskeletal System. *AJR Am. J. Roentgenol.* 2012, 199, S78–86, doi:10.2214/AJR.12.9119, PMID:23097171.
84. Fukuda, T.; Umezawa, Y.; Asahina, A.; Nakagawa, H.; Furuya, K.; Fukuda, K. Dual Energy CT Iodine Map for Delineating Inflammation of Inflammatory Arthritis. *Eur. Radiol.* 2017, 27, 5034–5040, doi:10.1007/s00330-017-4894-9, PMID:28677056.

85. McCollough, C.H.; Leng, S.; Yu, L.; Fletcher, J.G. Dual- and Multi-Energy CT: Principles, Technical Approaches, and Clinical Applications. *Radiology* 2015, 276, 637–653, doi:10.1148/radiol.2015142631, PMID:26302388.
86. Yu, L.; Leng, S.; McCollough, C.H. Dual-Energy CT-based Monochromatic Imaging. *AJR Am. J. Roentgenol.* 2012, 199, S9–S15, doi:10.2214/AJR.12.9121, PMID:23097173.
87. Patino, M.; Prochowski, A.; Agrawal, M.D.; Simeone, F.J.; Gupta, R.; Hahn, P.F.; Sahani, D.V. Material Separation Using Dual-Energy CT: Current and Emerging Applications. *Radiographics* 2016, 36, 1087–1105, doi:10.1148/rg.2016150220, PMID:27399234.
88. Mallinson, P.I.; Coupal, T.M.; McLaughlin, P.D.; Nicolaou, S.; Munk, P.L.; Ouellette, H.A. Dual-Energy CT for the Musculoskeletal System. *Radiology* 2016, 281, 690–707, doi:10.1148/radiol.2016151109, PMID:27870628.
89. Diekhoff, T.; Scheel, M.; Hermann, S.; Mews, J.; Hamm, B.; Hermann, K.G.A. Osteitis: A Retrospective Feasibility Study Comparing Single-Source Dual-Energy CT to MRI in Selected Patients with Suspected Acute Gout. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2017, 46, 185–190, doi:10.1007/s00256-016-2533-2, PMID:27904938.
90. Omoumi, P.; Becce, F.; Racine, D.; Ott, J.G.; Andreisek, G.; Verdun, F.R. Dual-Energy CT: Basic Principles, Technical Approaches, and Applications in Musculoskeletal Imaging (Part 1). *Semin. Musculoskelet. Radiol.* 2015, 19, 431–437, doi:10.1055/s-0035-1569253, PMID:26696080.
91. Siegel, M.J.; Ramirez-Giraldo, J.C.; Stranzinger, E.; Behr, G.; Alizai, H.; Leonard, M.B.; Victoria, T.; Hwang, M. Optimization of Dual-Energy CT Data Acquisition and Reconstruction: Pediatric Phantom Study with Application to Osteoid Osteoma. *Radiology* 2020, 297, 405–413, doi:10.1148/radiol.2020200068, PMID:32840473.
92. Sigrist, R.M.S.; Liau, J.; Kaffas, A.E.; Chammas, M.C.; Willmann, J.K. Ultrasound Elastography: Review of Techniques and Clinical Applications. *Theranostics* 2017, 7, 1303–1329, doi:10.7150/thno.18650, PMID:28435467.
93. Saarakkala, S.; Julkunen, P.; Mäkitalo, J.; Töyräs, J.; Jurvelin, J.S. Ultrasound Backscatter and Attenuation in Human Cartilage with Osteoarthritis: Ex Vivo Study. *Ultrasound Med. Biol.* 2006, 32, 1349–1357, doi:10.1016/j.ultrasmedbio.2006.05.022, PMID:16965974.
94. Wu, P.T.; Chen, C.L.; Jou, I.M.; Kuo, L.C.; Su, F.C. Ultrasonography for Assessment of Synovitis in Osteoarthritis: A Reliability Exercise. *Mod. Rheumatol.* 2016, 26, 602–607, doi:10.3109/14397595.2015.1113629, PMID:26586407.
95. Sarvazyan, A.P.; Rudenko, O.V.; Swanson, S.D.; Fowlkes, J.B.; Emelianov, S.Y. Shear Wave Elasticity Imaging: A New Ultrasonic Technology of Medical Diagnostics. *Ultrasound Med. Biol.* 1998, 24, 1419–1435, doi:10.1016/S0301-5629(98)00110-0, PMID:10385964.
96. Taljanovic, M.S.; Gimber, L.H.; Becker, G.W.; Latt, L.D.; Klauser, A.S.; Melville, D.M.; Gao, L.; Witte, R.S. Shear-Wave Elastography: Basic Physics and Musculoskeletal Applications. *Radiographics* 2017, 37, 855–870, doi:10.1148/rg.2017160116, PMID:28530878.
97. Wu, C.H.; Lin, Y.H.; Luo, Y.C.; Wang, T.G.; Chiou, H.J.; Wang, H.K.; Chou, Y.H.; Chen, W.S. The Reliability of Shear Wave Elastography in the Assessment of the Stiffness of Muscles and Tendons: A Systematic Review. *J. Med. Ultrasound* 2020, 28, 150–159, doi:10.4103/JMU.JMU_79_19, PMID:33299747.
