UCSF UC San Francisco Previously Published Works

Title

Longitudinal analysis of cartilage T2 relaxation times and joint degeneration in African American and Caucasian American women over an observation period of 6 years – data from the Osteoarthritis Initiative

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9661s0tk

Journal Osteoarthritis and Cartilage, 24(8)

ISSN

1063-4584

Authors

Kretzschmar, M Heilmeier, U Yu, A <u>et al.</u>

Publication Date 2016-08-01

DOI

10.1016/j.joca.2016.03.002

Peer reviewed

Osteoarthritis and Cartilage



Longitudinal analysis of cartilage T2 relaxation times and joint degeneration in African American and Caucasian American women over an observation period of 6 years – data from the Osteoarthritis Initiative



M. Kretzschmar † ^{*}, U. Heilmeier †, A. Yu † §, G.B. Joseph †, F. Liu ‡, M. Solka †, C.E. McCulloch ‡, M.C. Nevitt ‡, T.M. Link †

† Musculoskeletal and Quantitative Imaging Research Group, Department of Radiology & Biomedical Imaging, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

‡ Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

§ Department of Radiology, Beijing Jishuitan Hospital, 4th Medical College of Peking University, Beijing, China

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 14 July 2015 Accepted 3 March 2016

Keywords: Knee cartilage Osteoarthritis MRI Quantitative T2 Ethnicity

SUMMARY

Objectives: To investigate the change in cartilage T2 values and structural degeneration in knee joints over 72 months in women of African American (AA) vs Caucasian American (CA) ethnicity. *Methods:* Knee 3T magnetic resonance imaging (MRIs) from baseline, 24, 48 and 72 months visits of 100 AA and 100 CA women from the Osteoarthritis Initiative (OAI) were assessed for cartilage T2 values and whole-organ magnetic resonance imaging (WORMS) score. Subjects were pair-matched by age, body mass index (BMI), Kellgren–Lawrence (KL) score, clinical site and subcohort within the OAI. We

compared the rate of change in whole knee cartilage T2 values and WORMS cartilage, bone marrow edema pattern (BMEP) and meniscus scores between the two ethnic groups using mixed random effects models. *Results:* At 24 and 48 months 60 subjects and at 72 months 45 subjects per group were available for

analysis resulting in 38 complete pairs with data of all time points. Compared to CA, cartilage T2 values in AA increased at a significantly faster rate at baseline (AA: 0.45 ms/y, CA: 0.35 ms/y, P = 0.029) and averaged over 6 years (AA: 0.36 ms/y, CA: 0.27 ms/y, P = 0.039) with changes in both groups reaching a plateau by 48 months. Cartilage, meniscus and BMEP scores tended to increase in both groups during follow up, but rates of change did not differ by ethnicity.

Conclusion: Cartilage T2 values increased faster over 72 months in AA than CA, however changes in WORMS cartilage, meniscus and BMEP scores did not differ. T2 values may be able to distinguish ethnicity-related differences of cartilage degeneration at an early stage before differences in structural joint degeneration appear.

© 2016 Osteoarthritis Research Society International. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Osteoarthritis (OA) is a chronic degenerative form of arthritis; it is a complex entity evolving as a collection of multiple etiologies. These etiologies can be categorized by local factors such as joint injury and joint instability, constitutional factors such as muscle weakness, misalignment and obesity as well as systemic factors such as sex, age, hormonal status, bone mineral density, inflammatory, metabolic and genetic factors, all of which contribute to the onset and development of the disease¹. Genetic factors may be responsible for up to 65% of the variance of OA in women² and

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.joca.2016.03.002

1063-4584/© 2016 Osteoarthritis Research Society International. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

^{*} Address correspondence and reprint requests to: M. Kretzschmar, Musculoskeletal Quantitative Imaging Research Group, Department of Radiology and Biomedical Imaging, University of California San Francisco, 185 Berry St, Suite 350, San Francisco, CA 94158, USA. Tel: 1-415-353-9436; Fax: 1-415-353-9428.

E-mail addresses: martin.kretzschmar@ucsf.edu (M. Kretzschmar), ursula. heilmeier@ucsf.edu (U. Heilmeier), aihongy@gmail.com (A. Yu), gabby.joseph@ ucsf.edu (G.B. Joseph), fliu@psg.ucsf.edu (F. Liu), solka.martin@gmail.com (M. Solka), cmcculloch@epi.ucsf.edu (C.E. McCulloch), mnevitt@psg.ucsf.edu (M.C. Nevitt), thomas.link@ucsf.edu (T.M. Link).

there is evidence that the prevalence and degree of OA varies between ethnic groups with a higher prevalence of knee OA among African American women³ and a higher prevalence of hip OA in African American men⁴. While these ethnic differences may in part be explained by behavioral, socioeconomic and constitutional factors, genetic differences have to be considered as a contributing factor.

A recent study on ethnic differences in cartilage composition showed that MRI T2 relaxation times of the knee cartilage in African American women were significantly lower compared to Caucasian women⁵. In the context of a higher prevalence of knee OA in African American as reported in several studies^{3,4} the finding of lower T2 values in this group was surprising since degradation of the cartilage matrix⁶ and progression of structural changes with knee OA⁷ have been shown to be associated with increased T2 values raising the question of whether the natural history of cartilage degeneration is different in African Americans.

To further explore differences in joint degeneration and cartilage biochemical composition over 6 years we performed a longitudinal study using 3T MRI for the measurement of cartilage T2 and the WORMS scoring system for the assessment of structural joint degeneration in African American and Caucasian American women.

Materials and methods

Subjects

Subjects for this study were from the Osteoarthritis Initiative (OAI), a multi center cohort study consisting of 4796 participants divided into a progression cohort (subjects with symptomatic knee OA), an incidence cohort (subjects without symptomatic knee OA but risk factors for OA) and a normal cohort without knee OA or risk factors⁸. We used the same sample as our recent study of 200 African-American and Caucasian-American women selected from the OAI incidence and progression subcohorts⁵ [Fig. 1].

The inclusion criteria for that study were: females who were either of African-American or Caucasian-American ethnicity, age 45–69 and a body mass index (BMI) of 22.5–39.5 kg/m². Subjects also had to have low Kellgren-Lawrence (KL) scores of 0 (definitively radiographically absent OA), and 1 (doubtful radiographic OA) to ensure that only participants with low cartilage lesion load were included and were suitable for T2 relaxation time measurements. Exclusion criteria were history of inflammatory arthritis and knee surgery at the right knee. The resulting selection of 140 African-American and 609 Caucasian American women was matched pairwise by KL grade (0 or 1), baseline age (5 year strata from 45 to 69 years) and BMI (5 point strata from 22 to 40 kg/m²), subcohort and clinical site. For each stratum Caucasian subjects were randomly selected. A total of 100 Caucasian American women could be identified to fulfill the matching criteria, thus 38 African American women had to be excluded. Two subjects had to be excluded because of incomplete data sets resulting in a total of 100 pairs at baseline.

For the present study, 60 pairs (120 subjects) had follow-up MRI data in both members of the pair at both 24 and 48 months. At month 72, the data of 45 individuals was available in each group including 38 complete pairs and seven individuals each, who lost their matching partner. These individuals were kept in the study groups to maintain a sufficient sample size. A retrospective analysis of the demographic data showed that both groups remained balanced [Fig. 1, Table I].

Radiographs

Standing postero-anterior fixed flexion knee radiographs were acquired as described in detail in the OAI Radiographic Procedure Manual freely accessible at http://www.oai.ucsf.edu. All knee radiographs were analyzed centrally and graded with regard to the degree of joint degeneration using the KL score^{9,10}.

MR imaging protocol

MR images of the right knee were obtained using four identical 3.0 T scanners (Trio, Siemens) and quadrature transmit—receive coils (USA Instruments, Aurora, OH, USA) at one of four sites (Ohio State University, Columbus, OH; University of Maryland, School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD; University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA; and Memorial Hospital of Rhode Island, Pawtucket, RI). Details of the acquisition protocol have been published¹¹ and included the following sequences: (1) coronal proton density-weighted fast spin-echo (FSE); (2) sagittal 3-D dual echo in the steady state (DESS) with selective water excitation; (3) sagittal T2-weighted multi-echo spin-echo (SE) for quantitative T2 relaxation time measurements.

Quantitative T2 relaxation time measurements

The sagittal 2-D multi-echo SE of the right knee was used for segmentation and quantification of T2 relaxation time using an in-house developed spline-based, semi-automated software segmentation algorithm in MATLAB (Mathworks Inc., El Segundo, CA)^{12,13}. Segmentation of the cartilage was performed on the first echo sequence to maximize signal-to-noise ratio. All segmentations were performed by four individuals (MK, AY, UH, MS) in the following compartments: patella, medial/lateral femoral condyle, medial/lateral tibia. The trochlea was not segmented because of interfering flow artifacts from the popliteal artery. Inter-reader (1.57%) and intra-reader reproducibility errors of the (1.46%) of this technique were minimal as reported in a prior study¹⁴.

