Original Article
ISSN (Online): 2350-0530
ISSN (Print): 2394-3629

International Journal of Research - GRANTHAALAYAH
March 2025 13(3), 97–107

A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF DEEP LEARNING TECHNIQUES FOR CLASSIFYING KNEE ABNORMALITIES

Divyakant Meva [1], HirenKumar Kukadiya [2]

[1] Associate Professor, Faculty of Computer Application, Marwadi University, Rajkot (Gujarat), India
[2] Assistant Professor, Gandhinagar Institute of Computer Science and Applications, Kathmandu, Gandhinagar University, Gandhinagar (Gujarat) 382721, India

Received 15 January 2024
Accepted 17 February 2025
Published 31 March 2025

Corresponding Author

Divyakant Meva, divyakant.meva@marwadieducation.edu.in

DOI
10.29121/granthaalayah.v13.i3.2025.5992

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ABSTRACT

Knee abnormalities represent one of the most common orthopedic conditions affecting individuals across different age groups, significantly impacting mobility and quality of life. For treatment planning to be successful, these anomalies must be diagnosed promptly and accurately. Deep learning techniques have transformed medical image analysis in the last ten years, providing promising answers for automated knee anomaly classification from a variety of imaging modalities. This comprehensive review examines the current state-of-the-art deep learning techniques for knee abnormality classification, analyzing their architectures, performance metrics, clinical applications, and limitations. We systematically categorize these approaches based on the imaging modalities used (MRI, X-ray, ultrasound), the specific knee abnormalities targeted, and the underlying deep learning architectures employed. Additionally, we discuss the challenges in this field, including limited dataset availability, class imbalance, interpretability issues, and the gap between research and clinical implementation. Finally, we highlight emerging trends and future research directions that could further enhance the clinical utility of deep learning for knee abnormality classification.

Keywords: Computer-Aided Diagnosis, Classification, Convolutional Neural Networks, Deep Learning, Knee Abnormalities, Medical imaging, MRI

1. INTRODUCTION

Knee disorders, including ligament tears, meniscal injuries, cartilage damage, and osteoarthritis, represent a significant healthcare burden worldwide. According to recent epidemiological studies, knee injuries account for approximately 15-50% of all sports injuries, while knee osteoarthritis affects over 250 million people globally Wang et al. (2023). Accurate diagnosis of these conditions is essential for appropriate treatment planning and optimal patient outcomes.

The diagnosis of knee abnormalities has historically depended on a clinical examination in conjunction with a variety of imaging techniques, including as computed tomography (CT), ultrasonography, X-rays, and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Because of its superior contrast resolution and multiplanar imaging capabilities, MRI has become the gold standard for assessing the knee's soft tissue structures. However, especially in complex instances, knee MRI interpretation can be difficult, time-consuming, and susceptible to inter-observer variability.

Deep learning (DL), in particular, and artificial intelligence (AI) have shown tremendous promise in medical picture processing in recent years. In a variety of medical imaging areas, deep learning algorithms—particularly convolutional neural networks, or CNNs—have demonstrated remarkable performance in tasks including classification, segmentation, and detection. Automated feature extraction, the capacity to recognize intricate patterns, and the possibility of lowering diagnostic mistakes and interpretation time are only a few benefits of these methods.

The goal of this paper is to present a thorough examination of the most advanced deep learning methods available for classifying knee abnormalities. We comprehensively classify and contrast these methods according to performance criteria, architectural designs, targeted abnormalities, and imaging modalities. Additionally, we go over the difficulties, constraints, and possible future paths in this developing topic.

2. METHODOLOGY FOR LITERATURE REVIEW

This review follows a systematic approach to identify, select, and critically appraise relevant research on deep learning techniques for knee abnormality classification. We conducted a comprehensive search across major electronic databases, including PubMed, IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, Google Scholar, and Scopus, covering publications from January 2015 to September 2024.

The search strategy employed combinations of keywords including but not limited to: "deep learning," "convolutional neural networks," "knee," "abnormalities," "classification," "detection," "MRI," "X-ray," "osteoarthritis," "meniscus," "ligament," and "cartilage." Additional relevant articles were identified through reference lists of selected papers and review articles.

Inclusion criteria were: (1) original research papers published in peer-reviewed journals or conferences; (2) studies focusing on deep learning approaches for knee abnormality classification; (3) clear description of the methodology, dataset, and evaluation metrics; and (4) articles written in English. Case reports, editorials, letters, and conference abstracts without full papers were excluded.

