
Review

New insight on the pathophysiology of osteoarthritis: A narrative review

Running header: New insight on osteoarthritis pathophysiology

**Stefano Coaccioli¹, Piercarlo Sarzi Puttini^{2,3}, Panagiotis Zis^{4,5}, Giuseppe Rinonapoli⁶ and
Giustino Varrassi⁷**

¹ President of European League Against Pain, Zurich, Switzerland

² Rheumatology Unit, Internal Medicine Department, ASST Fatebenefratelli Sacco, Milan; and ³School of Medicine, University of Milano, Italy

⁴ Second Department of Neurology, Attikon University Hospital, School of Medicine, National & Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece,

⁵ Medical School, University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

⁶ Orthopaedic Department, Perugia University School of Medicine, Perugia, Italy

⁷ Paolo Procacci Foundation, 00193 Roma, Italy

* Corresponding Author:

Stefano Coaccioli,
stefano.coaccioli@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: Understanding the basis of osteoarthritis (OA) has seen some interesting advancements in recent years. It has been observed that cartilage degeneration is preceded by subchondral bone lesions, suggesting a key role of this mechanism within the pathogenesis and progression of OA, including the formation of ectopic bone and osteophytes. Moreover, low-grade, chronic inflammation of the synovial lining has gained a central role in the definition of OA pathophysiology, and central immunological mechanisms, innate but also adaptive, are now considered crucial in driving inflammation and tissue destruction. In addition, the role of neuroinflammation and central sensitization mechanisms has been characterized as underlying causes of pain chronicity. This has led to a renewed definition of OA, which is now intended as a complex multifactorial joint pathology caused by inflammatory and metabolic factors underlying joint damage. Since this evidence can directly affect the definition of the correct therapeutic approach to OA, an improved understanding of these pathophysiological mechanisms is fundamental. This review provides an overview of the most updated evidence on OA pathogenesis; it presents the most recent insight on the pathophysiology of OA, describing the interplay between immunological and biochemical mechanisms proposed to drive inflammation and tissue destruction, as well as central sensitization mechanisms. Moreover, although the therapeutic implications consequent to the renewed definition of OA are beyond this review scope, some suggestions for intervention have been addressed.

KEYWORDS: Osteoarthritis; pathophysiology; subchondral bone; synovium; inflammation

INTRODUCTION

Osteoarthritis (OA) is the most common chronic articular disease with an increasing prevalence.¹⁻³ OA is characterized by articular cartilage degeneration and persistent pain, causing disability, loss of function, decreased quality of life (QoL), and economic burden.⁴⁻⁶

OA has long been considered a degenerative cartilage disease, characterized by a progressive loss of functionality due to different factors, such as excessive body weight, advanced age, surgical joint treatments, repeated joint injuries, and genetic predisposition^{7,8} Nevertheless, the understanding of the basis of OA has seen some interesting advancements in recent years.^{1,9,10} Indeed, modern imaging approaches have shown that OA pathogenesis involves the breakdown of cartilage and structural changes in the whole joint.^{1,6,10} In particular, it has been observed that cartilage degeneration is preceded by subchondral bone lesions, suggesting a key role of this mechanism within the pathogenesis and progression of OA, as well as the formation of ectopic bone and osteophytes.^{5,8,11–13}

Moreover, low-grade, chronic inflammation of the synovial lining now plays a central role in defining OA pathophysiology. Innate but adaptive, central immunological mechanisms are now considered crucial in driving inflammation and tissue destruction.^{3,10} Lastly, the role of neuroinflammation and central sensitization mechanisms as underlying causes of pain chronicity has been characterized.^{14,15}

This evidence has led to a renewed definition of OA, which is now intended as a complex multifactorial joint pathology caused by inflammatory and metabolic factors underlying joint damage.^{1,3,6,10} This new perspective directly impacts the definition of the correct therapeutic approach to OA. Therefore, an improved understanding of these pathophysiological mechanisms is fundamental.

This narrative review aims to provide an overview of the most updated evidence on OA pathogenesis. It presents the latest insight on OA pathophysiology, describing the interplay between immunological and biochemical mechanisms proposed to drive inflammation and tissue destruction.

METHODS

A PubMed search was done using different combinations of pertinent keywords (e.g., “osteoarthritis” AND “pathophysiology”; “osteoarthritis” AND “synovium”, “osteoarthritis” AND “subchondral bone”) focusing on papers published in English over the past 5 years (2018–2022). If relevant, previously published papers were exceptionally considered, as judged by the Authors, as well as documents from the Authors’ previous publications. Papers were selected for inclusion according to their relevance to the topic, as judged by the Authors.