Whole-organ magnetic resonance imaging score (WORMS) grading

MR images were evaluated for the grade of cartilage, meniscal and bone marrow edema pattern (BMEP) lesions using WORMS¹⁵, modified as previously described¹⁶. Two radiologists (MK with 11 and AY with 9 years of experience) who were blinded to the ethnicity of subjects analyzed separately an equal number of subjects (AA and CA subjects all time points). Problematic cases were reviewed with TML (24 years of experience) and a final consensus diagnosis was obtained. Inter- and intra-observer agreement data of the UCSF modified WORMS score were published previously¹⁶. Meniscus lesions were graded 0-4 in each of six regions (medial/ lateral and anterior/body/posterior). Cartilage grades (0-6) and BMEP grades (0-3) were also scored in six regions (patella. trochlea, medial/lateral femur, and medial/lateral tibia). BMEP was defined as areas of poorly marginated increases in T2 signal intensity in the fat suppressed imaging sequences. For each type of lesion (meniscus, cartilage, BMEP), a sum score per knee was defined as the sum of scores in all regions. We also calculated a total score (WORMS sum) by summing scores for menisci, cartilage, ligaments, BMEP, cysts, effusion and baker cysts for each knee over all regions.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using JMP version 11 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA) and STATA version 12 software (Stata-Corp LP, College Station, TX, USA). In addition to descriptive statistics, differences of demographic variables between ethnic



Fig. 1. Selection of subjects. *Pairwise matching by age, BMI, KL grade, subcohort and clinical site. Overall 200 subjects in 100 matched pairs were included in the analysis. Due to dropouts the data set contained 38 matched pairs with a complete MRIs at all time points. At month 72, the data of 45 individuals was available in each group including 38 complete pairs and seven individuals each, who lost their matching partner.

groups were determined using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Based on the previously published significant differences in baseline cartilage T2 values⁵ we wanted to investigate the development of T2 values and WORMS grades in the two different ethnic groups. Mean T2 values and WORMS scores of AA and CA subjects were compared at each time point using paired *t*-test. Significance of differences of mean T2 values and WORMS scores from baseline to 72 months follow-up was tested using analysis of variance (ANOVA), level of confidence was set to P < 0.05. Mixed models were used to assess the differences in the rates of change of (1) cartilage T2 and (2) WORMS scores (using all four time points) between the AA and CA subjects. We assumed a nonlinear increment of T2 values and found a significant quadratic relationship with time while WORMS changes followed a significant linear pattern. We controlled for random effects with multiple measurements per subjects in adding the identification code for the individual subject as a covariate. Pairs were identified with a numerical code and included as a covariate. Since the T2 increments followed a non-linear quadratic relationship, we reported the (1) difference in the baseline rate of change in T2 between both groups and (2) difference in the average annual rate of change averaged over 6 years between both groups.

Results

Subject characteristics

Subject characteristics at baseline are summarized in Table I. Although drop out changed group composition slightly at the different follow up time points, there were no significant differences in BMI, age, KL grade or physical activity scale for the elderly (PASE) physical activity scores including the subscore for occupational physical activity between AA and CA at any of the time points.

T2 relaxation time and ethnicity

AA cartilage T2 values remained lower at all time points. However, the significance of differences disappeared after 24 months (P = 0.617), which was mainly due to the increase of T2 values in AA cartilage (Tables II and IV, Fig. 2(A)). There was a significant increase of T2 values averaged over the joint in both groups over the 6 years [Table III, Fig. 2(A)] (P < 0.0001). The slope followed a non-linear pattern and gradually decreased with time building a plateau after 4th year [Fig. 2(A)]. Compared to the Caucasian Americans the

Table I

	Ethnicity	P-value	
	African American	Caucasian American	
Baseline			
Ν	100	100	
Age	55.89 (6.02)	55.32 (6.46)	0.138
BMI*	29.20 (4.02)	29.16 (3.81)	0.816
KL*	0.29	0.29	1.000
PASE*	151.2 (80.4)	167.1 (78.7)	0.160
Occupational act. level	2.17	2.16	0.888
24 months follow up			
Ν	60	60	
Age*	57.7 (5.8)	57.2 (6.3)	0.690
BMI*	29.6 (0.56)	29.0 (0.53)	0.393
KL*	0.54 (0.7)	0.48 (0.74)	0.658
PASE*	154.4 (73.0)	164.7 (87.8)	0.491
PASE occupational act. level	2.26	2.17	0.685
48 months follow up			
Ν	60	60	
Age*	59.4 (6.0)	59.0 (6.2)	0.733
BMI*	29.5 (0.53)	29.3 (0.51)	0.832
KL*	0.55 (0.77)	0.63 (0.96)	0.619
PASE*	159.0 (79.2)	164.2 (80.1)	0.727
PASE occupational act. level [†]	2.24	2.26	0.905
72 months follow up			
Ν	45	45	
Age*	61.1 (5.5)	60.3 (6.2)	0.388
BMI*	30.0 (3.7)	29.3 (4.1)	0.360
KL*	0.5 (0.68)	0.66 (0.77)	0.348
PASE*	156.2 (76.4)	170.1 (81.4)	0.407
PASE occupational act. level	2.38	2.34	0.796

* Numbers are mean (SD).

^{\dagger} Graded with 1 = sitting, 2 = sitting/standing/walking, 3 = walking/handling <50 lbs., 4 = walking/handling >50 lbs.

baseline rate of increase in the African Americans was significantly higher in the total cartilage per joint (AA 0.45 ms/y [CI 0.38–0.5], CA 0.35 ms/y [CI 0.29–0.41], P = 0.029). Also the average annual rate of change of the total cartilage T2 was significantly higher in AA (AA 0.36, [CI 0.30–0.43], CA 0.27 [CI 0.20–0.33], P = 0.039, Table IV), so that while total cartilage T2 values were lower in AA at baseline the values converged over time. In addition, baseline and overall annual rates of change were greater in AA in the medial femoral condyle (baseline rate P = 0.025, average annual rate P = 0.030) and there were trends for a greater baseline and average annual rates of change in the medial and lateral tibia in the African Americans subjects [Table IV, Fig. 2(A)].

Progression of WORMS lesions and ethnicity

Both the African and the Caucasian American group started with a nearly identical total WORMS score of 7.57 and 7.79 (P = 0.755, Table II) and increased significantly in a linear pattern over the time interval of 6 years (P < 0.0001 and P = 0.0003 in the two groups, respectively, Table III, Fig. 2(D)). However, there were no significant differences in the rate of change over 6 years between the two groups (AA 0.99/y [CI 0.79-1.19], CA 0.81/y [CI 0.61-1.01], P = 0.193) (Table V). The WORMS sum of the medial and lateral compartment did not significantly differ between AA and CA at all time points (Table II). WORMS sum of both compartments increased significantly in both ethic groups (Table III). While the sum of WORMS cartilage lesions increased significantly during follow up in both groups (P < 0.0001 in both groups) the slope of increase was not significantly different between the groups (AA 0.54/y [CI 0.41–0.66], CA 0.48/y [CI 0.35–0.61], P = 0.526) [Table V, Fig. 2(B)].

There was a non-significant trend for BMEP lesion scores to increase faster in the African American group (AA 0.17/y [CI