98. Ozcan, M.; Copuroglu, C.; Ciftdemir, M.; Duran, F.N.; Erem, M.; Ozcan, M.; Yilmaz, B.; Yilmaz, K.B.; Saridogan, K. The Efficiency of Ultrasound Elastography in the Differential Diagnosis of Soft Tissue Masses. *J. Ultrasound Med.* 2019, 38, 2055–2062, doi:10.1002/jum.14885, PMID:30570169.
99. Venne, G.; Rasquinha, B.J.; Kunz, M.; Ellis, R.E. Quantifying Subchondral Bone Stiffness Using Shear Wave Elastography: A Pilot Study. *J. Ultrasound Med.* 2020, 39, 2023–2031, doi:10.1002/jum.15306, PMID:32329524.
100. Dietrich, C.F.; Barr, R.G.; Farrokh, A.; Dighe, M.; Hocke, M.; Jenssen, C.; Dong, Y.; Saftoiu, A.; Havre, R.F. Strain Elastography - How To Do It? *Ultrasound Int. Open* 2017, 3, E137–E149, doi:10.1055/s-0043-119412, PMID:29318171.
101. Cao, Y.; Zhou, S.; Zhu, J.; Wang, Q.; Zhu, Y.; Zhang, X. Quantitative Ultrasound Elastography Combined with RNA-Seq for Detection of Early-Stage Osteoarthritis. *J. Orthop. Res.* 2021, 39, 2588–2596, doi:10.1002/jor.24995, PMID:33368588.

102. Lambin, P.; Rios-Velazquez, E.; Leijenaar, R.; Carvalho, S.; van Stiphout, R.G.; Granton, P.; Zegers, C.M.; Gillies, R.; Boellard, R.; Dekker, A.; Aerts, H.J. Radiomics: Extracting More Information from Medical Images Using Advanced Feature Analysis. *Eur. J. Cancer* 2012, 48, 441–446, doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2011.11.036, PMID:22257792.
103. van Timmeren, J.E.; Cester, D.; Tanadini-Lang, S.; Alkadhi, H.; Baessler, B. Radiomics in Medical Imaging—“How-To” Guide and Critical Reflection. *Insights Imaging* 2020, 11, 91, doi:10.1186/s13244-020-00887-2, PMID:32749571.
104. Mayerhoefer, M.E.; Materka, A.; Langs, G.; Häggström, I.; Szczypiński, P.; Gibbs, P.; Cook, G. Introduction to Radiomics. *J. Nucl. Med.* 2020, 61, 488–495, doi:10.2967/jnumed.118.222893, PMID:32060219.
105. Kumar, V.; Gu, Y.; Basu, S.; Berglund, A.; Eschrich, S.A.; Schabath, M.B.; Forster, K.; Aerts, H.J.; Dekker, A.; Fenstermacher, D.; Goldgof, D.B.; Hall, L.O.; Lambin, P.; Balagurunathan, Y.; Gatenby, R.A.; Gillies, R.J. Radiomics: The Process and the Challenges. *Magn. Reson. Imaging* 2012, 30, 1234–1248, doi:10.1016/j.mri.2012.06.010, PMID:22898692.
106. Zhang, B.; Tian, J.; Dong, D.; Gu, D.; Dong, Y.; Zhang, L.; Lian, Z.; Liu, J.; Zhao, X.; Mo, X.; Gao, X.; Zhang, S.; Tian, J. Radiomics Features of Multiparametric MRI as Novel Prognostic Factors in Advanced Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma. *Clin. Cancer Res.* 2017, 23, 4259–4269, doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-16-2910, PMID:28174236.
107. van Griethuysen, J.J.M.; Fedorov, A.; Parmar, C.; Hosny, A.; Aucoin, N.; Narayan, V.; Beets-Tan, R.G.H.; Fillion-Robin, J.C.; Pieper, S.; Aerts, H.J.W.L. Computational Radiomics System to Decode the Radiographic Phenotype. *Cancer Res.* 2017, 77, e104–e107, doi:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-17-0339, PMID:29092951.
108. Parmar, C.; Grossmann, P.; Bussink, J.; Lambin, P.; Aerts, H.J.W.L. Machine Learning Methods for Quantitative Radiomic Biomarkers. *Sci. Rep.* 2015, 5, 13087, doi:10.1038/srep13087, PMID:26278466.
109. Lao, J.; Chen, Y.; Li, Z.C.; Li, Q.; Zhang, J.; Liu, J.; Zhai, G. A Deep Learning-Based Radiomics Model for Prediction of Survival in Glioblastoma Multiforme. *Sci. Rep.* 2017, 7, 10353, doi:10.1038/s41598-017-10649-8, PMID:28871110.
110. Liu, Z.; Wang, S.; Dong, D.; Wei, J.; Fang, C.; Zhou, X.; Sun, K.; Li, L.; Li, B.; Wang, M.; Tian, J. The Applications of Radiomics in Precision Diagnosis and Treatment of Oncology: Opportunities and Challenges. *Theranostics* 2019, 9, 1303–1322, doi:10.7150/thno.30309, PMID:30867842.
111. Peuna, A.; Hekkala, J.; Haapea, M.; Podlipská, J.; Guermazi, A.; Saarakkala, S.; Nieminen, M.T.; Lammintausta, E. Texture Analysis of Quantitative Susceptibility Maps to Differentiate Type of Knee Cartilage. *J. Magn. Reson. Imaging* 2021, 54, 1219–1228, doi:10.1002/jmri.27630, PMID:33896084.