3. OVERVIEW OF KNEE ABNORMALITIES AND IMAGING MODALITIES

3.1. COMMON KNEE ABNORMALITIES

Knee abnormalities encompass a wide spectrum of conditions affecting different anatomical structures:

1) **Meniscal Tears**: The menisci are C-shaped fibrocartilaginous structures that cushion the knee joint. Tears can occur due to traumatic injuries or degenerative processes.

2) **Ligament Injuries**: The anterior cruciate ligament (ACL), posterior cruciate ligament (PCL), medial collateral ligament (MCL), and lateral collateral ligament (LCL) are the four main ligaments that make up the knee. ACL tears are especially frequent during athletic activities.
3) **Osteoarthritis (OA)**: A degenerative joint disease characterized by cartilage loss, subchondral bone changes, and inflammation.
4) **Cartilage Defects**: Focal lesions or widespread thinning of the articular cartilage.
5) **Bone Marrow Lesions**: Areas of increased signal intensity on MRI within the subchondral bone.
6) **Synovitis**: Inflammation of the synovial membrane lining the joint cavity.
7) **Tendinopathies**: Inflammatory or degenerative conditions affecting tendons, particularly the patellar and quadriceps tendons.

3.2. IMAGING MODALITIES FOR KNEE ASSESSMENT

Different imaging modalities offer complementary information for knee evaluation:

1) **Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)**: Provides excellent visualization of soft tissues, including ligaments, menisci, cartilage, synovium, and bone marrow. Various MRI sequences (T1-weighted, T2-weighted, proton density, fat-suppressed) highlight different aspects of pathology.
2) **X-ray (Radiography)**: Primarily visualizes bony structures, joint space narrowing, osteophytes, and gross alignment issues. Commonly used for initial assessment and OA staging.
3) **Computed Tomography (CT)**: Offers detailed bone imaging and can be useful for complex fractures or preoperative planning.
4) **Ultrasound**: Enables dynamic assessment of tendons, ligaments, joint effusion, and synovitis. Benefits include lack of radiation, cost-effectiveness, and real-time imaging.

4. FOUNDATIONS OF DEEP LEARNING FOR MEDICAL IMAGE ANALYSIS

4.1. BASIC PRINCIPLES OF DEEP LEARNING

A subset of machine learning called "deep learning" uses multi-layered artificial neural networks to extract hierarchical representations from data. Deep learning algorithms automatically discover pertinent features through end-to-end training on massive datasets, in contrast to conventional machine learning techniques that need for manual feature engineering.

The artificial neuron, the basic unit of deep neural networks, executes a non-linear activation function after a weighted sum of inputs. These neurons are arranged in layers, each of which converts the preceding layer's information into features that are more abstract.

4.2. CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORKS

For image analysis applications, Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) have become the most popular deep learning architecture. Three fundamental concepts—local receptive fields, weight sharing, and spatial pooling—are incorporated into its design, which draws inspiration from the structure of the visual cortex.

The typical CNN architecture consists of:

1) **Convolutional Layers**: Apply learnable filters to input data, capturing local patterns.
2) **Activation Functions**: Introduce non-linearity, with ReLU (Rectified Linear Unit) being the most common.
3) **Pooling Layers**: Perform downsampling to reduce spatial dimensions and computational complexity.
4) **Fully Connected Layers**: Connect every neuron to all neurons in the adjacent layers, typically used in the final stages for classification.

4.3. TRANSFER LEARNING

Utilizing the knowledge acquired from resolving one problem, transfer learning enhances performance on a similar but distinct challenge. In medical imaging, where there are frequently few large annotated datasets, pre-trained networks on natural picture datasets (like ImageNet) are optimized for particular medical tasks. Because there aren't many large-scale annotated knee imaging datasets available, this method has worked very well for classifying knee abnormalities.

4.4. ADVANCED ARCHITECTURES

Recent advances in deep learning have introduced several sophisticated architectures with applications in knee abnormality classification:

1) **Residual Networks (ResNets)**: Address the vanishing gradient problem through skip connections, enabling the training of very deep networks.
2) **Densely Connected Networks (DenseNets)**: Each layer receives feature maps from all preceding layers, enhancing feature reuse and reducing parameter count.
3) **Attention Mechanisms**: Allow models to focus on relevant parts of the input when making predictions, particularly useful for identifying small abnormalities.
4) **Vision Transformers (ViTs)**: Adapt transformer architectures from natural language processing to image analysis, showing promising results in medical imaging.
5) **Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs)**: Incorporate anatomical or spatial relationships between different structures in the knee.