Table II

Differences in T2 values and WORMS scores at time points baseline to 6 years

African Americans Americans Mean 95% CI Mean 95% CI Baseline 7.79 6.47–9.12 7.57 6.58–8.56 0.0001 WORMS sum 7.79 6.47–9.12 7.57 6.58–8.56 0.755 WORMS medial compartment 1.22 0.90–1.53 1.16 0.84–1.47 0.775 Cartilage sum 3.61 2.97–4.23 3.62 2.96–4.28 0.969 BMEP sum 1.81 1.37–2.24 1.35 0.99–1.71 0.075 Meniscus sum 0.9 0.54–1.26 1.36 0.89–1.83 0.065 Medial meniscus sum 0.56 0.25–0.87 0.75 0.33–1.16 0.379 24 montis - - - 0.34 0.16–0.22 0.516 WORMS medial compartment 1.37 0.73–2.00 1.66 1.04–2.27 0.516 WORMS sum 2.06 0.271 1.454 3.69–5.38 0.556 BMEP sum 2.17 1.60–2.74 1.71		Ethnic	Р			
Mean 95% CI Mean 95% CI Baseline Average T2 (ms) 32.07 31.7–32.4 32.85 32.5–33.2 <0.0011		African Americans		Caucasian Americans		
BaselineAverage T2 (ms) 32.07 $31.7-32.4$ 32.85 $32.5-33.2$ <0.0001		Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI	
Average T2 (ms)32.0731.7-32.432.8532.5-33.2<0.0001WORMS sum7.796.47-9.127.576.58-8.560.755WORMS medial compartment1.220.90-1.331.160.84-1.470.774WORMS lateral compartment1.831.38-2.261.741.29-2.170.775Cartilage sum3.612.97-4.233.622.96-4.280.969BMEP sum1.811.37-2.241.350.99-1.710.069Meniscus sum0.90.54-1.261.360.89-1.830.065Medial meniscus sum0.340.16-0.520.610.38-0.840.031Lateral meniscus sum0.340.16-0.520.610.38-0.840.067Varage T2 (ms)33.4933.2-33.833.733.8-34.40.617WORMS sum8.666.91-0.1038.917.44-10.380.687WORMS sum8.666.91-0.1038.917.44-10.380.687WORMS sum1.370.73-2.001.661.04-2.270.516WORMS sum2.081.42-2.732.161.52-2.790.857Cartilage sum0.260.02-0.490.550.26-0.840.017Lateral meniscus sum0.660.18-1.131.420.82-2.020.003Medial meniscus sum0.260.02-0.490.550.26-0.840.017Lateral meniscus sum0.260.02-0.490.550.26-0.840.017Lateral meniscus sum0.260.02-0.490.5	Baseline					
WORMS sum 7.79 6.47-9.12 7.57 6.58-8.56 0.755 WORMS medial compartment 1.22 0.90-1.53 1.16 0.84-1.47 0.774 WORMS lateral compartment 1.83 1.38-2.26 1.74 1.29-2.17 0.069 BMEP sum 1.81 1.37-2.24 1.35 0.99-1.71 0.069 Meniscus sum 0.9 0.54-1.26 1.36 0.89-1.83 0.065 Medial meniscus sum 0.56 0.25-0.87 0.75 0.33-0.84 0.031 Lateral meniscus sum 0.56 0.25-0.87 0.75 0.33-1.16 0.379 24 months - - - 0.34 0.16-0.52 0.61 0.38-0.84 0.031 WORMS sum 0.56 0.25-0.87 0.75 0.33-1.16 0.379 24 months - - 0.73-2.00 1.66 1.04-2.27 0.5516 WORMS lateral compartment 2.08 1.42-2.73 2.16 1.52-2.79 0.857 Cartilage sum 4.29 <td>Average T2 (ms)</td> <td>32.07</td> <td>31.7-32.4</td> <td>32.85</td> <td>32.5-33.2</td> <td><0.0001</td>	Average T2 (ms)	32.07	31.7-32.4	32.85	32.5-33.2	<0.0001
WORMS medial compartment1.22 $0.90-1.53$ 1.16 $0.84-1.47$ 0.774 WORMS lateral compartment1.83 $1.38-2.26$ 1.74 $1.29-2.17$ 0.775 Cartilage sum3.61 $2.97-4.23$ 3.62 $2.96-4.28$ 0.669 BMEP sum1.81 $1.37-2.24$ 1.35 $0.99-1.71$ 0.069 Meniscus sum 0.9 $0.54-1.26$ 1.36 $0.89-1.83$ 0.065 Medial meniscus sum 0.56 $0.25-0.87$ 0.75 $0.33-1.16$ 0.379 24 months </td <td>WORMS sum</td> <td>7.79</td> <td>6.47-9.12</td> <td>7.57</td> <td>6.58-8.56</td> <td>0.755</td>	WORMS sum	7.79	6.47-9.12	7.57	6.58-8.56	0.755
WORMS lateral compartment1.831.38–2.261.741.29–2.170.775Cartilage sum3.612.97–4.233.622.96–4.280.969BMEP sum1.811.37–2.241.350.99–1.710.069Meniscus sum0.90.54–1.261.360.89–1.830.065Medial meniscus sum0.560.25–0.870.750.33–0.160.379 24 months	WORMS medial compartment	1.22	0.90-1.53	1.16	0.84-1.47	0.774
Cartilage sum 3.61 2.97-4.23 3.62 2.96-4.28 0.969 BMEP sum 1.81 1.37-2.24 1.35 0.99-1.71 0.069 Meniscus sum 0.9 0.54-1.26 1.36 0.89-1.83 0.065 Medial meniscus sum 0.34 0.16-0.52 0.61 0.38-0.84 0.031 Lateral meniscus sum 0.56 0.25-0.87 0.75 0.33-1.16 0.379 24 months	WORMS lateral compartment	1.83	1.38 - 2.26	1.74	1.29-2.17	0.775
BMEP sum1.811.37–2.241.350.99–1.710.069Meniscus sum0.90.54–1.261.360.89–1.830.065Medial meniscus sum0.340.16–0.520.610.38–0.840.031Lateral meniscus sum0.560.25–0.870.750.33–1.160.379 24 months 0.667Average T2 (ms)33.4933.2–33.833.9733.8–34.40.617WORMS sum8.666.91–10.398.917.44–10.380.687WORMS medial compartment1.370.73–2.001.661.04–2.270.5516WORMS lateral compartment2.081.42–2.732.161.52–2.790.857Cartilage sum4.293.47–5.114.543.69–5.380.556BMEP sum2.171.60–2.741.711.25–2.160.231Meniscus sum0.660.18–1.131.420.82–2.020.003Medial meniscus sum0.260.02–0.490.550.26–0.840.017Lateral meniscus sum0.260.02–0.490.550.26–0.840.017Lateral meniscus sum2.211.41–3.021.511.33–2.960.908Lateral meniscus sum2.211.41–3.021.551.433.42–34.90.259WORMS sum1.211.41–3.021.554.90–6.600.749BMEP sum2.830.28–3.382.021.56–2.480.024Meniscus sum1.390.94–1.851.851	Cartilage sum	3.61	2.97 - 4.23	3.62	2.96-4.28	0.969
Meniscus sum0.90.54-1.261.360.89-1.830.065Medial meniscus sum0.560.25-0.870.750.33-0.840.031Lateral meniscus sum0.560.25-0.870.750.33-1.160.379 24 months </td <td>BMEP sum</td> <td>1.81</td> <td>1.37-2.24</td> <td>1.35</td> <td>0.99-1.71</td> <td>0.069</td>	BMEP sum	1.81	1.37-2.24	1.35	0.99-1.71	0.069
Medial meniscus sum0.340.16-0.520.610.38-0.840.031Lateral meniscus sum0.560.25-0.870.750.33-1.160.379 24 months	Meniscus sum	0.9	0.54-1.26	1.36	0.89-1.83	0.065
Lateral meniscus sum0.560.25-0.870.750.33-1.160.379 24 months 33.4933.2-33.833.9733.8-34.40.617WORMS sum8.666.91-10.398.917.44-10.380.687WORMS medial compartment1.370.73-2.001.661.04-2.270.5516WORMS lateral compartment2.081.42-2.732.161.52-2.790.857Cartilage sum4.293.47-5.114.543.69-5.380.556BMEP sum2.171.60-2.741.711.25-2.160.231Meniscus sum0.660.18-1.131.420.82-2.020.003Medial meniscus sum0.260.02-0.490.550.26-0.840.017Lateral meniscus sum0.4-0.01-0.80.870.34-1.400.259WORMS sum12.1510.48-13.8210.938.98-12.890.268Medial meniscus sum2.211.41-3.022.151.33-2.960.908Lateral meniscus sum2.211.41-3.022.151.33-2.960.908Lateral meniscus sum2.211.41-3.022.151.33-2.960.633Cartilage sum5.885.09-6.675.754.90-6.600.749BMEP sum2.830.28-3.382.021.56-2.480.227Medial meniscus sum0.490.27-0.710.740.44-1.030.287Lateral meniscus sum0.490.27-0.710.740.44-1.030.287Medial meniscus sum0.49 <th< td=""><td>Medial meniscus sum</td><td>0.34</td><td>0.16-0.52</td><td>0.61</td><td>0.38-0.84</td><td>0.031</td></th<>	Medial meniscus sum	0.34	0.16-0.52	0.61	0.38-0.84	0.031