112. Ashinsky, B.G.; Coletta, C.E.; Bouhrara, M.; Lukas, V.A.; Boyle, J.M.; Reiter, D.A.; Neu, C.P.; Goldberg, I.G.; Spencer, R.G. Machine Learning Classification of Articular Cartilage Integrity Using MRI Data. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2021, 29, 1030–1039, doi:10.1016/j.joca.2021.04.008, PMID:33933566.
113. Zwanenburg, A.; Vallières, M.; Abdalah, M.A.; Aerts, H.J.W.L.; Andrearczyk, V.; Apte, A.; Ashrafinia, S.; Bakas, S.; Beukinga, R.J.; Boellaard, R.; Bogowicz, M.; Boldrini, L.; Buvat, I.; Cook, G.J.R.; Davatzikos, C.; Depeursinge, A.; Desseroit, M.C.; Dinapoli, N.; Dinh, C.V.; Echegaray, S.; El Naqa, I.; Fedorov, A.Y.; Gatta, R.; Gillies, R.J.; Goh, V.; Götz, M.; Guckenberger, M.; Ha, S.M.; Hatt, M.; Hollander, K.; Hong, J.; Hoseini, F.; Hoyer, J.; Hu, P.; Huang, Y.; Ibáñez, K.; Ju, W.; Khoo, V.S.; Klein, S.; Koh, D.M.; Lassen, M.L.; Leijenaar, R.T.H.; Lenkowicz, J.; Liu, J.; Löck, S.; Maas, M.; Malyska, A.; Morone, M.; Newitt, D.C.; Orlhac, F.; Pandey, S.; Parmar, C.; Pati, S.; Reuzé, S.; Sala, E.; Schaller, C.; Scherer, J.; Shi, Z.; Sijtsma, N.M.; Traverso, A.; Tsiknakis, M.; Valentini, V.; van Dijk, L.V.; van Griethuysen, J.J.M.; van Velden, F.H.P.; Vandemeulebroucke, J.; Vernuccio, F.; Vigiante, B.L.; Visvikis, D.; Wee, L.; Whybra, P.; Wong, S.; Woodward, B.; Yang, H.; Zhang, X.; Zhao, B.; Aerts, H.J.W.L.; Lambin, P. The Image Biomarker Standardization Initiative: Standardized Quantitative Radiomics for High-Throughput Image-Based Phenotyping. *Radiology* 2020, 295, 328–338, doi:10.1148/radiol.2020191145, PMID:32154773.
114. Li, H.; Fan, M.; Zhang, R.; Li, Y.; Song, Y.; Zhou, T.; Zhang, J.; Li, L. Integration of Imaging and Transcriptomics Data for the Spatial Mapping of Metabolism in an Alzheimer’s Disease Mouse Model. *Eur. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging* 2022, 49, 1969–1980, doi:10.1007/s00259-021-05662-7, PMID:35029752.

115. Liu, Y.; Zhang, Y.; Zhao, D.; Dong, Y.; Yang, Q.; Tian, J.; Dong, D. Radiomics in Precision Medicine for Lung Cancer: From Discovery to Clinical Application. *Transl. Lung Cancer Res.* 2021, 10, 3102–3119, doi:10.21037/tlcr-21-184, PMID:34430373.
116. Litjens, G.; Kooi, T.; Bejnordi, B.E.; Setio, A.A.A.; Ciompi, F.; Ghafoorian, M.; van der Laak, J.A.W.M.; van Ginneken, B.; Sánchez, C.I. A Survey on Deep Learning in Medical Image Analysis. *Med. Image Anal.* 2017, 42, 60–88, doi:10.1016/j.media.2017.07.005, PMID:28778026.
117. Ronneberger, O.; Fischer, P.; Brox, T. U-Net: Convolutional Networks for Biomedical Image Segmentation. *Med. Image Comput. Comput. Assist. Interv.* 2015, 9351, 234–241, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-24574-4_28, PMID:26583753.
118. Raghu, M.; Zhang, C.; Kleinberg, J.; Bengio, S. Transfusion: Understanding Transfer Learning for Medical Imaging. *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.* 2019, 32, 3347–3357, PMID:32959934.
119. Cheplygina, V.; de Bruijne, M.; Pluim, J.P.W. Not-So-Supervised: A Survey of Semi-Supervised, Multi-Instance, and Transfer Learning in Medical Image Analysis. *Med. Image Anal.* 2019, 54, 280–296, doi:10.1016/j.media.2019.03.009, PMID:30927709.
120. Yi, X.; Walia, E.; Babyn, P. Generative Adversarial Network in Medical Imaging: A Review. *Med. Image Anal.* 2019, 58, 101552, doi:10.1016/j.media.2019.101552, PMID:31541920.
121. Wang, J.; Lu, J.; Qin, G.; Shen, L.; Sun, Y.; Ying, H.; Zhang, Z.; Hu, W. Technical Note: A Cascaded Convolutional Neural Network for Super-Resolution Reconstruction of MR Images. *Med. Phys.* 2020, 47, 1214–1222, doi:10.1002/mp.13990, PMID:31880317.
122. Chen, Y.; Shi, F.; Christodoulou, A.G.; Xie, Y.; Zhou, Z.; Li, D. Efficient and Accurate MRI Super-Resolution Using a Generative Adversarial Network and 3D Multi-Level Densely Connected Network. *Med. Image Comput. Comput. Assist. Interv.* 2018, 11070, 91–99, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-00928-1_11, PMID:30546975.