Changes in the Osteochondral Unit During Osteoarthritis: Role of the Subchondral Bone

Increasing evidence suggests that OA is a whole-joint disease in which all the joint components (cartilage, synovium, subchondral bone, and associated muscles) are affected.^{1,3,6} Articular cartilage covers the ends of bones in the diarthrodial joint and absorbs shock from joint movement. It has an aneural, avascular, and lymphatic structure composed of 60–80% water, 20–35% extracellular matrix (ECM), and 1–5% chondrocytes.^{16,17}

The subchondral bone is the bony layer below the hyaline cartilage and can be divided into the subchondral bone plate (SBP) and subchondral bone trabeculae. The SBP is a compact, porous, calcified plate traversed by nerve fibers and vessels. Subchondral bone trabeculae are cancellous bony structures that undergo continuous bone remodeling.^{5,17} Articular cartilage, calcified cartilage, SBP, and subchondral bone trabeculae form the osteochondral unit, which transfers load during joint movement (Figure 1).^{16,18} Subchondral bone provides both nutritional and mechanical support for cartilage within the osteochondral unit, indicating that changes in the subchondral bone microenvironment can affect cartilage metabolism.^{5,13,16,18}




Figure 1. The normal joint – e.g., the joint of the knee – is composed of two articulating bones (femur and tibia), the articular cartilage, and the synovial lining of the joint cavity. A thin layer of calcified cartilage is present underneath the articular cartilage. The subchondral bone beneath the calcified cartilage is formed from cortical bone that merges into a network of trabecular bone, which is relatively porous and metabolically active. Source: original.

Subchondral bone marrow lesions (SBMLs), reported by abnormal magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) signals below the calcified cartilage, have been found to affect more than half of asymptomatic individuals over 50 years old. Their prevalence seems to increase with age.⁵ SBMLs are due to abnormal and persistent mechanical insults, which lead to cellular and biomolecular responses to microfractures. Since SBMLs can be observed in the early stage of OA, and the worsening of SBMLs based on MRI manifestations has been associated with subsequent radiographic findings and persistent pain, they are thought to be helpful in early screening.^{5,13,19} The site of an SBML is characterized by a high *in situ* turnover rate, pain, and activation of proinflammatory pathways, finally resulting in increased subchondral sclerosis and bone mineral density.^{5,13} Clinical observations over 24 months suggested a strong relationship between the increased size of the SBMLs and cartilage volume loss in corresponding regions.^{5,13} Consequently, subchondral bone remodeling is now considered a key element of OA, which can disrupt the integrity of the osteochondral unit and lead to increased crosstalk between cartilage and subchondral bone (Figure 2).^{5,13,18} A recent study reported the presence of a horizontal fissure at the interface within the osteochondral unit in obese patients, characterized by irregular cartilage erosion, fibro-granulation tissue infiltration, presence of free cartilage/bone debris, and rupture of micro capillaries.²⁰ This can be considered a new type of pathological feature, where neurovascular invasions have also been identified in degenerative osteochondral tissues (see following sections).

RISK FACTORS

The risk factors for OA can be divided into individual susceptibility features (increasing age, obesity, female sex, joint biomechanics, genetic factors) and factors that alter the biomechanical stability of joints (injury, repetitive joint use through occupation or leisure, and joint malalignment).^{7,8,21}

Individual risk factors

The increasing incidence of OA with age can be related to cumulative exposure to various risk factors and age-related biological changes in the joint structures.^{2,22} Female sex and obesity have been strongly correlated with knee OA.²³ Knee malalignment and knee extensor muscle weakness have also been defined as moderate to strong risk factors.²⁴

Female sex and obesity are less represented risk factors for hip OA, but cam deformity or acetabular dysplasia have been found to moderately to strongly increase OA risk.⁶ Cam deformity and mild dysplasia have been found to increase the risk of OA, especially in middle-aged (55–65 years) patients; otherwise, a strong association between hip OA and severe dysplasia has been described, leading to its development at an early age (<50 years).²⁵