24 months Average T2 (ms)33.4933.2–33.833.9733.8–34.40.617WORMS sum8.666.91–10.398.917.44–10.380.687WORMS medial compartment1.370.73–2.001.661.04–2.270.5516WORMS lateral compartment2.081.42–2.732.161.52–2.790.857Cartilage sum4.293.47–5.114.543.69–5.380.556BMEP sum2.171.60–2.741.711.25–2.160.231Meniscus sum0.660.18–1.131.420.82–2.020.003Medial meniscus sum0.260.02–0.490.550.26–0.840.017Lateral meniscus sum0.260.02–0.490.550.26–0.840.017Lateral meniscus sum0.24-0.01–0.80.870.4–1.030.259WORMS sum12.1510.48–13.821.0938.98–12.890.268Medial meniscus sum2.211.41–3.022.151.33–2.960.908Lateral meniscus sum2.211.41–3.022.151.33–2.960.908Lateral meniscus sum3.992.33–4.453.021.56–2.480.24Meniscus sum3.990.24–1.851.851.25–2.450.252Medial meniscus sum0.490.27–0.710.740.44–1.030.287Lateral meniscus sum0.490.27–0.710.740.44–1.030.287Lateral meniscus sum0.490.27–0.710.740.44–1.030.287 <td>Lateral meniscus sum</td> <td>0.56</td> <td>0.25-0.87</td> <td>0.75</td> <td>0.33-1.16</td> <td>0.379</td>	Lateral meniscus sum	0.56	0.25-0.87	0.75	0.33-1.16	0.379
Average T2 (ms)33.4933.2–33.833.9733.8–34.40.617WORMS sum8.666.91–10.398.917.44–10.380.687WORMS medial compartment1.370.73–2.001.661.04–2.270.5516WORMS lateral compartment2.081.42–2.732.161.52–2.790.857Cartilage sum4.293.47–5.114.543.69–5.380.556BMEP sum2.171.60–2.741.711.25–2.160.231Meniscus sum0.660.18–1.131.420.82–2.020.003Medial meniscus sum0.260.02–0.490.550.26–0.840.017Lateral meniscus sum0.4-0.01–0.80.870.34–1.400.034 4 months 71.41–3.022.151.33–2.960.259WORMS sum12.1510.48–13.821.0938.98–12.890.268Medial meniscus sum2.211.41–3.022.151.33–2.960.908Lateral meniscus sum2.211.41–3.022.151.33–2.960.908Lateral meniscus sum3.392.33–4.453.021.95–4.090.633Cartilage sum5.885.09–6.675.754.90–6.600.749BMEP sum2.830.28–3.382.021.56–2.480.024Meniscus sum0.990.52–1.291.110.58–1.650.566Taueral meniscus sum0.900.52–1.291.150.366Medial meniscus sum0.900.52–1.291.210.	24 months					
WORMS sum8.66 $6.91-10.39$ 8.91 $7.44-10.38$ 0.687 WORMS medial compartment 1.37 $0.73-2.00$ 1.66 $1.04-2.27$ 0.5516 WORMS lateral compartment 2.08 $1.42-2.73$ 2.16 $1.52-2.79$ 0.857 Cartilage sum 4.29 $3.47-5.11$ 4.54 $3.69-5.38$ 0.556 BMEP sum 2.17 $1.60-2.74$ 1.71 $1.25-2.16$ 0.231 Meniscus sum 0.66 $0.18-1.13$ 1.42 $0.82-2.02$ 0.003 Medial meniscus sum 0.26 $0.02-0.49$ 0.55 $0.26-0.84$ 0.017 Lateral meniscus sum 0.4 $-0.01-0.8$ 0.87 $0.34-1.40$ 0.034 48 months $4.16-3.82$ 10.93 $8.98-12.89$ 0.268 Medial meniscus sum 2.21 $1.41-3.02$ 2.15 $1.33-2.96$ 0.208 Lateral meniscus sum 2.21 $1.41-3.02$ 2.15 $1.33-2.96$ 0.633 Cartilage sum 5.88 $5.09-6.67$ 5.75 $4.90-6.60$ 0.749 BMEP sum 2.83 $0.28-3.38$ 2.02 $1.56-2.48$ 0.024 Meniscus sum 0.49 $0.27-0.71$ 0.74 $0.44-1.03$ 0.287 Lateral meniscus sum 0.49 $0.27-0.71$ 0.74 $0.44-1.03$ 0.287 Lateral meniscus sum 0.49 $0.27-0.71$ 0.74 $0.44-1.03$ 0.287 Lateral meniscus sum 0.90 $1.64-4.16$ 2.49 $1.21-3.76$ 0.648 <	Average T2 (ms)	33.49	33.2-33.8	33.97	33.8-34.4	0.617
WORMS medial compartment 1.37 0.73–2.00 1.66 1.04–2.27 0.5516 WORMS lateral compartment 2.08 1.42–2.73 2.16 1.52–2.79 0.857 Cartilage sum 4.29 3.47–5.11 4.54 3.69–5.38 0.556 BMEP sum 2.17 1.60–2.74 1.71 1.25–2.16 0.231 Meniscus sum 0.66 0.18–1.13 1.42 0.82–2.02 0.003 Medial meniscus sum 0.26 0.02–0.49 0.55 0.26–0.84 0.017 Lateral meniscus sum 0.4 –0.01–0.8 0.87 0.34–1.40 0.034 48 months - - 0.10–0.8 0.87 0.34–1.40 0.259 WORMS sum 12.15 10.48–13.82 1.093 8.98–12.89 0.268 Medial meniscus sum 2.21 1.41–3.02 2.15 1.33–2.96 0.908 Lateral meniscus sum 3.39 2.34–44 3.02 1.56–2.48 0.024 Meniscus sum 1.39 0.94–1.85 1.85 <td>WORMS sum</td> <td>8.66</td> <td>6.91-10.39</td> <td>8.91</td> <td>7.44-10.38</td> <td>0.687</td>	WORMS sum	8.66	6.91-10.39	8.91	7.44-10.38	0.687
WORMS lateral compartment2.081.42–2.732.161.52–2.790.857Cartilage sum4.293.47–5.114.543.69–5.380.556BMEP sum2.171.60–2.741.711.25–2.160.231Meniscus sum0.660.18–1.131.420.82–2.020.003Medial meniscus sum0.260.02–0.490.550.26–0.840.017Lateral meniscus sum0.4-0.01–0.80.870.34–1.400.34 48 months 4-0.01–0.80.870.34–1.400.34 48 months 1.21510.48–13.8210.938.98–12.890.268ModRMS sum12.1510.48–13.8210.938.98–12.890.268ModRMS sum2.211.41–3.022.151.33–2.960.908Lateral meniscus sum2.211.41–3.022.151.33–2.960.908Lateral meniscus sum2.830.28–3.382.021.56–2.480.024Meniscus sum3.390.34–1.453.021.55–2.450.252Medial meniscus sum0.490.27–0.710.740.44–1.030.287Lateral meniscus sum0.90.27–0.710.740.44–1.030.287Lateral meniscus sum0.90.27–0.710.740.44–1.030.287Lateral meniscus sum0.90.27–0.710.740.44–1.030.287Lateral meniscus sum0.91.64–4.162.491.21–3.760.648WORMS sum13.8411.88–15.79	WORMS medial compartment	1.37	0.73-2.00	1.66	1.04-2.27	0.5516
Cartilage sum 4.29 $3.47-5.11$ 4.54 $3.69-5.38$ 0.556 BMEP sum 2.17 $1.60-2.74$ 1.71 $1.25-2.16$ 0.231 Meniscus sum 0.66 $0.18-1.13$ 1.42 $0.82-2.02$ 0.003 Medial meniscus sum 0.26 $0.02-0.49$ 0.55 $0.26-0.84$ 0.017 Lateral meniscus sum 0.4 $-0.01-0.8$ 0.87 $0.34-1.40$ 0.34 48 months 48 0.221 $1.41-3.02$ 2.15 $1.33-2.96$ 0.908 Medial meniscus sum 2.21 $1.41-3.02$ 2.15 $1.33-2.96$ 0.908 Lateral meniscus sum 2.21 $1.41-3.02$ 2.15 $1.33-2.96$ 0.908 Lateral meniscus sum 2.21 $1.41-3.02$ 2.15 $1.33-2.96$ 0.908 Lateral meniscus sum 2.21 $1.41-3.02$ 2.15 $1.32-2.96$ 0.908 Lateral meniscus sum $2.23-44.5$ 3.02 $1.55-2.45$ 0.252 Medial meniscus sum 2.83 $0.28-3.38$ 2.02 $1.56-2.48$ 0.024 Meniscus sum 1.39 $0.94-1.85$ 1.85 $1.25-2.45$ 0.252 Medial meniscus sum 0.49 $0.27-0.71$ 0.74 $0.44-1.03$ 0.287 Lateral meniscus sum 0.9 $0.52-1.29$ 1.11 $0.58-1.51.9$ 0.251 Medial meniscus sum 1.384 $11.88-15.79$ 12.38 $9.57-15.19$ 0.251 Medial meniscus sum 2.90 $1.64-4.16$ 2.49 $1.21-3.76$ </td <td>WORMS lateral compartment</td> <td>2.08</td> <td>1.42 - 2.73</td> <td>2.16</td> <td>1.52 - 2.79</td> <td>0.857</td>	WORMS lateral compartment	2.08	1.42 - 2.73	2.16	1.52 - 2.79	0.857