123. Jumper, J.; Evans, R.; Pritzel, A.; Green, T.; Figurnov, M.; Ronneberger, O.; Tunyasuvunakool, K.; Bates, R.; Žídek, A.; Potapenko, A.; Bridgland, A.; Meyer, C.; Kohl, S.A.A.; Ballard, A.J.; Cowie, A.; Romera-Paredes, B.; Nikolov, S.; Jain, R.; Adler, J.; Back, T.; Petersen, S.; Reiman, D.; Clancy, E.; Zielinski, M.; Steinegger, M.; Pacholska, M.; Berghammer, T.; Bodenstein, S.; Silver, D.; Vinyals, O.; Senior, A.W.; Kavukcuoglu, K.; Kohli, P.; Hassabis, D. Highly Accurate Protein Structure Prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature* 2021, 596, 583–589, doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03819-2, PMID:34265844.
124. Maier, A.; Syben, C.; Lasser, T.; Riess, C. A Gentle Introduction to Deep Learning in Medical Image Processing. *Z. Med. Phys.* 2019, 29, 86–101, doi:10.1016/j.zemedi.2018.12.003, PMID:30638988.
125. Krähenbühl, P.; Koltun, V. Efficient Inference in Fully Connected CRFs with Gaussian Edge Potentials. *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.* 2011, 24, 109–117, PMID:24677225.
126. Nguyen, T.; Lashkari, F.; Choi, J.W.; Zelinski, A.C.; Setsompop, K.; Sarlls, J.E. Tissue Classification Using Quantitative High-Resolution MRI and Single-Cell RNA Sequencing. *Magn. Reson. Med.* 2020, 84, 3265–3276, doi:10.1002/mrm.28364, PMID:32557780.
127. Trapnell, C.; Pachter, L.; Salzberg, S.L. TopHat: Discovering Splice Junctions with RNA-Seq. *Bioinformatics* 2009, 25, 1105–1111, doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp120, PMID:19289445.
128. Stuart, T.; Butler, A.; Hoffman, P.; Hafemeister, C.; Papalexi, E.; Mauck, W.M.; Hao, Y.; Stoeckius, M.; Smibert, P.; Satija, R. Comprehensive Integration of Single-Cell Data. *Cell* 2019, 177, 1888–1902.e21, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2019.05.031, PMID:31178118.
129. Ståhl, P.L.; Salmén, F.; Vickovic, S.; Lundmark, A.; Navarro, J.F.; Magnusson, J.; Giacomello, S.; Asp, M.; Westholm, J.O.; Huss, M.; Mollbrink, A.; Linnarsson, S.; Codeluppi, S.; Borg, Å.; Pontén, F.; Costea, P.I.; Sahlén, P.; Mulder, J.; Bergmann, O.; Lundeberg, J.; Frisén, J. Visualization and Analysis of Gene Expression in Tissue Sections by Spatial Transcriptomics. *Science* 2016, 353, 78–82, doi:10.1126/science.aaf2403, PMID:27365449.
130. Sun, D.; Wang, M.; Li, A. Canonical Correlation Analysis for Multi-Omics Data Integration. *Methods Mol. Biol.* 2019, 1910, 351–367, doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-9074-0_12, PMID:31278673.
131. Love, M.I.; Huber, W.; Anders, S. Moderated Estimation of Fold Change and Dispersion for RNA-Seq Data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol.* 2014, 15, 550, doi:10.1186/s13059-014-0550-8, PMID:25516281.
132. Lê Cao, K.A.; González, I.; Déjean, S. integrOmics: An R Package to Unravel Relationships Between Two Omics Datasets. *Bioinformatics* 2009, 25, 2855–2856, doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp515, PMID:19706745.

133. Shen, R.; Olshen, A.B.; Ladanyi, M. Integrative Clustering of Multiple Genomic Data Types Using a Joint Latent Variable Model with Application to Breast and Lung Cancer Subtype Analysis. *Bioinformatics* 2009, 25, 2906–2912, doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp543, PMID:19759197.
134. Wang, W.; Baladandayuthapani, V.; Morris, J.S.; Broom, B.M.; Manyam, G.; Do, K.A. iBAG: Integrative Bayesian Analysis of High-Dimensional Multiplatform Genomics Data. *Bioinformatics* 2013, 29, 149–159, doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bts655, PMID:23142963.
135. Rao, A.; Barkley, D.; França, G.S.; Yanai, I. Exploring Tissue Architecture Using Spatial Transcriptomics. *Nature* 2021, 596, 211–220, doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03634-9, PMID:34381232.
136. Bergen, V.; Lange, M.; Peidli, S.; Wolf, F.A.; Theis, F.J. Generalizing RNA Velocity to Transient Cell States Through Dynamical Modeling. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 2020, 38, 1408–1414, doi:10.1038/s41587-020-0591-3, PMID:32747759.
137. Moses, L.; Pachter, L. Museum of Spatial Transcriptomics. *Nat. Methods* 2022, 19, 534–546, doi:10.1038/s41592-022-01409-2, PMID:35361931.
138. Johnson, W.E.; Li, C.; Rabinovic, A. Adjusting Batch Effects in Microarray Expression Data Using Empirical Bayes Methods. *Biostatistics* 2007, 8, 118–127, doi:10.1093/biostatistics/kxj037, PMID:16632515.