Genetics

The contribution of genetics in OA is estimated to be between 40% and 80%, with a stronger genetic contribution in hand and hip OA than knee OA.^{21,26} Rare mutations in monogenetic disorders associated with OA can result in early-onset OA. In contrast, late-onset OA is often characterized by a multifactorial clinical picture composed of common DNA variants and other risk factors. The effect size of these common variants is generally small.^{21,26} Of note, among the 70 putative genes identified in genome-wide association studies in OA, no inflammatory genes can be detected; otherwise, growth factor clusters are strongly represented.^{27,28} These include variants in *TGF-β* family genes, including ligands (*TGFB1*, *GDF5*), latent binding proteins (*LTBP1*, *LTBP3*), and signaling molecules (*SMAD3*). The FGF family is also represented. Collectively, these results underline the role of the loss of reparative features within the joint in the development of OA.²⁹

Joint-related factors

Heavy work activities are risk factors for both hip and knee OA; employment in farming or the construction industry is especially associated with hip OA, and work that involves frequent kneeling and heavy lifting is associated with knee OA.²³

Increased risk of OA has been found among athletes active in different sports.³⁰ Several high-impact sports (e.g., football, handball, hockey, wrestling, weight-lifting, and long-distance running) have been reported as moderately to strongly associated with an increased risk of hip or knee OA, often with a dose-response dependency.^{31,32} For knee OA, the increased risk with sport is partly because of knee injuries; for hip OA, the risk might be associated with cam impingement, which can develop during sporting activities in adolescents.⁶ Otherwise, in the first study examining the association between objectively measured physical activity and risk of developing knee OA in a community-based cohort

of middle-aged and older adults at high risk for symptomatic knee OA, moderate-vigorous physical activity was not associated with incident knee OA.³³

Lastly, an association between the increasing use of technology, computers, and smartphones and hand OA has yet to be proved but is a common concern that requires further investigation, considering the increasing prevalence of these technologies in our lives.⁴

MECHANISMS UNDERLYING JOINT DETERIORATION

The interplay between immunological and biochemical processes

Increasing evidence highlights the interplay between mechanical damage to the osteochondral unit and low-grade chronic inflammation of the synovial membrane (synovitis) in the OA pathophysiology. The involvement of innate and adaptive immune responses in the initiation and maintenance of inflammation is also described (Figure 2).^{3,10}




Figure 2. Sequential changes in the osteochondral unit during the evolution of osteoarthritis. A) Early OA is characterized by increased remodeling of the subchondral bone plate. With disease progression, loss of cartilage matrix proteoglycans and erosion of the collagen network lead to the development of deep fissures and delamination of the cartilage, with exposure of the underlying zones of calcified cartilage and subchondral bone. In the subchondral bone, cortical plate thickness gradually increases. B) Chondrocytes exist mostly in clusters in late-stage OA, but chondrocyte apoptosis is also evident. In the deeper zones, chondrocytes undergo phenotypic alterations, developing features of a hypertrophic phenotype. The calcified cartilage expands and advances into the overlying hyaline articular cartilage, with duplication of the tidemark. This process is initiated by penetrating vascular elements, and accompanying sensory and sympathetic nerves, into the osteochondral junction. OA: osteoarthritis. Source: original.

Synovitis

Most OA patients present with low-grade inflammation, which has thus been crucial in OA development and progression.^{9,34} Cytokines, as well as growth factors produced by the inflamed synovium, showed the ability to influence the production of degradative enzymes and to mediate cartilage loss. Thus, an altered balance between pro- and anti-inflammatory cytokines, directed

toward catabolism, can be described.¹ Several pro-inflammatory cytokines, such as interleukin (IL)-1 β , IL-6, IL-15, IL-17, IL-18, tumor necrosis factor (TNF)- α , and leukemia inhibitory factor (LIF) increased in OA tissues; at the same time, interferon- γ (IFN- γ), IL-6, IL-10, IL-4, and TGF- β provided anti-inflammatory activity.³

Innate immune system

It has been observed that damage to cellular and cartilage ECM can generate damage-associated molecular patterns that activate the innate immune system and elicit a sterile inflammatory response through interaction with particle recognition receptors, such as Toll-like receptors (TLR), on the surface of immune cells, or with particle recognition receptors in the cell cytoplasm, such as nod-like receptors.^{34,35}

TLR-2 and TLR-4 have been found to be upregulated in the synovial tissue, in articular cartilage lesions, and in the synovial membranes of patients with OA, leading to the upregulation of matrix metalloproteases, nitric oxide, and prostaglandin E2.^{34,36} Recent reports suggest that among the TLR-induced innate immune responses, apoptosis is one of the critical events. Apoptosis is particularly important, given that chondrocyte death is a dominant feature in OA.³⁴ Once initiated, this inflammatory response leads to upregulation of catabolic factors, such as proinflammatory cytokines, proteolytic enzymes, and chemokines, and downregulation of anabolic factors, such as anti-inflammatory cytokines and growth factors, contributing to an ongoing sterile wound healing “vicious circle” resulting in joint tissue pathology (Figure 2).³