BMEP sum 2.17 1.60-2.74 1.71 1.25-2.16 0.231 Meniscus sum 0.66 0.18-1.13 1.42 0.82-2.02 0.003 Medial meniscus sum 0.26 0.02-0.49 0.55 0.26-0.84 0.017 Lateral meniscus sum 0.4 -0.01-0.8 0.87 0.34-1.40 0.034 48 months - - 0.4 -0.01-0.8 0.87 0.34-1.40 0.034 Average T2 (ms) 34.16 33.8-34.5 34.43 34.2-34.9 0.259 WORMS sum 12.15 10.48-13.82 10.93 8.98-12.89 0.268 Medial meniscus sum 2.21 1.41-3.02 2.15 1.33-2.96 0.908 Lateral meniscus sum 3.39 2.33-4.45 3.02 1.95-4.09 0.633 Cartilage sum 5.88 5.09-6.67 5.75 4.90-6.60 0.749 BMEP sum 2.83 0.28-3.38 2.02 1.56-2.48 0.024 Meniscus sum 1.39 0.94-1.85 1.85 1.25-2.45 0.252 Medial meniscus sum 0.9 0.52	Cartilage sum	4.29	3.47-5.11	4.54	3.69-5.38	0.556
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	BMEP sum	2.17	1.60 - 2.74	1.71	1.25 - 2.16	0.231
Medial meniscus sum Lateral meniscus sum 0.26 0.4 $-0.01-0.8$ 0.55 	Meniscus sum	0.66	0.18-1.13	1.42	0.82-2.02	0.003
Lateral meniscus sum 0.4 $-0.01-0.8$ 0.87 $0.34-1.40$ 0.034 48 months 34.16 $33.8-34.5$ 34.43 $34.2-34.9$ 0.259 WORMS sum12.15 $10.48-13.82$ 10.93 $8.98-12.89$ 0.268 Medial meniscus sum 2.21 $1.41-3.02$ 2.15 $13.3-2.96$ 0.908 Lateral meniscus sum 3.39 $2.33-4.45$ 3.021 $195-4.09$ 0.633 Cartilage sum 5.88 $5.09-6.67$ 5.75 $4.90-6.60$ 0.749 BMEP sum 2.83 $0.28-3.38$ 2.02 $1.56-2.48$ 0.024 Meniscus sum 0.9 $0.27-0.71$ 0.74 $0.44-1.03$ 0.287 Lateral meniscus sum 0.9 $0.27-0.71$ 0.74 $0.44-1.03$ 0.287 Lateral meniscus sum 0.9 $0.52-1.29$ 1.11 $0.58-1.65$ 0.506 72 months 72 34.08 $33.7-34.5$ 34.23 $33.9-34.7$ 0.386 WORMS sum 13.84 $11.88-15.79$ 12.38 $9.57-15.19$ 0.251 Medial meniscus sum 2.90 $1.64-4.16$ 2.49 $1.21-3.76$ 0.648 Lateral meniscus sum 3.91 $2.49-5.34$ 3.67 $2.22-5.11$ 0.810 Cartilage sum 6.79 $5.87-7.71$ 6.44 $5.45-7.43$ 0.866 BMEP sum 3.09 $2.44-3.73$ 2.11 $1.58-2.65$ 0.065 Medial meniscus sum 1.54 $1.01-2.08$ 2.02 $1.32-2.72$ 0.639 <td>Medial meniscus sum</td> <td>0.26</td> <td>0.02 - 0.49</td> <td>0.55</td> <td>0.26-0.84</td> <td>0.017</td>	Medial meniscus sum	0.26	0.02 - 0.49	0.55	0.26-0.84	0.017
48 monthsAverage T2 (ms) 34.16 $33.8-34.5$ 34.43 $34.2-34.9$ 0.259 WORMS sum 12.15 $10.48-13.82$ 10.93 $8.98-12.89$ 0.268 Medial meniscus sum 2.21 $1.41-3.02$ 2.15 $1.33-2.96$ 0.908 Lateral meniscus sum 2.21 $1.41-3.02$ 2.15 $1.33-2.96$ 0.908 Lateral meniscus sum 3.39 $2.33-445$ 3.02 $1.95-4.09$ 0.633 Cartilage sum 5.88 $5.09-6.67$ 5.75 $4.90-6.60$ 0.749 BMEP sum 2.83 $0.28-3.38$ 2.02 $1.56-2.48$ 0.024 Meniscus sum 1.39 $0.94-1.85$ 1.85 $1.25-2.45$ 0.252 Medial meniscus sum 0.49 $0.27-0.71$ 0.74 $0.44-1.03$ 0.287 Lateral meniscus sum 0.9 $0.22-1.29$ 1.11 $0.58-1.55$ 0.506 72 monthsNN 34.08 $33.7-34.5$ 34.23 $3.9-34.7$ 0.386 WORMS sum 13.84 $11.88-15.79$ 12.38 $9.57-15.19$ 0.251 Medial meniscus sum 2.90 $1.64-4.16$ 2.49 $1.21-3.76$ 0.648 Lateral meniscus sum 3.91 $2.49-5.34$ 3.67 $2.22-5.11$ 0.816 BMEP sum 3.09 $2.44-3.73$ 2.11 $1.58-2.65$ 0.065 Medial meniscus sum 1.54 $1.01-2.08$ 2.02 $1.32-2.72$ 0.639 Medial meniscus sum 0.63 $0.37-0.89$ 0.87	Lateral meniscus sum	0.4	-0.01 - 0.8	0.87	0.34-1.40	0.034
Average T2 (ms) 34.16 $33.8-34.5$ 34.43 $34.2-34.9$ 0.259 WORMS sum 12.15 $10.48-13.82$ 10.93 $8.98-12.89$ 0.268 Medial meniscus sum 2.21 $1.41-3.02$ 2.15 $1.33-2.96$ 0.908 Lateral meniscus sum 3.39 $2.33-4.45$ 3.02 $1.95-4.09$ 0.633 Cartilage sum 5.88 $5.09-6.67$ 5.75 $4.90-6.60$ 0.749 BMEP sum 2.83 $0.28-3.38$ 2.02 $1.56-2.48$ 0.024 Meniscus sum 0.90 $0.27-0.71$ 0.74 $0.44-1.03$ 0.287 Lateral meniscus sum 0.9 $0.52-1.29$ 1.11 $0.58-1.65$ 0.506 72 months 0.90 1.84 $11.88-15.79$ 12.38 $9.57-15.19$ 0.251 Medial meniscus sum 2.90 $1.64-4.16$ 2.49 $1.21-3.76$ 0.648 Lateral meniscus sum 2.90 $1.64-4.16$ 2.49 $1.21-3.76$ 0.648 Lateral meniscus sum 3.91 $2.49-5.34$ 3.67 $2.22-5.11$ 0.810 Cartilage sum 6.79 $5.87-7.71$ 6.44 $5.45-7.43$ 0.866 BMEP sum 3.09 $2.44-3.73$ 2.11 $1.58-2.65$ 0.065 Meniscus sum 1.54 $1.01-2.08$ 2.02 $1.32-2.72$ 0.639 Medial meniscus sum 0.63 $0.37-0.89$ 0.87 $0.52-1.21$ 0.216	48 months					
WORMS sum12.15 $10.48-13.82$ 10.93 $8.98-12.89$ 0.268 Medial meniscus sum2.21 $1.41-3.02$ 2.15 $1.33-2.96$ 0.908 Lateral meniscus sum 3.39 $2.33-4.45$ 3.02 $1.95-4.09$ 0.633 Cartilage sum 5.88 $5.09-6.67$ 5.75 $4.90-6.60$ 0.749 BMEP sum 2.83 $0.28-3.38$ 2.02 $1.56-2.48$ 0.024 Meniscus sum 1.39 $0.94-1.85$ 1.85 $1.25-2.45$ 0.252 Medial meniscus sum 0.49 $0.27-0.71$ 0.74 $0.44-1.03$ 0.287 Lateral meniscus sum 0.9 $0.52-1.29$ 1.11 $0.58-1.65$ 0.506 72 months72months74 0.49 $0.27-0.71$ 0.74 $0.41-1.03$ 0.287 Average T2 (ms) 34.08 $33.7-34.5$ 34.23 $33.9-34.7$ 0.386 WORMS sum 13.84 $11.88-15.79$ 12.38 $9.57-15.19$ 0.251 Medial meniscus sum 2.90 $1.64-4.16$ 2.49 $1.21-3.76$ 0.648 Lateral meniscus sum 3.91 $2.49-5.34$ 3.67 $2.22-5.11$ 0.810 Cartilage sum 6.79 $5.87-7.71$ 6.44 $5.45-7.43$ 0.866 BMEP sum 3.09 $2.44-3.73$ 2.11 $1.58-2.65$ 0.065 Meniscus sum 1.54 $1.01-2.08$ 2.02 $1.32-2.72$ 0.639 Medial meniscus sum 0.63 $0.37-0.89$ 0.87 $0.52-1.21$ <t< td=""><td>Average T2 (ms)</td><td>34.16</td><td>33.8-34.5</td><td>34.43</td><td>34.2-34.9</td><td>0.259</td></t<>	Average T2 (ms)	34.16	33.8-34.5	34.43	34.2-34.9	0.259
Medial meniscus sum2.21 $1.41-3.02$ 2.15 $1.33-2.96$ 0.908 Lateral meniscus sum 3.39 $2.33-4.45$ 3.02 $1.95-4.09$ 0.633 Cartilage sum 5.88 $5.09-6.67$ 5.75 $4.90-6.60$ 0.749 BMEP sum 2.83 $0.28-3.38$ 2.02 $1.56-2.48$ 0.024 Meniscus sum 1.39 $0.94-1.85$ 1.85 $1.25-2.45$ 0.252 Medial meniscus sum 0.9 $0.27-0.71$ 0.74 $0.44-1.03$ 0.287 Lateral meniscus sum 0.9 $0.52-1.29$ 1.11 $0.58-1.65$ 0.506 72 months72 months8 $3.7-34.5$ 34.23 $3.9-34.7$ 0.386 WORMS sum 13.84 $11.88-15.79$ 12.38 $9.57-15.19$ 0.251 Medial meniscus sum 2.90 $1.64-4.16$ 2.49 $1.21-3.76$ 0.648 Lateral meniscus sum 3.91 $2.49-5.34$ 3.67 $2.22-5.11$ 0.810 Cartilage sum 6.79 $5.87-7.71$ 6.44 $5.45-7.43$ 0.866 BMEP sum 3.09 $2.44-3.73$ 2.11 $1.58-2.65$ 0.065 Meniscus sum 1.54 $1.01-2.08$ 2.02 $1.32-2.72$ 0.639 Medial meniscus sum 0.63 $0.37-0.89$ 0.87 $0.52-1.21$ 0.216	WORMS sum	12.15	10.48-13.82	10.93	8.98-12.89	0.268
Lateral meniscus sum3.392.33-4.453.021.95-4.090.633Cartilage sum5.885.09-6.675.754.90-6.600.749BMEP sum2.830.28-3.382.021.56-2.48 0.024 Meniscus sum1.390.94-1.851.851.25-2.450.252Medial meniscus sum0.90.52-1.291.110.58-1.650.506 72 months 72monts720.6441.88-15.7912.389.57-15.190.251Medial meniscus sum2.901.64-4.162.491.21-3.760.6480.648Lateral meniscus sum3.912.49-5.343.672.22-5.110.810Cartilage sum6.795.87-7.716.445.45-7.430.866BMEP sum3.092.44-3.732.111.58-2.650.065Meniscus sum0.630.37-0.890.870.52-1.210.216	Medial meniscus sum	2.21	141 - 302	2.15	1 33-2 96	0.908