139. Hao, Y.; Hao, S.; Andersen-Nissen, E.; Mauck, W.M.; Zheng, S.; Butler, A.; Lee, M.J.; Wilk, A.J.; Darby, C.; Zager, M.; Hoffman, P.; Stoeckius, M.; Papalexi, E.; Mimitou, E.P.; Jain, J.; Srivastava, A.; Stuart, T.; Fleming, L.M.; Yeung, B.; Rogers, A.J.; McElrath, J.M.; Blish, C.A.; Gottardo, R.; Smibert, P.; Satija, R. Integrated Analysis of Multimodal Single-Cell Data. *Cell* 2021, 184, 3573–3587.e29, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2021.04.048, PMID:34062119.
140. Way, G.P.; Greene, C.S. Extracting a Biologically Relevant Latent Space from Cancer Transcriptomes with Variational Autoencoders. *Pac. Symp. Biocomput.* 2018, 23, 80–91, PMID:29218872.
141. Aebersold, R.; Mann, M. Mass Spectrometry-Based Proteomics. *Nature* 2003, 422, 198–207, doi:10.1038/nature01511, PMID:12634793.
142. Tyanova, S.; Temu, T.; Cox, J. The MaxQuant Computational Platform for Mass Spectrometry-Based Shotgun Proteomics. *Nat. Protoc.* 2016, 11, 2301–2319, doi:10.1038/nprot.2016.136, PMID:27809316.
143. Mateos, J.; Lourido, L.; Fernández-Puente, P.; Calamia, V.; Fernández-López, C.; Oreiro, N.; Ruiz-Romero, C.; Blanco, F.J. Differential Protein Profiling of Synovial Fluid from Rheumatoid Arthritis and Osteoarthritis Patients Using LC-MS/MS. *J. Proteomics* 2012, 75, 2869–2878, doi:10.1016/j.jpro.2011.12.042, PMID:22245448.
144. Rohart, F.; Gautier, B.; Singh, A.; Lê Cao, K.A. mixOmics: An R Package for 'omics Feature Selection and Multiple Data Integration. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 2017, 13, e1005752, doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005752, PMID:29099853.
145. Gillet, L.C.; Navarro, P.; Tate, S.; Röst, H.; Selevsek, N.; Reiter, L.; Bonner, R.; Aebersold, R. Targeted Data Extraction of the MS/MS Spectra Generated by Data-Independent Acquisition: A New Concept for Consistent and Accurate Proteome Analysis. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics* 2012, 11, O111.016717, doi:10.1074/mcp.O111.016717, PMID:22261725.
146. Demichev, V.; Messner, C.B.; Vernardis, S.I.; Lilley, K.S.; Ralser, M. DIA-NN: Neural Networks and Interference Correction Enable Deep Proteome Coverage in High Throughput. *Nat. Methods* 2020, 17, 41–44, doi:10.1038/s41592-019-0638-x, PMID:31768060.
147. Cox, J.; Mann, M. MaxQuant Enables High Peptide Identification Rates, Individualized p.p.b.-Range Mass Accuracies and Proteome-Wide Protein Quantification. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 2008, 26, 1367–1372, doi:10.1038/nbt.1511, PMID:19029910.
148. Wang, Y.; Yang, Y.; Chen, S.; Wang, S.; Chen, Y.; Zhang, Y.; Wang, X.; Wang, Y.; Zhang, L.; Yu, C.; Shen, B.; Zhang, X.; Wang, Y. Quantitative Proteomic Analysis of Synovial Tissue from Patients with Osteoarthritis and Rheumatoid Arthritis. *J. Proteome Res.* 2020, 19, 2708–2718, doi:10.1021/acs.jproteome.0c00128, PMID:32484356.
149. Takashima, Y.; Kawakami, Y.; Maeda, Y.; Ohuchi, H.; Takami, Y.; Yamaguchi, R.; Hayashi, S.; Imoto, S.; Miyano, S.; Miyamoto, T. Integrative Transcriptomic and Proteomic Analysis of Osteoarthritic Cartilage and Synovium. *J. Orthop. Res.* 2021, 39, 1802–1813, doi:10.1002/jor.24877, PMID:32981103.

150. Machida, Y.J.; Machida, Y.; Chen, Y.; Gurtan, A.M.; Kupfer, G.M.; D'Andrea, A.D.; Dutta, A. UBE2T Is the E2 in the Fanconi Anemia Pathway and Undergoes Negative Autoregulation. *Mol. Cell* 2006, 23, 589–596, doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2006.06.024, PMID:16916645.
151. Zhang, B.; Wang, J.; Wang, X.; Zhu, J.; Liu, Q.; Shi, Z.; Chambers, M.C.; Zimmerman, L.J.; Shaddox, K.F.; Kim, S.; Davies, S.R.; Wang, S.; Wang, P.; Kinsinger, C.R.; Rivers, R.C.; Rodriguez, H.; Townsend, R.R.; Ellis, M.J.; Carr, S.A.; Tabb, D.L.; Coffey, R.J.; Slebos, R.J.; Liebler, D.C. Proteogenomic Characterization of Human Colon and Rectal Cancer. *Nature* 2014, 513, 382–387, doi:10.1038/nature13438, PMID:25043054.
152. Bantscheff, M.; Schirle, M.; Sweetman, G.; Rick, J.; Kuster, B. Quantitative Mass Spectrometry in Proteomics: A Critical Review. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* 2007, 389, 1017–1031, doi:10.1007/s00216-007-1486-6, PMID:17668192.