5. DEEP LEARNING APPROACHES FOR KNEE ABNORMALITY CLASSIFICATION

5.1. MRI-BASED CLASSIFICATION

MRI-based deep learning approaches represent the largest category in knee abnormality classification research, given MRI's superior soft tissue contrast and ability to visualize multiple knee structures.

5.1.1. MENISCAL TEAR CLASSIFICATION

Meniscal tears are among the most commonly targeted abnormalities. Zhang et al. (2020) proposed a 3D CNN architecture for meniscal tear classification using volumetric MRI data. Their approach achieved 89.2% accuracy on a dataset of 427 knee MRI examinations, outperforming traditional 2D CNN approaches. The authors incorporated attention mechanisms to focus on relevant regions, improving the model's performance particularly for subtle tears.

In a different approach, Liu and colleagues (2021) developed a two-stage framework combining a U-Net for meniscus segmentation with a ResNet-50 classifier for tear detection. This method achieved a sensitivity of 91.8% and specificity of 87.3%, demonstrating the potential benefits of incorporating anatomical localization prior to classification.

5.1.2. ANTERIOR CRUCIATE LIGAMENT (ACL) INJURY DETECTION

For ACL injury classification, Chen et al. (2022) implemented a multi-view CNN that processes sagittal, coronal, and axial MRI slices simultaneously. Their ensemble approach, combining predictions from different views, achieved an AUC of 0.94 for complete ACL tear detection. The multi-view strategy proved particularly effective for cases where the ACL was partially visualized in a single plane.

An innovative approach by Kumar et al. (2023) utilized a 3D DenseNet architecture with spatial attention for ACL tear classification. Their model achieved 93.5% accuracy and demonstrated excellent generalization across different MRI protocols and scanner types, addressing a significant challenge in clinical translation.

5.1.3. MULTI-STRUCTURE CLASSIFICATION

Several studies have attempted to simultaneously classify abnormalities across multiple knee structures. Wang et al. (2023) proposed a hierarchical CNN architecture for classifying nine different knee abnormalities from MRI. Their model first classified abnormalities into broad categories (ligament, meniscus, cartilage, bone) before making specific diagnoses within each category. This hierarchical approach achieved an average accuracy of 87.6% across all abnormality types, with particularly high performance for ACL tears (92.3%) and meniscal tears (90.1%).

Similarly, García-Castro et al. (2024) developed a multi-task learning framework that simultaneously performed segmentation and classification of knee structures. By sharing features between these related tasks, their approach improved classification performance, particularly for cartilage defects and bone marrow lesions, which can be subtle and difficult to detect.

5.2. X-RAY-BASED CLASSIFICATION

While MRI provides superior soft tissue contrast, X-rays remain the most accessible and commonly used imaging modality for initial knee assessment, particularly for osteoarthritis.

5.2.1. OSTEOARTHRITIS CLASSIFICATION

Tiulpin et al. (2019) proposed a Siamese CNN architecture for knee osteoarthritis grading from plain radiographs. Their approach explicitly incorporated symmetry information by comparing left and right knees, achieving a quadratic kappa coefficient of 0.83 for Kellgren-Lawrence grading on the OAI dataset, outperforming previous methods.

Building on this work, Leung et al. (2022) implemented a weakly supervised learning approach using only image-level labels to automatically identify radiographic features associated with OA progression. Their model not only classified current OA severity but also predicted progression with an AUC of 0.78, potentially offering clinically valuable prognostic information.

5.2.2. DETECTION OF SUBTLE RADIOGRAPHIC FEATURES

Recent work has focused on detecting subtle radiographic features that may precede obvious OA changes. Zhang et al. (2023) utilized a Vision Transformer architecture to detect early osteophytes and subchondral sclerosis, achieving higher sensitivity (84.2% vs. 72.1%) than experienced radiologists for early-stage changes. Their approach incorporated spatial attention mechanisms that highlighted relevant regions for model decisions, enhancing interpretability.

5.3. ULTRASOUND-BASED CLASSIFICATION

Ultrasound offers advantages of real-time imaging, lack of radiation, and lower cost, although with more operator dependency.

Kim et al. (2021) developed a CNN approach for classifying meniscal tears from ultrasound images, achieving 82.3% accuracy. While lower than MRI-based approaches, their method demonstrated potential for point-of-care screening in resource-limited settings.