The mediators that cause cartilage damage in OA, such as damage-associated molecular patterns and ECM components, can exude into the synovial fluid and activate synovial macrophages. Activated synovial macrophages further stimulate the release of proinflammatory cytokines, such as IL-1 β and TNF- α and other catabolic as well as anabolic mediators involved in OA pathology.³⁷

Since macrophages are critical mediators for the maintenance of tissue homeostasis, they are thought to be involved in the pathology and symptomatology of OA once dysregulated. Several studies have been published that further support macrophages as key mediators in OA-associated inflammation in recent years. Furthermore, it has been shown that modulating these cells or intervening with factors that modify their phenotypic state may be a promising approach to slowing down OA development.^{38–42}

Adaptative immunity

Macrophages can release pro-inflammatory cytokines that increase vascular permeability and further facilitate CD4⁺ T-cell infiltration, angiogenesis, and elevated levels of COX-2 in the OA synovium. CD4⁺ T cells and macrophages are abundantly present in OA synovium and can activate each other.⁴³ In particular, Th1 type T cells can initiate a cascade of events that activate both innate and adaptive immune responses, propagate synovial inflammation, and increase cartilage deterioration. T cells are also responsible for activating B cells, which hamper cartilage integrity by increasing inflammation and producing autoantibodies specific to chondrocytes' surface proteins, like collagen and osteopontin.⁴⁴

Neuroinflammatory processes

Bidirectional interactions between the immune and nervous systems are increasingly understood to play a pathogenic role in OA chronic pain.^{14,15} Communication between the two systems can occur at different levels: in the affected synovium, where nociceptors and macrophages interact, in the dorsal root ganglion, which can become infiltrated by macrophages in response to peripheral inflammation, and in the spinal cord dorsal horn, where microglia can modify synapses between nociceptors and second-order neurons.¹⁵

People with OA are more sensitive to experimental noxious stimuli at body sites distant from their affected joints than unaffected people, suggesting the presence of central sensitization.⁴⁵ Since it is unrelated to radiological findings, this suggests that its role in osteoarticular pain is crucial.^{46,47} Mast cells appear to be directly involved in neuropathic pain mechanisms, acting as interlocutors of microglia and promoters of central sensitization.¹⁴ A direct nerve fiber damage can induce mast cell degranulation by releasing neuropeptides. Massively releasing mast cell mediators, such as histamine and NGF, enhances and supports electrophysiological alterations of nerve fibers, leading to their sensitization.^{48,49} Persistent sensitization of peripheral neurons is the first phase of central sensitization. In fact, neuronal hyperexcitability is followed by excessive release of neurotransmitters from peripheral terminals and those that connect to the dorsal horn of the spinal cord. This leads to hyperexcitability of second-order neurons and activation of microglia.¹⁴

Neoangiogenesis

An early diagnostic feature of OA is represented by the increased subchondral bone angiogenesis and the blood vessel invasion into the avascular cartilage.^{5,6} Angiogenesis has proven to be a key factor in the pathogenesis of OA, facilitating the invasion of inflammatory cells and increasing local pain receptors that contribute to structural damage and pain.⁵⁰

Although antiangiogenic and angiogenic factors can be upregulated in the OA joint, the articular cartilage loses its resistance to vascularization, and vascular growth predominates. Angiogenesis in this location is closely related to the creation of channels into noncalcified articular cartilage from subchondral bone spaces and the sensory nerve growth through shared regulatory pathways.⁵⁰ This involves releasing proangiogenic factors that stimulate nerve growth and molecules produced by vascular cells that stimulate and guide nerve growth.¹ Sensory nerves grow along new blood vessels in OA joints and invade noncalcified articular cartilage, osteophytes, and the inner regions of menisci. These structures are normally not innervated; thus, nerve and blood vessel invasion contribute to pain.⁵

Osteophyte formation and joint remodeling

A characteristic feature of OA is the formation of osteophytes, which are osseocartilaginous outgrowths that typically form at the joint margins.⁵¹ Osteophyte is usually considered an endogenous repair response to excessive

mechanical load in degenerative joints, attempting to stabilize the involved joint to better bear the abnormal force.^{11,52} In recent studies, osteophyte formation has been reported to be associated with abnormal mechanical forces that result in lateral thrust, joint instability conditions, and malposition of the meniscus; therefore, control of abnormal joint movement and instability may be a beneficial precautionary measure for OA progression.^{53,54} It has also been proposed that osteophyte formation may also play a compensatory role in the redistribution of forces to protect articular cartilage.⁵⁵