Cartilage sum5.885.09-6.675.754.90-6.600.749BMEP sum2.830.28-3.382.021.56-2.48 0.024 Meniscus sum1.390.94-1.851.851.25-2.450.252Medial meniscus sum0.90.27-0.710.740.44-1.030.287Lateral meniscus sum0.90.52-1.291.110.58-1.650.506 72 months Average T2 (ms)34.0833.7-34.534.2333.9-34.70.386WORMS sum13.8411.88-15.7912.389.57-15.190.251Medial meniscus sum2.901.64-4.162.491.21-3.760.648Lateral meniscus sum3.912.49-5.343.672.22-5.110.810Cartilage sum6.795.87-7.716.445.45-7.430.866BMEP sum3.092.44-3.732.111.58-2.650.065Meniscus sum1.541.01-2.082.021.32-2.720.639Medial meniscus sum0.630.37-0.890.870.52-1.210.216	Lateral meniscus sum	3 39	2 33-4 45	3.02	1 95-4 09	0.633
BMEP sum 2.83 0.28-3.38 2.02 1.56-2.48 0.024 Meniscus sum 1.39 0.94-1.85 1.85 1.25-2.45 0.252 Medial meniscus sum 0.49 0.27-0.71 0.74 0.44-1.03 0.287 Lateral meniscus sum 0.9 0.52-1.29 1.11 0.58-1.65 0.506 72 months Average T2 (ms) 34.08 33.7-34.5 34.23 33.9-34.7 0.386 WORMS sum 13.84 11.88-15.79 12.38 9.57-15.19 0.251 Medial meniscus sum 2.90 1.64-4.16 2.49 1.21-3.76 0.648 Lateral meniscus sum 3.91 2.49-5.34 3.67 2.22-5.11 0.810 Cartilage sum 6.79 5.87-7.71 6.44 5.45-7.43 0.866 BMEP sum 3.09 2.44-3.73 2.11 1.58-2.65 0.065 Meniscus sum 1.54 1.01-2.08 2.02 1.32-2.72 0.639 Medial meniscus sum 0.63 0.37-0.89 0.87 0.52-1.21 0.216	Cartilage sum	5.88	5.09-6.67	5 75	4 90-6 60	0.749
Meniscus sum 1.39 0.94–1.85 1.85 1.25–2.45 0.252 Medial meniscus sum 0.49 0.27–0.71 0.74 0.44–1.03 0.287 Lateral meniscus sum 0.9 0.52–1.29 1.11 0.58–1.65 0.506 72 months Average T2 (ms) 34.08 33.7–34.5 34.23 33.9–34.7 0.386 WORMS sum 13.84 11.88–15.79 12.38 9.57–15.19 0.251 Medial meniscus sum 2.90 1.64–4.16 2.49 1.21–3.76 0.648 Lateral meniscus sum 3.91 2.49–5.34 3.67 2.22–5.11 0.810 Cartilage sum 6.79 5.87–7.71 6.44 5.45–7.43 0.866 BMEP sum 3.09 2.44–3.73 2.11 1.58–2.65 0.065 Meniscus sum 1.54 1.01–2.08 2.02 1.32–2.72 0.639 Medial meniscus sum 0.63 0.37–0.89 0.87 0.52–1.21 0.216	BMEP sum	2.83	0.28-3.38	2.02	1.56 - 2.48	0.024
Medial meniscus sum 0.49 0.27-0.71 0.74 0.44-1.03 0.287 Lateral meniscus sum 0.9 0.52-1.29 1.11 0.58-1.65 0.506 72 months 34.08 33.7-34.5 34.23 33.9-34.7 0.386 WORMS sum 13.84 11.88-15.79 12.38 9.57-15.19 0.251 Medial meniscus sum 2.90 1.64-4.16 2.49 1.21-3.76 0.648 Lateral meniscus sum 3.91 2.49-5.34 3.67 2.22-5.11 0.810 Cartilage sum 6.79 5.87-7.71 6.44 5.45-7.43 0.866 BMEP sum 3.09 2.44-3.73 2.11 1.58-2.65 0.065 Meniscus sum 1.54 1.01-2.08 2.02 1.32-2.72 0.639 Medial meniscus sum 0.63 0.37-0.89 0.87 0.52-1.21 0.216	Meniscus sum	1 39	0.94 - 1.85	1.85	1 25-2 45	0.252
Lateral meniscus sum0.90.52-1.291.110.78-1.650.50672 monthsAverage T2 (ms)34.0833.7-34.534.2333.9-34.70.386WORMS sum13.8411.88-15.7912.389.57-15.190.251Medial meniscus sum2.901.64-4.162.491.21-3.760.648Lateral meniscus sum3.912.49-5.343.672.22-5.110.810Cartilage sum6.795.87-7.716.445.45-7.430.866BMEP sum3.092.44-3.732.111.58-2.650.065Meniscus sum1.541.01-2.082.021.32-2.720.639Medial meniscus sum0.630.37-0.890.870.52-1.210.216	Medial meniscus sum	0.49	0.27 - 0.71	0.74	0.44-1.03	0.287
72 months 34.08 33.7–34.5 34.23 33.9–34.7 0.386 WORMS sum 13.84 11.88–15.79 12.38 9.57–15.19 0.251 Medial meniscus sum 2.90 1.64–4.16 2.49 1.21–3.76 0.648 Lateral meniscus sum 3.91 2.49–5.34 3.67 2.22–5.11 0.810 Cartilage sum 6.79 5.87–7.71 6.44 5.45–7.43 0.866 BMEP sum 3.09 2.44–3.73 2.11 1.58–2.65 0.065 Meniscus sum 1.54 1.01–2.08 2.02 1.32–2.72 0.639 Medial meniscus sum 0.63 0.37–0.89 0.87 0.52–1.21 0.216	Lateral meniscus sum	0.9	0.52 - 1.29	1 11	0.58-1.65	0.506
Average T2 (ms) 34.08 33.7–34.5 34.23 33.9–34.7 0.386 WORMS sum 13.84 11.88–15.79 12.38 9.57–15.19 0.251 Medial meniscus sum 2.90 1.64–4.16 2.49 1.21–3.76 0.648 Lateral meniscus sum 3.91 2.49–5.34 3.67 2.22–5.11 0.810 Cartilage sum 6.79 5.87–7.71 6.44 5.45–7.43 0.866 BMEP sum 3.09 2.44–3.73 2.11 1.58–2.65 0.065 Meniscus sum 1.54 1.01–2.08 2.02 1.32–2.72 0.639 Medial meniscus sum 0.63 0.37–0.89 0.87 0.52–1.21 0.216	72 months	0.0	0.02 1.20		0.00 1100	0.000
WORMS sum13.8411.88-15.7912.389.57-15.190.251Medial meniscus sum2.901.64-4.162.491.21-3.760.648Lateral meniscus sum3.912.49-5.343.672.22-5.110.810Cartilage sum6.795.87-7.716.445.45-7.430.866BMEP sum3.092.44-3.732.111.58-2.650.065Meniscus sum1.541.01-2.082.021.32-2.720.639Medial meniscus sum0.630.37-0.890.870.52-1.210.216	Average T2 (ms)	34 08	337-345	34 23	339-347	0 386
Medial meniscus sum2.901.64-4.162.491.21-3.760.648Lateral meniscus sum3.912.49-5.343.672.22-5.110.810Cartilage sum6.795.87-7.716.445.45-7.430.866BMEP sum3.092.44-3.732.111.58-2.650.065Meniscus sum1.541.01-2.082.021.32-2.720.639Medial meniscus sum0.630.37-0.890.870.52-1.210.216	WORMS sum	13.84	11 88-15 79	12.38	957-1519	0.251
Lateral meniscus sum 3.91 2.49–5.34 3.67 2.22–5.11 0.810 Cartilage sum 6.79 5.87–7.71 6.44 5.45–7.43 0.866 BMEP sum 3.09 2.44–3.73 2.11 1.58–2.65 0.065 Meniscus sum 1.54 1.01–2.08 2.02 1.32–2.72 0.639 Medial meniscus sum 0.63 0.37–0.89 0.87 0.52–1.21 0.216	Medial meniscus sum	2.90	1 64-4 16	2.49	121-376	0.648
Cartilage sum 6.79 5.87-7.71 6.44 5.45-7.43 0.866 BMEP sum 3.09 2.44-3.73 2.11 1.58-2.65 0.065 Meniscus sum 1.54 1.01-2.08 2.02 1.32-2.72 0.639 Medial meniscus sum 0.63 0.37-0.89 0.87 0.52-1.21 0.216	Lateral meniscus sum	3 91	2 49-5 34	3 67	2 22-5 11	0.810
BMEP sum 3.09 2.44–3.73 2.11 1.58–2.65 0.065 Meniscus sum 1.54 1.01–2.08 2.02 1.32–2.72 0.639 Medial meniscus sum 0.63 0.37–0.89 0.87 0.52–1.21 0.216	Cartilage sum	6 79	5 87-7 71	6 4 4	5 45-7 43	0.866
Meniscus sum 1.54 1.01–2.08 2.02 1.32–2.72 0.639 Medial meniscus sum 0.63 0.37–0.89 0.87 0.52–1.21 0.216	BMFP sum	3 09	2 44-3 73	2 11	1 58-2 65	0.065
Medial meniscus sum 1.54 1.61 2.65 2.62 1.52–2.12 0.033 Medial meniscus sum 0.63 0.37–0.89 0.87 0.52–1.21 0.216	Meniscus sum	1 54	1 01-2 08	2.11	1 32-2 72	0.639
Media memora 3 ani 0.05 0.57 0.05 0.07 0.52–1.21 0.210	Medial meniscus sum	0.63	0.37-0.89	0.87	0.52 - 1.72	0.216
Lateral meniscus sum 0.91 0.46–1.37 1.15 0.54–1.78 0.871	Lateral meniscus sum	0.91	0.46 - 1.37	1.15	0.52 - 1.21 0.54 - 1.78	0.871