For ligament assessment, Raza et al. (2022) proposed a transfer learning approach using EfficientNet-B3 pre-trained on ImageNet and fine-tuned on ultrasound images for ACL and PCL tear classification. Their method achieved 85.7% accuracy for ACL and 83.2% for PCL tears, offering a viable alternative for cases where MRI is contraindicated or unavailable.

5.4. MULTIMODAL APPROACHES

Integrating information from multiple imaging modalities can potentially improve classification performance by leveraging complementary information.

Lee et al. (2023) proposed a dual-stream network that simultaneously processed MRI and X-ray images for comprehensive OA assessment. Their fusion approach, which combined features at multiple levels, achieved higher accuracy (91.2%) for OA classification than either modality alone (87.5% for MRI, 84.3% for X-ray). The authors noted that X-rays contributed valuable information about bone alignment and joint space narrowing, while MRI provided critical soft tissue details.

Similarly, Park et al. (2024) developed a multimodal framework incorporating clinical data (symptoms, patient history) alongside imaging features. This clinically-informed approach improved classification performance for meniscal tears by 4.3% compared to image-only models, highlighting the value of integrating clinical context.

6. PERFORMANCE COMPARISON AND EVALUATION METRICS

6.1. COMMONLY USED EVALUATION METRICS

Studies on knee abnormality classification employ various metrics to evaluate performance:

1) **Accuracy:** The percentage of cases that are accurately classified.
2) **Sensitivity/Recall:** The capacity to accurately recognize instances of abnormality.
3) **Specificity:** The capacity to accurately recognize typical situations.
4) **Precision:** The percentage of favorable forecasts that turn out to be anomalous.
5) **F1-Score:** The precision and recall harmonic mean
6) **Area Under the ROC Curve (AUC):** Measures discrimination ability across different threshold settings.
7) **Quadratic-Weighted Kappa:** Particularly for ordinal classification tasks like OA grading.

6.2. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENT APPROACHES

Table 1 summarizes the performance of key studies based on imaging modality and target abnormality.

Table 1

Table 1 Performance Comparison of Deep Learning Methods for Knee Abnormality Classification

Study	Imaging Modality	Target Abnormality	Architecture	Performance
Zhang et al. (2020)	MRI (3D)	Meniscal tears	3D CNN + Attention	Accuracy: 89.2%, AUC: 0.92
Liu et al. (2021)	MRI (2D)	Meniscal tears	U-Net + ResNet-50	Sensitivity: 91.8%, Specificity: 87.3%
Chen et al. (2022)	MRI (Multi-view)	ACL tears	Multi-view CNN Ensemble	AUC: 0.94, Accuracy: 90.7%
Kumar et al. (2023)	MRI (3D)	ACL tears	3D DenseNet + Attention	Accuracy: 93.5%, F1: 0.92
Wang et al. (2023)	MRI (2D)	Multiple (9 abnormalities)	Hierarchical CNN	Average Accuracy: 87.6%
García-Castro et al. (2024)	MRI (2D)	Multiple + Segmentation	Multi-task Network	Average F1: 0.88
Tiulpin et al. (2019)	X-ray	Osteoarthritis (KL grading)	Siamese CNN	Kappa: 0.83, Accuracy: 81.1%
Leung et al. (2022)	X-ray	OA + Progression	Weakly Supervised CNN	AUC: 0.78 (progression)
Zhang et al. (2023)	X-ray	Early OA features	Vision Transformer	Sensitivity: 84.2%, AUC: 0.87
Kim et al. (2021)	Ultrasound	Meniscal tears	VGG-16 (Transfer Learning)	Accuracy: 82.3%, AUC: 0.85
Raza et al. (2022)	Ultrasound	ACL/PCL tears	EfficientNet-B3	ACL Accuracy: 85.7%, PCL: 83.2%

Lee et al. (2023)	MRI + X-ray	Osteoarthritis	Dual-stream Network	Accuracy: 91.2%, Kappa: 0.88
Park et al. (2024)	MRI + Clinical data	Meniscal tears	Multimodal Fusion	Accuracy: 93.1%, AUC: 0.94

From this comparison, several trends emerge:

1) MRI-based approaches generally achieve higher performance than X-ray or ultrasound-based methods.
2) 3D and multi-view approaches tend to outperform single-slice 2D methods.
3) The incorporation of attention mechanisms consistently improves performance.
4) Multimodal approaches show promise in combining complementary information.
5) Performance varies by target abnormality, with ligament and meniscal tears generally achieving higher accuracy than cartilage defects or early OA changes.

7. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Despite significant progress, several challenges limit the clinical translation of deep learning approaches for knee abnormality classification:

7.1. DATASET LIMITATIONS

Most studies rely on relatively small, often single-institution datasets, raising concerns about generalizability. The largest publicly available dataset, the Osteoarthritis Initiative (OAI), primarily focuses on osteoarthritis, with limited annotation for other abnormalities. Additionally, class imbalance is common, with normal cases typically outnumbering abnormal ones, potentially biasing algorithms toward majority classes.

7.2. STANDARDIZATION AND REPRODUCIBILITY

Variations in MRI acquisition parameters, scanner types, and imaging protocols pose significant challenges for model generalization. Furthermore, inconsistent reporting of methodology, evaluation metrics, and validation strategies makes direct comparison between studies difficult.

7.3. INTERPRETABILITY AND EXPLAINABILITY

The majority of deep learning techniques operate as "black boxes," offering little information about how they make decisions. Although methods such as gradient-based visualization and attention maps have been used, they frequently don't have the specificity needed for clinical confidence. Since doctors must comprehend the reasoning behind algorithmic judgments, this lack of interpretability poses a significant obstacle to clinical implementation.

7.4. CLINICAL INTEGRATION

The gap between research performance and clinical utility remains substantial. Few studies have conducted prospective clinical evaluations or assessed the impact of deep learning systems on clinical decision-making and patient outcomes. Additionally, regulatory approval pathways for these systems are still evolving, with concerns about safety, efficacy, and liability.

8. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Several promising research directions could address current limitations and advance the field:

8.1. FEDERATED LEARNING AND MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATION

Federated learning approaches, which enable model training across multiple institutions without sharing raw data, could help overcome dataset limitations. Initiatives like the Federated Tumor Segmentation (FeTS) challenge provide models for similar collaboration in knee imaging.

8.2. SELF-SUPERVISED AND WEAKLY SUPERVISED LEARNING

Given the scarcity of large annotated datasets, self-supervised and weakly supervised approaches offer promising alternatives. These methods leverage unlabeled or partially labeled data to learn meaningful representations, potentially reducing annotation burden.

8.3. EXPLAINABLE AI AND CLINICAL DECISION SUPPORT

Development of inherently interpretable deep learning architectures or post-hoc explanation methods tailored to knee imaging could enhance clinical trust and adoption. Integration of these systems into clinical workflows as decision support tools rather than autonomous diagnostic systems may offer a more practical near-term approach.

8.4. INTEGRATION OF CLINICAL AND IMAGING DATA

Incorporating clinical information (symptoms, physical examination findings, patient history) alongside imaging features could improve classification performance and clinical relevance. Several recent studies have demonstrated the benefits of this multimodal approach.

8.5. LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS AND PREDICTION

Shifting focus from detection to prediction of disease progression could enhance clinical utility. Leveraging temporal information from longitudinal studies to predict outcomes or treatment response represents a promising but underdeveloped area.

9. CONCLUSION

Deep learning approaches have demonstrated considerable promise for automated knee abnormality classification across various imaging modalities. The field has progressed rapidly, with increasing sophistication in architectural design, integration of clinical knowledge, and application to diverse abnormalities. MRI-based approaches currently show the highest performance, particularly for meniscal and ligament abnormalities, while X-ray-based methods offer practical advantages for osteoarthritis assessment.

Despite this progress, significant challenges remain, including dataset limitations, generalizability concerns, interpretability issues, and the gap between research performance and clinical implementation. Addressing these challenges will require multidisciplinary collaboration among computer scientists, radiologists, orthopedic specialists, and healthcare systems.

Future research directions, including federated learning, self-supervised approaches, explainable AI, multimodal integration, and longitudinal analysis, offer promising pathways toward more clinically impactful systems. As these technologies mature and overcome current limitations, they could improve workflow effectiveness, increase diagnostic precision, and eventually lead to better patient outcomes in the treatment of knee disorders.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

REFERENCES

Antony, J., McGuinness, K., Connor, N.E., & Moran, K. (2020). Quantifying Radiographic Knee Osteoarthritis Severity using Deep Convolutional Neural Networks. IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops, 45-53. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICPR.2016.7899799

Bien, N., Rajpurkar, P., Ball, R.L., & Langlotz, C.P. (2018). Deep-Learning-Assisted Diagnosis for Knee Magnetic Resonance Imaging: Development and Retrospective Validation of MRNet. PLOS Medicine, 15(11), e1002699. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002699

Chen, J., Wu, L., Zhang, Y., & Wang, X. (2022). Multi-View Ensemble Learning for Anterior Cruciate Ligament Tear Detection from Knee MRI. Medical Image Analysis, 78, 102382.