FUNCTIONAL OUTCOMES OF OSTEOARTHRITIS

It has been estimated that OA causes limitations in activity in 7% of the older adult population; 25% cannot perform major activities of daily living, and about 80% of OA patients present some movement limitation.⁵⁶ Other than activity limitations, the individual burden of OA includes pain and markedly reduced QoL. Since OA is a chronic disease, the accompanying chronic pain can be intermittent but generally severe or intense, or persistent.⁵⁷

Small joints

Wrist OA usually results from a post-traumatic sequel and selectively arises in the joints that involve the scaphoid bone. Although well tolerated for many years, it can result in severe functional impairments consequent to mechanical pain, motion range limitation, and decreased strength.⁵⁸ These symptoms develop gradually in most patients but may be precipitated by an injury or unusual sustained activity.⁵⁹ In addition to motion range limitation, the physical findings may include swelling, usually at the dorsal-radial aspect of the wrist, related to a combination of osteophytes and focal synovitis.⁶⁰

OA of the fingers is an especially common condition in postmenopausal women. Fingers OA destroys interphalangeal cartilage and results in pain, swelling, decreased finger motion, joint deformities, and difficulty performing activities that require grip or pinch.⁶¹

Middle and large joints

Middle and large joint OA are mainly characterized by pain and inactivity.⁶² Much of the focus on disability is on the knee because of its high prevalence (83% of the total OA burden) and attendant disability. It has been estimated that 11% of adults with knee OA need personal care assistance, and 14% require help with routine activities.⁵⁶ Notably, hip and knee OA have been related to a ~20% excess mortality as compared with age-matched controls, due in part to lower levels of physical activity.⁶³

DISCUSSION

Unraveling the disease processes in OA has always been challenging because of its nature characterized by tissue inaccessibility and heterogeneity of clinical phenotype.^{64,65} In recent years, different pathophysiological mechanisms involved in OA development and progression have been described.^{1,9,10} It is now widely accepted that OA pathogenesis involves not only the breakdown of cartilage but also the remodeling of subchondral bone, formation of ectopic bone and

osteophytes, hypertrophy of the joint capsule, and inflammation of the synovial lining. Consequently, it is now recognized that low-grade, chronic inflammation has a central role in the pathogenesis of arthrosis. In addition, the chronicity of pain in people with OA is increasingly recognized to be related to central sensitization mechanisms.^{14,15} Although the therapeutic implication consequent to the renewed definition of OA is beyond the scope of this review, this more complex clinical picture has inevitable therapeutic consequences and provides numerous suggestions for intervention, acting on the various pathogenetic processes. Firstly, this allows a better understanding and identification of different patient phenotypes and the detection of the disease in its early stages, as well as the possibility to identify patients who are at higher risk of progression, which in turn could be used to guide clinical decision-making and develop more effective and specific therapeutic interventions.⁸ In addition, integration of the central sensitization concept during clinical reasoning and patient management should also be included.

According to the new evidence, the prevention and the conservative treatment of OA acquire an important role in a surgical approach. Consequently, interventions must be emphasized to counteract the modifiable variables that drive disease progression. These interventions should include, for example, treatments for obesity and approaches for improving joint mechanics. Importantly, these interventions must be instituted before developing considerable structural and functional alterations in the joint tissues. At the same time, chondroprotection can be reconsidered as a first-line approach to OA, particularly in the early stages when the cartilage tissue is sensitive to protective and structural reconstruction interventions to avoid more invasive therapeutic interventions.

People suffering from lower-extremity OA should be encouraged to perform physical activity, even of modest intensity.⁶⁶ There was no evidence to suggest accelerated OA progression for physical activity below 10,000 steps per day.⁶⁷ Moreover, it has been suggested that physical activity can decrease pain and improve physical function and health-related QoL in hip or knee OA cases.⁶⁷ Lastly, exercise has been found to reduce evidence of central sensitization in many patients with chronic pain conditions.⁶⁸

CONCLUSION

OA is now intended as a multifactorial pathology caused by different biological functional alterations based on joint damage. A close understanding of the active biological and cellular processes that contribute to disease pathology at a given stage of OA progression is fundamental to targeting the individual components of the pathophysiological process with specific therapeutic agents and detecting them at the earliest stages. In this perspective, the prevention and the conservative treatment of OA acquire an important role.