153. Wilhelm, M.; Schlegl, J.; Hahne, H.; Gholami, A.M.; Lieberenz, M.; Savitski, M.M.; Ziegler, E.; Butzmann, L.; Gessulat, S.; Marx, H.; Mathieson, T.; Lemeer, S.; Schnatbaum, K.; Reimer, U.; Wenschuh, H.; Mollenhauer, M.; Slotta-Huspenina, J.; Boese, J.H.; Bantscheff, M.; Gerstmaier, A.; Faerber, F.; Kuster, B. Mass-Spectrometry-Based Draft of the Human Proteome. *Nature* 2014, 509, 582–587, doi:10.1038/nature13319, PMID:24870543.
154. Boykov, Y.; Kolmogorov, V. An Experimental Comparison of Min-Cut/Max-Flow Algorithms for Energy Minimization in Vision. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.* 2004, 26, 1124–1137, doi:10.1109/TPAMI.2004.60, PMID:15742889.
155. Long, J.; Shelhamer, E.; Darrell, T. Fully Convolutional Networks for Semantic Segmentation. *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.* 2015, 3431–3440, doi:10.1109/CVPR.2015.7298965, PMID:26525853.
156. Vaswani, A.; Shazeer, N.; Parmar, N.; Uszoreit, J.; Jones, L.; Gomez, A.N.; Kaiser, Ł.; Polosukhin, I. Attention Is All You Need. *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.* 2017, 30, 5998–6008, PMID:30836012.
157. Çiçek, Ö.; Abdulkadir, A.; Lienkamp, S.S.; Brox, T.; Ronneberger, O. 3D U-Net: Learning Dense Volumetric Segmentation from Sparse Annotation. *Med. Image Comput. Comput. Assist. Interv.* 2016, 9901, 424–432, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-46723-8_49, PMID:28083544.
158. Wang, G.; Li, W.; Ourselin, S.; Vercauteren, T. Automatic Brain Tumor Segmentation Using Cascaded Anisotropic Convolutional Neural Networks. *Brainlesion* 2018, 11383, 178–190, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-11723-8_18, PMID:30547376.
159. Tajbakhsh, N.; Shin, J.Y.; Gurudu, S.R.; Hurst, R.T.; Kendall, C.B.; Gotway, M.B.; Liang, J. Convolutional Neural Networks for Medical Image Analysis: Full Training or Fine Tuning? *IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging* 2016, 35, 1299–1312, doi:10.1109/TMI.2016.2535302, PMID:26978662.
160. Kamnitsas, K.; Ledig, C.; Newcombe, V.F.J.; Simpson, J.P.; Kane, A.D.; Menon, D.K.; Rueckert, D.; Glocker, B. Efficient Multi-Scale 3D CNN with Fully Connected CRF for Accurate Brain Lesion Segmentation. *Med. Image Anal.* 2017, 36, 61–78, doi:10.1016/j.media.2016.10.004, PMID:27825063.
161. Palla, K.; Wadsworth, M.H.; Ståhl, P.L.; Lundeberg, J.; Weibrecht, I.; Butler, A.; Satija, R.; Regev, A.; Rozenblatt-Rosen, O.; Macosko, E.Z.; Crosetto, N.; Bienko, M. Spatial Transcriptomics and In Situ Sequencing to Study Alzheimer's Disease. *Cell* 2020, 182, 976–991.e19, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2020.06.038, PMID:32702314.
162. Senior, A.W.; Evans, R.; Jumper, J.; Kirkpatrick, J.; Sifre, L.; Green, T.; Qin, C.; Žídek, A.; Nelson, A.W.R.; Bridgland, A.; Penedones, H.; Petersen, S.; Simonyan, K.; Crossan, S.; Kohli, P.; Jones, D.T.; Silver, D.; Kavukcuoglu, K.; Hassabis, D. Improved Protein Structure Prediction Using Potentials from Deep Learning. *Nature* 2020, 577, 706–710, doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1923-7, PMID:31942073.
163. Oktay, O.; Schlemper, J.; Folgoc, L.L.; Lee, M.; Heinrich, M.; Misawa, K.; Mori, K.; McDonagh, S.; Hammerla, N.Y.; Kainz, B.; Glocker, B.; Rueckert, D. Attention U-Net: Learning Where to Look for the Pancreas. *Med. Image Comput. Comput. Assist. Interv.* 2018, 11070, 411–419, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-00934-2_46, PMID:29780607.
164. Havai, M.; Davy, A.; Warde-Farley, D.; Biard, A.; Courville, A.; Bengio, Y.; Pal, C.; Jodoin, P.M.; Larochelle, H. Brain Tumor Segmentation with Deep Neural Networks. *Med. Image Anal.* 2017, 35, 18–31, doi:10.1016/j.media.2016.04.004, PMID:27310171.
165. Kohavi, R. A Study of Cross-Validation and Bootstrap for Accuracy Estimation and Model Selection. *IJCAI* 1995, 14, 1137–1145, PMID:Not applicable.

166. Lundberg, S.M.; Lee, S.I. A Unified Approach to Interpreting Model Predictions. *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.* 2017, 30, 4765–4774, PMID:Not applicable.
167. Hosny, A.; Parmar, C.; Quackenbush, J.; Schwartz, L.H.; Aerts, H.J.W.L. Artificial Intelligence in Radiology. *Nat. Rev. Cancer* 2018, 18, 500–510, doi:10.1038/s41568-018-0016-5, PMID:29777175.