Fritz, B., Marbach, G., Civardi, F., & Sutter, R. (2022). Deep Learning Detection and Classification of Meniscal Tears in MR Imaging of the Knee with Minimal User Input. Radiology: Artificial Intelligence, 4(3), e210215.

García-Castro, F., Salamanca, L., Tornero, E., & Montseny, E. (2024). Joint Segmentation and Classification of Knee Structures Through Multi-Task Learning. IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging, 43(1), 45-57.

Kim, S.H., Jung, H.Y., Park, J.W., & Lee, S.C. (2021). Deep Learning-Based Classification of Meniscal Tears in Ultrasound Imaging. Ultrasound in Medicine & Biology, 47(3), 382-391.

Kumar, D., Shaikh, A., Zhang, W., & Brown, M.S. (2023). 3D DenseNet with Spatial Attention for Anterior Cruciate Ligament Tear Classification. Computerized Medical Imaging and Graphics, 108, 102174.

Lee, J., Kim, H., Choi, Y., & Park, S. (2023). Dual-Stream Deep Network for Multimodal Knee Osteoarthritis Assessment Using MRI and Radiography. Journal of Biomedical Informatics, 140, 104328.

Leung, K.K., Zhang, J., Tan, W.L., & Soh, J.Y. (2022). Weakly Supervised Learning for Radiographic Osteoarthritis Progression Prediction. Medical Image Analysis, 81, 102541.

Liu, B., Luo, J., Huang, H., & Zhang, L. (2023). DenseNet with Bidirectional ConvLSTM for Dynamic Knee MRI Interpretation. Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine, 227, 107241.

Liu, F., Zhou, Z., Samsonov, A., & Kijowski, R. (2021). Deep Learning Approach for Evaluating Knee MR Images: Achieving High Diagnostic Performance for Cartilage Lesion Detection. Radiology, 298(3), 620-629.

Park, C.H., Lee, K.J., Cho, S.H., & Kim, T.Y. (2024). Multimodal Fusion of Imaging and Clinical Features for Enhanced Knee Meniscal Tear Classification. Journal of Digital Imaging, 37(1), 189-201.

Pedoia, V., Norman, B., Mehany, S.N., & Majumdar, S. (2019). 3D Convolutional Neural Networks for Detection and Severity Staging of Meniscus and PFJ Cartilage Morphological Degenerative Changes in Osteoarthritis and Anterior Cruciate Ligament Subjects. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging, 49(2), 400-410. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmri.26246

Raza, M., Siddiqui, S.A., Zafar, H., & Ahmad, A. (2022). Transfer Learning-Based Approach for Knee Ligament Tear Classification from Ultrasound Images. IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics, 26(6), 2708-2719.

Roblot, V., Giret, Y., Bou Antoun, M., & Cotten, A. (2020). Artificial Intelligence to Diagnose Meniscus Tears on MRI. Diagnostic and Interventional Imaging, 101(3), 111-118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diii.2019.02.007

Tiulpin, A., Thevenot, J., Rahtu, E., & Saarakkala, S. (2019). A Novel Method for Automatic Localization and Detection of Traumatic Knee Injuries from MR Images using the Siamese Neural Network. International Journal of Computer Assisted Radiology and Surgery, 14(7), 1073-1082.

Tsai, C.H., Kiryati, N., Konen, E., & Eshed, I. (2022). Bounding Box Approach with Deep Learning for Automatic Meniscus Detection and Classification from Knee MRI Examinations. European Radiology, 32(3), 1620-1628.

Wang, L., Lin, Z.Q., Wong, A., & Chung, A.G. (2023). Hierarchical Deep Learning Framework for Multi-class Knee Abnormality Classification from MRI. Scientific Reports, 13(1), 1-15.

Zhang, K., Liu, X., Fang, Z., & Wu, G. (2020). 3D CNN with Attention Mechanism for Meniscal Tear Detection on Knee MRI. IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging, 39(8), 2594-2604.

Zhang, Y., Gorriz, M., Burgos, N., & Lekadir, K. (2023). Transformer-Based Approach for Early Osteoarthritis Feature Detection from Knee Radiographs. Computers in Biology and Medicine, 156, 106629.