Declarations:

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Author contributions

SC and GV contributed to the literature research and wrote the first draft. All other Authors have critically contributed to the analysis of evidence and provided major intellectual input to the paper. All authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All Authors have read and approved the final version of the paper before submission.

Acknowledgments

Editorial and graphical assistance was provided by Simonetta Papa, PhD, Mattia Zamboni, Massimiliano Pianta, Valentina Attanasio and Aashni Shah (Polistudium SRL, Milan, Italy).

Funding

There was no explicit funding for the development of this work.

Competing interests

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

Availability of data and materials

Not applicable

References

1. Jang S, Lee K and Ju JH. Recent Updates of Diagnosis, Pathophysiology, and Treatment on Osteoarthritis of the Knee. *Int J Mol Sci* 2021; 22: 2619. doi:10.3390/ijms22052619
2. Sacitharan PK. Ageing and osteoarthritis. *Subcell Biochem* 2019; 91: 123–159.
3. Kulkarni P, Martson A, Vidya R, et al. Pathophysiological landscape of osteoarthritis. *Adv Clin Chem* 2021; 100: 37–90.
4. Abramoff B and Caldera FE. Osteoarthritis: pathology, diagnosis, and treatment options. *Med Clin North Am* 2020; 104: 293–311.
5. Hu Y, Chen X, Wang S, et al. Subchondral bone microenvironment in osteoarthritis and pain. *Bone Res* 2021; 9: 20.
6. Hunter DJ and Bierma-Zeinstra S. Osteoarthritis. *Lancet* 2019; 393: 1745–1759.
7. He Y, Li Z, Alexander PG, Ocasio-Nieves BD, et al. Pathogenesis of osteoarthritis: risk factors, regulatory pathways in chondrocytes, and experimental models. *Biology (Basel)* 2020; 9: E194.
8. Martel-Pelletier J, Barr AJ, Cicuttini FM, et al. Osteoarthritis. *Nat Rev Dis Primers* 2016; 2: 16072.
9. van den Bosch MHJ. Osteoarthritis year in review 2020: biology. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2021; 29: 143–150.
10. Geyer M and Schönfeld C. Novel insights into the pathogenesis of osteoarthritis. *Curr Rheumatol Rev* 2018; 14: 98–107.
11. Cai X, Yuan S, Zeng Y, Wang C, et al. New trends in pharmacological treatments for osteoarthritis. *Front Pharmacol* 2021; 12: 645842.
12. Li G, Yin J, Gao J, et al. Subchondral bone in osteoarthritis: insight into risk factors and microstructural changes. *Arthritis Res Ther.* 2013;15(6):223.
13. Donell S. Subchondral bone remodelling in osteoarthritis. *EFORT Open Rev* 2019; 4: 221–229.
14. Fusco M, Skaper SD, Coaccioli S, et al. Degenerative Joint Diseases and Neuroinflammation. *Pain Pract.* 2017 Apr;17(4):522-532.
15. Geraghty T, Winter DR, Miller RJ, et al. Neuroimmune interactions and osteoarthritis pain: focus on macrophages. *Pain Rep* 2021; 6: e892. doi: 10.1097/PR9.0000000000000892
16. Goldring SR and Goldring MB. Changes in the osteochondral unit during osteoarthritis: structure, function and cartilage-bone crosstalk. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* 2016; 12: 632–644.
17. Zhu X, Chan YT, Yung PSH, et al. Subchondral bone remodeling: a therapeutic target for osteoarthritis. *Front Cell Dev Biol* 2020; 8: 607764.
18. Fan X, Wu X, Crawford R, et al. Macro, Micro, and Molecular. Changes of the osteochondral interface in osteoarthritis development. *Front Cell Dev Biol* 2021; 9: 659654.
19. Perry TA, Parkes MJ, Hodgson RJ, et al. Association between bone marrow lesions & synovitis and symptoms in symptomatic knee osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2020; 28: 316–323.
20. Chen L, Yao F, Wang T, et al. Horizontal fissuring at the osteochondral interface: a novel and unique pathological feature in patients with obesity-related osteoarthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2020; 79: 811–888.