Significance of differences was tested with the paired *t* test. Bold numbers indicate significant differences (P < 0.05), italic numbers indicate trends (P > 0.05 < 0.1). Part of baseline data were reported in Yu et al. 2015⁵.

0.12–0.22], CA 0.11/y [Cl 0.06–0.16], P = 0.11). The rate of change was significantly higher in the medial femoral condyle of the African Americans (AA 0.037/y [Cl 0.02–0.05], CA 0.003/y [Cl –0.01 to 0.02], P = 0.006). In contrast, in the lateral femoral condyle the BMEP score decreased in the African Americans while it slightly increased in the Caucasian Americans (P = 0.009) [Table V, Fig. 2(C)]. CA subjects showed higher mean meniscus lesions scores form baseline to 48 m follow up. The difference was predominantly found and significant in the medial meniscus. There was only a slight progression of meniscus lesions that was not significant in either group. Also the rates of change were not significantly different (P = 0.41) [Table V, Fig. 2(D)].

Discussion

The results of this study show that compared to CA, AA cartilage T2 relaxation times averaged over the whole joint and in the medial femoral condyle increased at a significantly faster rate per year, so that while T2 values in the latter were lower at baseline the T2 values of the two groups converged slowly within the observation period. In contrast, the rate of progression of WORMS cartilage

Table III

Development of T2 values and WORMS scores over 6 years

	Follow u	р							
	Baseline		24 mont	hs	48 mont	hs	72 mont	hs	Р
	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI	
African Americans									
Average T2 ms	32.07	31.7-32.4	33.49	33.2-33.8	34.16	33.8-34.5	34.08	33.7-34.5	<0.0001
WORMS sum	7.79	6.47-9.12	8.66	6.91-10.39	12.15	10.48-13.82	13.84	11.88-15.79	<0.0001
WORMS medial compartment	1.22	0.69-1.75	1.37	0.68 - 2.06	2.21	1.55-2.88	2.90	2.13-3.67	0.001
WORMS lateral compartment	1.83	1.99 - 2.45	2.07	1.25-2.89	3.39	2.60 - 4.17	3.91	2.99-4.83	0.0003
WORMS Cartilage sum	3.61	2.97 - 4.23	4.29	3.47-5.11	5.88	5.09-6.67	6.79	5.87-7.71	<0.0001
WORMS BMEP sum	1.81	1.37 - 2.24	2.17	1.60 - 2.74	2.83	0.28-3.38	3.09	2.44-3.73	0.003
Meniscus sum	0.9	0.54 - 1.26	0.66	0.18-1.13	1.39	0.94 - 1.85	1.54	1.01 - 2.08	0.033
Medial meniscus	0.34	0.16-0.52	0.26	0.02 - 0.49	0.49	0.27-0.71	0.63	0.37-0.89	0.148
Lateral meniscus	0.56	0.25-0.87	0.4	-0.01 - 0.8	0.9	0.52 - 1.29	0.91	0.46-1.37	0.191
Ligament sum	0.22	0.10-0.34	0.12	-0.02 - 0.26	0.16	0.02-0.30	0.04	-0.04 - 0.13	0.396
Cyst sum	0.63	0.31-0.94	0.57	0.15-0.98	0.95	0.56-1.35	1.35	0.88-1.81	0.043
Effusion	0.12	0.04-0.19	0.05	-0.04 - 0.14	0.11	0.02-0.19	0.13	0.03-0.23	0.629
Baker cyst	0.65	0.42-0.87	0.79	0.53-1.06	0.83	0.57 - 1.08	0.89	0.59-1.18	0.563
Caucasian Americans									
Average T2 ms	32.85	32.5-33.2	33.97	33.8-34.4	34.43	34.2-34.9	34.23	33.9-34.7	<0.0001
WORMS sum	7.57	6.58-8.56	8.91	7.44-10.38	10.93	8.98-12.89	12.38	9.57-15.19	0.0003
WORMS medial compartment	1.15	0.57-1.73	1.66	0.93-2.39	2.14	1.41 - 2.88	2.49	1.63-3.34	0.044
WORMS lateral compartment	1.74	1.03 - 2.44	2.16	1.26-3.05	3.02	2.12 - 3.92	3.67	2.61 - 4.71	0.012
WORMS cartilage sum	3.62	2.96 - 4.28	4.54	3.69-5.38	5.75	4.90 - 6.60	6.44	5.45-7.43	<0.0001
WORMS BMEP sum	1.35	0.99 - 1.71	1.71	1.25-2.16	2.02	1.56 - 2.48	2.11	1.58 - 2.65	0.052
Meniscus sum	1.36	0.89-1.83	1.42	0.82 - 2.02	1.85	1.25 - 2.45	2.02	1.32 - 2.72	0.328
Medial meniscus	0.61	0.38-0.84	0.55	0.26 - 0.84	0.74	0.44-1.03	0.87	0.52-1.21	0.494
Lateral meniscus	0.75	0.33-1.16	0.87	0.34-1.40	1.11	0.58 - 1.65	1.15	0.54 - 1.78	0.626
Ligament sum	0.28	0.17-0.39	0.08	-0.07 - 0.23	0.15	0.00 - 0.29	0.09	-0.08 - 0.26	0.117
Cyst sum	0.29	0.05-0.53	0.42	0.11-0.72	0.48	0.17-0.78	0.82	0.46-1.18	0.119
Effusion	0.06	0.03-0.09	0.00	-0.04 - 0.04	0.00	-0.04 - 0.04	0.00	-0.05 - 0.05	0.042
Baker cyst	0.66	0.43-0.88	0.77	0.48-1.05	0.69	0.41-0.97	0.89	0.56-1.21	0.68

Significance of differences between groups was tested with ANOVA. Bold numbers indicate significant differences (P < 0.05), italic numbers indicate trends (P > 0.05 < 0.1). Part of baseline data were reported in Yu et al. 2015⁵.

lesion scores was not significantly different between the two groups. There were also no differences between groups in the rate of progression in WORMS meniscus or total joint BMEP lesion scores, but BMEP lesions in the MFC increased more in the AA and BMEP lesions in the LFC increased more in the CA women.

To date there is limited knowledge on ethnic differences in cartilage composition with MRI and to the best of our knowledge only one study was performed⁵. This cross-sectional analysis of baseline data of AA and CA women in the OAI, a subset of whom were also included in this study, showed consistently lower T2 values in AA women in all compartments. Since the results were strictly controlled for the main confounders of age, BMI and KL grade and a sub analysis of compartments without cartilage lesions confirmed the results of lower T2 lesions in AA, the differences in cartilage T2 might reflect racial differences in cartilage composition. Interestingly data from our longitudinal study show that the initially different T2 values converged over time. This effect was due to both the significantly higher rate of increment at baseline and average change over 6 years in AA women and may be indicative for a faster progression of matrix degeneration.

The development of cartilage T2 followed a nonlinear quadratic relationship entering a plateau phase after 4 years while cartilage lesions measured with WORMS progressed constantly during follow up. This ceiling effect has been theorized in a prior study¹⁷ that followed the development of cartilage T2 over 2 years and found an inverse relationship between baseline T2 and the slope of T2 progression. The authors hypothesized a saturation effect that might occur after a certain degree of cartilage matrix degeneration prior to the onset of a cartilage lesion. There are other studies supporting this finding e.g., Dunn *et al.*¹⁸ found significantly elevated T2 values in subjects with mild knee OA while no significant further increment could be observed from mild to severe OA

and a study with a pig model reported a ceiling effect with cartilage maturation followed by a decrease of T2 with further aging¹⁹.

While cartilage T2 values increased faster in AA women the progression of structural knee degeneration as expressed with the WORMS score was comparable. This seems to be in contrast to the higher prevalence of knee OA (at least KL 2) in AA women found by Anderson *et al.*³ However, our study cohort consisted of subjects without definite OA (KL0-1) thus the grade of knee joint degeneration may have been too low and the observation period too short to detect significant differences. A longer follow up observation with more subjects entering the stage of definite radiographic OA is needed to estimate the predictive value of cartilage T2 changes with regard to the onset of definite knee OA in these groups.

There was also a difference in the distribution of lesions within the joint. Meniscus lesions were found to be significantly more frequent in the Caucasian American group while BMEP lesion scores tended to be higher in African Americans. Since potential risk factors for meniscus lesions and higher BMEP such as high physical activity²⁰ (measured with PASE) or obesity^{21,22} (no significant difference in BMI) were very similar in both groups these factors are not a likely explanation for these differences. Analyzing the distribution of degeneration according to medial and lateral disease we did not find a significant discrepancy between the ethnic groups. Particularly we did not find a predominance of lateral disease in African American knees as described in Braga et al.²³ who analyzed knee X-rays of more than 3187 participants of the Johnston County osteoarthritis project. The reason for this may be that we included only subjects with no or doubtful signs of radiographic knee OA.

Our study has several limitations: Many subjects were lost for the follow-up time points resulting in relatively small groups of 45 subjects per ethnic group at 72 months. This reduces the

Table IV

Rate of change in T2 values at baseline and over 6 years

Rate of change at baseline	Ethnicity						
	African Americans		Caucasian Americans				
	Slope coeff.*	95% CI	Slope coeff.*	95% CI			
Average of all regions	0.45	0.38-0.51	0.35	0.29-0.41	0.029		
LFC	0.62	0.53-0.72	0.55	0.45-0.65	0.238		
LT	0.53	0.44-0.62	0.42	0.34-0.51	0.058		
MFC	0.37	0.28 - 0.42	0.23	0.13-0.33	0.025		
MT	0.37	0.28-0.45	0.26	0.18-0.34	0.054		
Р	0.33	0.19-0.47	0.32	0.18-0.45	0.835		
Average change rate over 6 years	Rate/year*	95% CI	Rate/year*	95% CI	Р		
Average of all regions	0.36	0.30-0.43	0.27	0.20-0.33	0.039		
LFC	0.51	0.41-0.61	0.43	0.33-0.53	0.269		
LT	0.46	0.37-0.54	0.35	0.26-0.43	0.067		
MFC	0.29	0.20-0.39	0.14	0.05-0.24	0.030		
MT	0.29	0.21-0.37	0.18	0.10-0.26	0.061		
Р	0.27	0.15-0.40	0.25	0.13-0.38	0.821		

Bold numbers indicate significant differences (P < 0.05), italic numbers indicate trends (P > 0.05 < 0.1).

* Numbers of slope coefficients at baseline and average rate/year are least square means adjusted for multiple measurements per ID and matched pairing between groups pairs using a mixed random effects model. Units are ms/year.



Fig. 2. Mean cartilage T2 (A) and the WORMS scores for cartilage (B), BMEP (C) menisci (D) and the sum of all WORMS scores (D) in African American (AA) and Caucasian American (CA) women over 6 years. Values are least square means adjusted for multiple measurements per ID and matched pairing between groups pairs using a mixed random effects model. Error bars indicate standard errors. *P* values indicate significance of differences of the rate of change (at baseline in non-linear increments). LF = lateral femur, MF = medial femur, LT = lateral tibia, MT = medial tibia, PAT = patella, Joint = mean of all compartments.