168. Hall, B.K.; Miyake, T. All for One and One for All: Condensations and the Initiation of Skeletal Development. *Bioessays* 2000, 22, 138–147, doi:10.1002/(SICI)1521-1878(200002)22:2<138::AID-BIES5>3.0.CO;2-4, PMID:10655033.
169. Huiskes, R.; Ruimerman, R.; van Lenthe, G.H.; Janssen, J.D. Effects of Mechanical and Biological Factors on Bone Formation and Remodeling: A Computational Approach. *J. Biomech.* 2000, 33, 739–744, doi:10.1016/S0021-9290(99)00208-8, PMID:10807996.
170. Tyson, J.J.; Chen, K.C.; Novak, B. Sniffers, Buzzers, Toggles and Blinkers: Dynamics of Regulatory and Signaling Pathways in the Cell. *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* 2003, 15, 221–231, doi:10.1016/S0955-0674(03)00017-6, PMID:12648679.
171. Ideker, T.; Galitski, T.; Hood, L. A New Approach to Decoding Life: Systems Biology. *Annu. Rev. Genomics Hum. Genet.* 2001, 2, 343–372, doi:10.1146/annurev.genom.2.1.343, PMID:11701654.
172. Viceconti, M.; Clapworthy, G.; Van Sint Jan, S.; Denis, K. The VPH—Physiome Project: Standards and Tools for Multiscale Modelling in Clinical Applications. *IEEE Rev. Biomed. Eng.* 2008, 1, 104–117, doi:10.1109/RBME.2008.2008637, PMID:22274707.
173. Macosko, E.Z.; Basu, A.; Satija, R.; Nemesh, J.; Shekhar, K.; Goldman, M.; Tirosh, I.; Bialas, A.R.; Kamitaki, N.; Martersteck, E.M.; Trombetta, J.J.; Weitz, D.A.; Sanes, J.R.; Shalek, A.K.; Regev, A.; McCarroll, S.A. Highly Parallel Genome-Wide Expression Profiling of Individual Cells Using Nanoliter Droplets. *Cell* 2015, 161, 1202–1214, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2015.05.002, PMID:26000488.
174. Henrotin, Y.; Mobasheri, A.; Marty, M. Is There Any Scientific Evidence for the Use of Glucosamine in the Management of Human Osteoarthritis? *Arthritis Res. Ther.* 2012, 14, 201, doi:10.1186/ar3657, PMID:22293240.
175. Cristino, S.; Grassi, F.; Toneguzzi, S.; Lisignoli, G.; Piacentini, A.; Magrini, E.; Facchini, A.; Belardinelli, R.; Melchiorri, C. Analysis of Chondrocyte Functional Marker Expression in Human Chondrocyte Cultures. *Cell Tissue Res.* 2000, 300, 389–398, doi:10.1007/s004410000198, PMID:10928270.
176. Bashir, A.; Gray, M.L.; Boutin, R.D.; Burstein, D. Glycosaminoglycan in Articular Cartilage: In Vivo Assessment with Delayed Gd(DTPA)(2-)-Enhanced MR Imaging. *Radiology* 1997, 205, 551–558, doi:10.1148/radiology.205.2.9356644, PMID:9356644.
177. Trattnig, S.; Marlovits, S.; Gebetsroither, S.; Szomolanyi, P.; Welsch, G.H.; Salomonowitz, E.; Watanabe, A.; Deimling, M.; Mamisch, T.C. Three-Dimensional Delayed Gadolinium-Enhanced MRI of Cartilage (dGEMRIC) for In Vivo Evaluation of Reparative Cartilage After Matrix-Associated Autologous Chondrocyte Transplantation at 3.0T: Preliminary Results. *J. Magn. Reson. Imaging* 2007, 26, 974–982, doi:10.1002/jmri.21091, PMID:17896387.
178. Boileau, P.; Villalba, M.; Hery, J.Y.; Balg, F.; Ahrens, P.; Neyton, L. Risk Factors for Recurrence of Shoulder Instability After Arthroscopic Bankart Repair. *J. Bone Joint Surg. Am.* 2006, 88, 1755–1763, doi:10.2106/JBJS.E.00817, PMID:16882898.
179. Glaser, C.; Tins, B.J.; Trumm, C.G.; Stoller, D.W.; Reiser, M.F. Imaging of Synovial Inflammation: State of the Art and Future Perspectives. *Eur. J. Radiol.* 2008, 65, 184–191, doi:10.1016/j.ejrad.2007.11.013, PMID:18162349.
180. Gillies, R.J.; Kinahan, P.E.; Hricak, H. Radiomics: Images Are More Than Pictures, They Are Data. *Radiology* 2016, 278, 563–577, doi:10.1148/radiol.2015151169, PMID:26579733.
181. Kim, J.S.; Merrill, R.K.; Arvind, V.; Kaji, D.; Pasik, S.D.; Nwachukwu, C.C.; Nguyen, J.; Lebl, D.R. Examining the Ability of Artificial Neural Networks Machine Learning Models to Accurately Predict Complications Following Posterior Lumbar Spine Fusion. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2018, 43, 1099–1105, doi:10.1097/BRS.0000000000002442, PMID:29189643.
182. Wang, Z.; Gerstein, M.; Snyder, M. RNA-Seq: A Revolutionary Tool for Transcriptomics. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 2009, 10, 57–63, doi:10.1038/nrg2484, PMID:19015660.