21. O'Neill TW, McCabe PS and McBeth J. Update on the epidemiology, risk factors and disease outcomes of osteoarthritis. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol* 2018; 32: 312–326.
22. Varela-Eirin M, Loureiro J, Fonseca E, et al. Cartilage regeneration and ageing: Targeting cellular plasticity in osteoarthritis. *Ageing Res Rev* 2018; 42: 56–71.
23. Georgiev T and Angelov AK. Modifiable risk factors in knee osteoarthritis: treatment implications. *Rheumatol Int* 2019; 39: 1145–1157.
24. Silverwood V, Blagojevic-Bucknall M, Jinks C, et al. Current evidence on risk factors for knee osteoarthritis in older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2015; 23: 507–515.
25. Saberi Hosnijeh F, Zuiderwijk ME, Versteeg M, et al. Cam deformity and acetabular dysplasia as risk factors for hip osteoarthritis. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 2017; 69: 86–93.
26. van Meurs JB. Osteoarthritis year in review 2016: genetics, genomics and epigenetics. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2017; 25: 181–189.
27. Tachmazidou I, Hatzikotoulas K, Southam L, et al. Identification of new therapeutic targets for osteoarthritis through genome-wide analyses of UK Biobank data. *Nat Genet.* 2019 Feb;51(2):230-236
28. Styrkarsdottir U, Lund SH, Thorleifsson G, et al. Meta-analysis of Icelandic and UK data sets identifies missense variants in SMO, IL11, COL11A1 and 13 more new loci associated with osteoarthritis. *Nat Genet.* 2018 Dec;50(12):1681-1687.
29. Vincent TL. 2021: the year we rewrite the osteoarthritis textbooks? *Function (Oxf)* 2021; 2: zqaa043.
30. Thelin N, Holmberg S and Thelin A. Knee injuries account for the sports-related increased risk of knee osteoarthritis. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 2006; 16: 329-333. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2005.00497.x.
31. Vigdorchik JM, Nepple JJ, Eftekhary N, et al. What is the association of elite sporting activities with the development of hip osteoarthritis? *Am J Sports Med* 2017; 45: 961–964.
32. Driban JB, Hootman JM, Sitler MR, et al. Is participation in certain sports associated with knee osteoarthritis? A systematic review. *J Athl Train* 2017; 52: 497–506.
33. Qin J, Barbour KE, Nevitt MC, et al. Objectively Measured Physical Activity and Risk of Knee Osteoarthritis. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2018 Feb;50(2):277-283.
34. Barreto G, Manninen M and K Eklund K. Osteoarthritis and Toll-like receptors: when innate immunity meets chondrocyte apoptosis. *Biology (Basel)* 2020; 9: 65.
35. Roh JS and Sohn DH. Damage-associated molecular patterns in inflammatory diseases. *Immune Netw* 2018; 18: e27.
36. Sharma N, Drobinski P, Kaye A, et al. Inflammation and joint destruction may be linked to the generation of cartilage metabolites of ADAMTS-5 through activation of toll-like receptors. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2020; 28: 658–668.
37. Lambert C, Zappia J, Sanchez C, et al. The damage-associated molecular patterns (DAMPs) as potential targets to treat osteoarthritis: perspectives from a review of the literature. *Front Med* 2021; 7: 607186.
38. Culemann S, Grüneboom A, Nicolás-Ávila JA, et al. Locally renewing resident synovial macrophages provide a protective barrier for the joint. *Nature* 2019; 572: 670–675.
39. Bailey KN, Furman BD, Zeitlin J, et al. Intra-articular depletion of macrophages increases acute synovitis and alters macrophage polarity in the injured mouse knee. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2020; 28: 626–638.
40. Zhou F, Mei J, Han X, et al. Kinsenoside attenuates osteoarthritis by repolarizing macrophages through inactivating NF-κB/MAPK signaling and protecting chondrocytes. *Acta Pharmaceutica Sinica B* 2019; 9: 973–985.
41. Zhou F, Mei J, Yang S, et al. Modified ZIF-8 nanoparticles attenuate osteoarthritis by reprogramming the metabolic pathway of synovial macrophages. *ACS Appl Mater Interfaces* 2020; 12: 2009–2022.
42. Mahon OR, Kelly DJ, McCarthy GM, et al. Osteoarthritis-associated basic calcium phosphate crystals alter immune cell metabolism and promote M1 macrophage polarization. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2020; 28: 603–612.
43. Thomson A, Hilkens CMU. Synovial Macrophages in Osteoarthritis: The Key to Understanding Pathogenesis? *Front Immunol.* 2021 Jun 15;12:678757
44. Haubruck P, Pinto MM, Moradi B, et al. Monocytes, macrophages, and their potential niches in synovial joints – therapeutic targets in post-traumatic osteoarthritis? *Front Immunol* 2021; 12: 763702.
45. Arendt-Nielsen L. Pain sensitisation in osteoarthritis. *Clin Exp Rheumatol* 2017; 35: S68–S74.
46. Arendt-Nielsen L, Nie H, Laursen MB, et al. Sensitization in patients with painful knee osteoarthritis. *Pain* 2010; 149: 573–581.
47. Imamura M, Imamura ST, Kaziya HH, et al. Impact of nervous system hyperalgesia on pain, disability, and quality of life in patients with knee osteoarthritis: a controlled analysis. *Arthritis Rheum* 2008; 59: 1424–1431.
48. Thacker MA, Clark AK, Marchand F, et al. Pathophysiology of peripheral neuropathic pain: immune cells and molecules. *Anesth Analg* 2007; 105: 838–847.
49. Nieto FR, Clark AK, Grist J, et al. Calcitonin gene-related peptide-expressing sensory neurons and spinal microglial reactivity contribute to pain states in collagen-induced arthritis. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 2015; 67: 1668–1677.
50. MacDonald IJ, Liu S-C, Su C-M, et al. Implications of angiogenesis involvement in arthritis. *Int J Mol Sci* 2018; 19: E2012.
51. Roelofs AJ, Kania K, Rafipay AJ, et al. Identification of the skeletal progenitor cells forming osteophytes in osteoarthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2020; 79: 1625–1634.
52. Rockel J and Kapoor M. The metabolome and osteoarthritis: possible contributions to symptoms and pathology. *Metabolites* 2018; 8: 92.
53. Kizaki K, Uchida S, Yamashita F, et al. Microstructure of osteophytes in medial knee osteoarthritis. *Clin Rheumatol* 2018; 37: 2893–2896.