Table	e V
14014	

Rate of change of WORMS scores over 6 years

WORMS scores		Р			
	African Americans		Caucasian American		
	Rate/year*	95% CI	Rate/year*	95% CI	
Total score	0.99	0.79-1.19	0.81	0.61-1.01	0.193
Cartilage					
Sum of all regions	0.54	0.41-0.66	0.48	0.35-0.61	0.526
LFC	0.06	0.02-0.89	0.08	0.04-0.12	0.388
LT	0.14	0.09-0.19	0.11	0.07-0.16	0.399
MFC	0.07	0.02-0.11	0.09	0.04-0.13	0.49
MT	0.07	0.04-0.09	0.06	0.03-0.08	0.619
Р	0.2	0.14-0.26	0.13	0.07-0.19	0.133
BMEP					
Sum of all regions	0.17	0.12-0.22	0.11	0.06-0.16	0.109
LFC	-0.01	-0.02 - 0.04	0.02	0.003-0.03	0.009
LT	0.03	0.02-0.05	0.02	-0.001 - 0.03	0.108
MFC	0.037	0.02-0.05	0.003	-0.01 - 0.02	0.006
MT	0.01	0.003-0.02	0.006	-0.003 - 0.02	0.400
Р	0.05	0.02-0.08	0.01	-0.02 - 0.04	0.076
Menisci					
Meniscus sum	0.15	0.09-0.21	0.11	0.05-0.17	0.405
Medial meniscus	0.05	0.02-0.08	0.06	0.03-0.09	0.743
Lateral meniscus	0.09	0.05-0.15	0.05	0-0.10	0.200

Bold numbers indicate significant differences (P < 0.05), italic numbers indicate trends (P > 0.05 < 0.1).

* Numbers of rate/year are least square means adjusted for multiple measurements per ID and matched pairing between groups pairs using a mixed random effects model.

generalizability of our findings and may have reduced the power of the study leading to significant differences of T2 values only in the average of compartments and the MFC and borderline significant results of T2 measures in the lateral and medial tibia. Moreover the high rate of dropouts could have introduced a selection bias, e.g., changing demographic data or improving T2 values due to potential dropout of the worst cases receiving TKR. However, demographic data were equally distributed among study groups at all time points and no subject of our study cohort received a TKR during the observation period. Moreover structural degeneration proceeded constantly over the four observation time points. We used the arithmetic average as a parameter for the T2 cartilage composition of the whole joint. This method gives equal weight to all compartments regardless the size of the cartilage segmentations, thus regions with smaller segmentation size may have been overrepresented in the average value. Since we used the same method in both ethnic groups it should not have biased the differences between groups. The strengths of this study are the one to one matching of the African and Caucasian subjects enabling a thorough comparison between the groups and the follow up regimen with four measurements over 6 years that allowed a precise monitoring of the cartilage composition and structural joint degeneration.

In conclusion, this study showed that in AA women without definite radiographic OA T2 values increased faster compared to CA women while the progress of cartilage degeneration and joint degeneration measured with WORMS was comparable. The results suggest that T2 values are able to distinguish ethnicity-related longitudinal cartilage changes in an early stage before differences of structural joint degeneration appear.

Authors' contributions

Study design: MK, UH, GBJ, MN, CEM, TML. Subject selection: MK, UH, AY, MS, FL. Image analysis: MK, AY, UH, MS. Statistical analysis: GBJ, CEM, MK. Interpretation of data: MK, GBJ, MN, CEM, TML. Drafting of article: MK, TML. Review/revision: MK, AY, UH, MS, FL, GBJ, MN, CEM, TML. Final approval: MK, AY, UH, MS, FL, GBJ, MN, CEM, TML.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

The study was supported by the Osteoarthritis Initiative, a public-private partnership comprising five NIH contracts (National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases contracts N01-AR-2-2258, N01-AR-2-2259, N01-AR-2-2260, N01-AR-2-2261, and N01-AR-2-2262) with research conducted by the Osteoarthritis Initiative Study Investigators. Private funding partners include Merck Research, Novartis Pharmaceuticals, GlaxoSmithKline, and Pfizer; the private sector funding for the Osteoarthritis Initiative is managed by the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health. The analyses in this study were funded through the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases grants U01-AR059507, P50-AR060752 and R01-AR064771. The study was also funded by a grant from Beijing High Levels of Health Technical Talent Team of Construction Project (no. 2013-3-033). MK received grants from the Gottfried and Julia Bangerter-Rhyner Foundation.

References

- 1. Felson DT, Lawrence RC, Dieppe PA, Hirsch R, Helmick CG, Jordan JM, *et al.* Osteoarthritis: new insights. Part 1: the disease and its risk factors. Ann Intern Med 2000;133:635–46.
- Spector TD, Cicuttini F, Baker J, Loughlin J, Hart D. Genetic influences on osteoarthritis in women: a twin study. BMJ 1996;312:940–3.
- **3.** Anderson JJ, Felson DT. Factors associated with osteoarthritis of the knee in the first national Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (HANES I). Evidence for an association with overweight, race, and physical demands of work. Am J Epidemiol 1988;128:179–89.

- **4.** Jordan JM, Helmick CG, Renner JB, Luta G, Dragomir AD, Woodard J, *et al.* Prevalence of hip symptoms and radiographic and symptomatic hip osteoarthritis in African Americans and Caucasians: the Johnston County Osteoarthritis Project. J Rheumatol 2009;36:809–15.
- 5. Yu A, Heilmeier U, Kretzschmar M, Joseph GB, Liu F, Liebl H, *et al.* Racial differences in biochemical knee cartilage composition between African–American and Caucasian–American women with 3Tesla MR-based T2 relaxation time measurements data from the Osteoarthritis Initiative. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2015;23:1595–604.
- Mosher TJ, Dardzinski BJ, Smith MB. Human articular cartilage: influence of aging and early symptomatic degeneration on the spatial variation of T2-preliminary findings at 3 T. Radiology 2000;214:259–66.
- 7. Joseph GB, Baum T, Alizai H, Carballido-Gamio J, Nardo L, Virayavanich W, *et al.* Baseline mean and heterogeneity of MR cartilage T2 are associated with morphologic degeneration of cartilage, meniscus, and bone marrow over 3 years data from the Osteoarthritis Initiative. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2012;20:727–35.
- **8.** Felson DT, Nevitt MC. Epidemiologic studies for osteoarthritis: new versus conventional study design approaches. Rheum Dis Clin North Am 2004;30. 783–797, vii.
- **9.** Kellgren JH, Lawrence JS. Radiological assessment of osteoarthrosis. Ann Rheum Dis 1957;16:494–502.
- **10.** Felson DT, Niu J, Guermazi A, Sack B, Aliabadi P. Defining radiographic incidence and progression of knee osteoarthritis: suggested modifications of the Kellgren and Lawrence scale. Ann Rheum Dis 2011;70:1884–6.
- **11.** Peterfy CG, Schneider E, Nevitt M. The Osteoarthritis Initiative: report on the design rationale for the magnetic resonance imaging protocol for the knee. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2008;16:1433–41.
- **12.** Carballido-Gamio J, Bauer JS, Stahl R, Lee K-Y, Krause S, Link TM, *et al.* Inter-subject comparison of MRI knee cartilage thickness. Med Image Anal 2008;12:120–35.
- **13.** Carballido-Gamio J, Blumenkrantz G, Lynch JA, Link TM, Majumdar S. Longitudinal analysis of MRI T(2) knee cartilage laminar organization in a subset of patients from the Osteoarthritis Initiative. Magn Reson Med 2010;63:465–72.
- 14. Stehling C, Baum T, Mueller-Hoecker C, Liebl H, Carballido-Gamio J, Joseph GB, *et al.* A novel fast knee cartilage

segmentation technique for T2 measurements at MR imaging – data from the Osteoarthritis Initiative. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2011;19:984–9.

- **15.** Peterfy CG, Guermazi A, Zaim S, Tirman PFJ, Miaux Y, White D, *et al.* Whole-organ magnetic resonance imaging score (WORMS) of the knee in osteoarthritis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2004;12:177–90.
- 16. Stehling C, Lane NE, Nevitt MC, Lynch J, McCulloch CE, Link TM, et al. Subjects with higher physical activity levels have more severe focal knee lesions diagnosed with 3T MRI: analysis of a non-symptomatic cohort of the Osteoarthritis Initiative. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2010;18:776–86.
- **17.** Jungmann PM, Kraus MS, Nardo L, Liebl H, Alizai H, Joseph GB, *et al.* T(2) relaxation time measurements are limited in monitoring progression, once advanced cartilage defects at the knee occur: longitudinal data from the Osteoarthritis Initiative. J Magn Reson Imaging 2013;38:1415–24.
- **18.** Dunn TC, Lu Y, Jin H, Ries MD, Majumdar S. T2 relaxation time of cartilage at MR imaging: comparison with severity of knee osteoarthritis. Radiology 2004;232:592–8.
- **19.** Shinar H, Navon G. Multinuclear NMR and microscopic MRI studies of the articular cartilage nanostructure. NMR Biomed 2006;19:877–93.
- **20.** Kretzschmar M, Lin W, Nardo L, Joseph GB, Dunlop DD, Heilmeier U, *et al.* Association of physical activity measured by accelerometer, knee joint abnormalities and cartilage T2-measurements obtained from 3T MRI: data from the Osteo-arthritis Initiative. Arthritis Care Res Hob 2015;67:1272–80.
- 21. Laberge MA, Baum T, Virayavanich W, Nardo L, Nevitt MC, Lynch J, et al. Obesity increases the prevalence and severity of focal knee abnormalities diagnosed using 3T MRI in middleaged subjects – data from the Osteoarthritis Initiative. Skelet Radiol 2012;41:633–41.
- 22. Lim YZ, Wang Y, Wluka AE, Davies-Tuck ML, Hanna F, Urquhart DM, *et al.* Association of obesity and systemic factors with bone marrow lesions at the knee: a systematic review. Semin Arthritis Rheum 2014;43:600–12.
- 23. Braga L, Renner JB, Schwartz TA, Woodard J, Helmick CG, Hochberg MC, *et al.* Differences in radiographic features of knee osteoarthritis in African-Americans and Caucasians: the Johnston county osteoarthritis project. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2009;17:1554–61.