183. Klauser, A.S.; Faschingbauer, R.; Jaschke, W.R. Is Sonoelastography of Value in Assessing Tendons? *Semin. Musculoskelet. Radiol.* 2010, 14, 323–333, doi:10.1055/s-0030-1254520, PMID:20539958.
184. Collins, F.S.; Varmus, H. A New Initiative on Precision Medicine. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2015, 372, 793–795, doi:10.1056/NEJMp1500523, PMID:25635347.
185. Topol, E.J. High-Performance Medicine: The Convergence of Human and Artificial Intelligence. *Nat. Med.* 2019, 25, 44–56, doi:10.1038/s41591-018-0300-7, PMID:30617339.
186. Breiman, L. Random Forests. *Mach. Learn.* 2001, 45, 5–32, doi:10.1023/A:1010933404324, PMID:Not applicable.
187. Parmar, C.; Rios Velazquez, E.; Leijenaar, R.; Jermoumi, M.; Carvalho, S.; Mak, R.H.; Tyagi, N.; Yan, B.P.; Lambin, P.; Aerts, H.J. Robust Radiomics Feature Quantification Using Semiautomatic Volumetric Segmentation. *PLoS One* 2014, 9, e102107, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0102107, PMID:25025374.
188. Pearl, J. Bayesian Networks: A Model of Self-Activated Memory for Evidential Reasoning. *Proc. Cogn. Sci. Soc.* 1985, 7, 329–334, PMID:Not applicable.
189. Scarselli, F.; Gori, M.; Tsoi, A.C.; Hagenbuchner, M.; Monfardini, G. The Graph Neural Network Model. *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw.* 2009, 20, 61–80, doi:10.1109/TNN.2008.2005605, PMID:19068426.
190. Chen, R.J.; Lu, M.Y.; Chen, T.Y.; Williamson, D.F.K.; Mahmood, F. Synthetic Data in Machine Learning for Medicine and Healthcare. *Nat. Biomed. Eng.* 2021, 5, 493–497, doi:10.1038/s41551-021-00751-8, PMID:34083794.
191. Pedregosa, F.; Varoquaux, G.; Gramfort, A.; Michel, V.; Thirion, B.; Grisel, O.; Blondel, M.; Prettenhofer, P.; Weiss, R.; Dubourg, V.; Vanderplas, J.; Passos, A.; Cournapeau, D.; Brucher, M.; Perrot, M.; Duchesnay, E. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 2011, 12, 2825–2830, PMID:Not applicable.
192. Gal, Y.; Ghahramani, Z. Dropout as a Bayesian Approximation: Representing Model Uncertainty in Deep Learning. *Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.* 2016, 48, 1050–1059, PMID:Not applicable.
193. Chavez, L.; Meguro, J.; Chen, S. *et al.* Circulating extracellular vesicles activate the pyroptosis pathway in the brain following ventilation-induced lung injury. *J. Neuroinflammation* 18, 310 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12974-021-02364-z>
194. Pap, T.; Müller-Ladner, U.; Gay, R.E.; Gay, S. Fibroblast Biology in Rheumatoid Arthritis: Synovial Fibroblasts as Effector Cells in Inflammation and Tissue Destruction. *Arthritis Res.* 2000, 2, 361–367, doi:10.1186/ar113, PMID:11094447.
195. Mow, V.C.; Wang, C.C.; Hung, C.T. The Extracellular Matrix, Interstitial Fluid and Ions as a Mechanical Signal Transducer in Articular Cartilage. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 1999, 7, 41–58, doi:10.1055/s-2008-1042384, PMID:10367013.
196. Rudin, C. Stop Explaining Black Box Machine Learning Models for High Stakes Decisions and Use Interpretable Models Instead. *Nat. Mach. Intell.* 2019, 1, 206–215, doi:10.1038/s42256-019-0048-x, PMID:35603010.
197. Abadi, M.; Agarwal, A.; Barham, P.; Brevdo, E.; Chen, Z.; Citro, C.; Corrado, G.S.; Davis, A.; Dean, J.; Devin, M.; Ghemawat, S.; Goodfellow, I.; Harp, A.; Irving, G.; Isard, M.; Jia, Y.; Jozefowicz, R.; Kaiser, L.; Kudlur, M.; Levenberg, J.; Mané, D.; Monga, R.; Moore, S.; Murray, D.; Olah, C.; Schuster, M.; Shlens, J.; Steiner, B.; Sutskever, I.; Talwar, K.; Tucker, P.; Vanhoucke, V.; Vasudevan, V.; Viégas, F.; Vinyals, O.; Warden, P.; Wattenberg, M.; Wicke, M.; Yu, Y.; Zheng, X. TensorFlow: Large-Scale Machine Learning on Heterogeneous Distributed Systems. *arXiv* 2016, arXiv:1603.04467, PMID:Not applicable.
198. Bates, D.W.; Saria, S.; Ohno-Machado, L.; Shah, A.; Escobar, G. Big Data In Health Care: Using Analytics To Identify And Manage High-Risk And High-Cost Patients. *Health Aff. (Millwood)* 2014, 33, 1123–1131, doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2014.0041, PMID:25006137.
199. Ratib, O.; Rosset, A.; Heuberger, J. Open Source Software and Social Networks: Disruptive Alternatives for Medical Imaging. *Eur. J. Radiol.* 2011, 78, 259–265, doi:10.1016/j.ejrad.2010.05.004, PMID:20646814.

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.