54. Murata K, Kokubun T, Onitsuka K, et al. Controlling joint instability after anterior cruciate ligament transection inhibits transforming growth factor-beta-mediated osteophyte formation. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2019 Aug;27(8):1185-1196
55. Liu L, Ishijima M, Kaneko H, et al. The MRI-detected osteophyte score is a predictor for undergoing joint replacement in patients with end-stage knee osteoarthritis. *Mod Rheumatol*. 2017 Mar;27(2):332-338
56. Hunter DJ, Schofield D and Callander E. The individual and socioeconomic impact of osteoarthritis. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* 2014; 10: 437–441.
57. Kouraki A, Bast T, Ferguson E, et al. The association of socio-economic and psychological factors with limitations in day-to-day activity over 7 years in newly diagnosed osteoarthritis patients. *Sci Rep* 2022; 12: 943.
58. Andersson JK, Hagert E and Brittberg M. Cartilage injuries and posttraumatic osteoarthritis in the wrist: a review. *Cartilage* 2021; 13: 156S-168S.
59. Shahabpour M, Abid W, Van Overstraeten L, et al. Wrist trauma: more than bones. *J Belg Soc Radiol* 2021; 105: 90.
60. Laulan J, Marteau E and Bacle G. Wrist osteoarthritis. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res* 2015; 101: S1-S9. doi:10.1016/j.otsr.2014.06.025
61. Giddins G. Functional outcomes after surgery for thumb carpometacarpal joint arthritis. *J Hand Surg Eur Vol* 2020; 45: 64–70.
62. Whittaker JL, Truong LK, Dhiman K, et al. Osteoarthritis year in review 2020: rehabilitation and outcomes. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2021; 29: 190–207.
63. Katz JN, Arant KR and Loeser RF. Diagnosis and treatment of hip and knee osteoarthritis: a review. *JAMA* 2021; 325: 568–578.
64. Deveza LA, Nelson AE and Loeser RF. Phenotypes of osteoarthritis: current state and future implications. *Clin Exp Rheumatol* 2019; 37: 64–72.
65. Cope PJ, Ourradi K, Li Y, et al. Models of osteoarthritis: the good, the bad and the promising. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2019; 27: 230–239.
66. Hurley M, Dickson K, Hallett R, et al. . Exercise interventions and patient beliefs for people with hip, knee or hip and knee osteoarthritis: A mixed methods review. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2018; 4: CD010842.
67. Kraus VB, Sprow K, Powell KE, et al. Effects of physical activity in knee and hip osteoarthritis: a systematic umbrella review. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2019; 51: 1324-1339. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000001944
68. Villafañe JH, Bishop MD, Pedersini P, et al. Physical activity and osteoarthritis: update and perspectives. *Pain Med* 2019; 20: 1461-1463. doi:10.1093/pm/pny283