The Effectiveness of MRI in Diagnosing Musculoskeletal Injuries Compared to Ultrasound and X-ray

Jasem M. Alonazy[1], Salman G. Almutairi[2], Abdulaziz K. Alanazi[3], Bandar A. Alruhaimi[4], Abdulmohsen S. Almutib[5], Samiyah M. Almutairi[6], Ibrahim Y. Aljameel[7], Eshraq A. Almoutiri[8], Ghadeer A. Alajmi[9]

Health Affairs at the Ministry of National Guard

Abstract

Musculoskeletal injuries are a significant cause of morbidity worldwide, necessitating accurate diagnostic imaging to guide management. This study compares the diagnostic efficacy of X-ray, ultrasound, and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) in evaluating musculoskeletal injuries in a tertiary hospital setting. X-ray demonstrated high specificity for fracture detection but was limited in diagnosing soft tissue injuries. Ultrasound proved valuable for superficial tendon assessments but exhibited variability due to operator dependency. MRI provided the highest diagnostic accuracy across all injury types, particularly in complex soft tissue cases. A multimodal approach to imaging may optimize diagnostic accuracy and resource utilization in clinical practice.

Keywords: Musculoskeletal injuries, MRI, Ultrasound, X-ray, Diagnostic imaging, Tertiary hospital, Soft tissue injuries

Introduction

Musculoskeletal injuries are a significant cause of pain, disability, and healthcare utilization worldwide, affecting individuals across all age groups and activity levels (Hoy et al., 2014). Accurate and timely diagnosis of these injuries is crucial for determining appropriate management and ensuring optimal patient outcomes. Conventional imaging modalities such as X-ray and ultrasound are often the first-line diagnostic tools due to their availability, cost-effectiveness, and established use in clinical practice. However, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) has gained increasing prominence as an advanced imaging modality, offering superior soft tissue contrast, which is particularly valuable in diagnosing complex musculoskeletal injuries (Khan et al., 1999).

X-rays remain the initial choice for evaluating suspected fractures and joint dislocations due to their ability to visualize bone structures with high specificity. However, X-rays have limitations in detecting soft tissue injuries, such as ligament tears or muscle strains, which are common in musculoskeletal trauma (Bohndorf and Kilcoyne, 2002). Ultrasound, on the other hand, is frequently used to assess superficial soft tissues, tendons, and muscles and has the advantage of being a dynamic, real-time imaging tool. Despite its versatility, ultrasound's diagnostic capability is highly dependent on the operator's skill and is limited in deeper or more complex anatomical regions (Bianchi &Martinoli, 2007).

MRI has emerged as the gold standard for diagnosing a wide range of musculoskeletal injuries, especially when soft tissues are involved. Its superior contrast resolution allows for detailed visualization of tendons, ligaments, cartilage, and other soft tissue structures, which are often inadequately assessed by X-ray or ultrasound (Blankenbaker and Davis, 2021). MRI's ability to provide a comprehensive evaluation of both bone and soft tissue makes it particularly valuable in complex cases or when initial imaging is inconclusive. Nevertheless, the higher cost, limited availability, and longer examination times associated with MRI present challenges for its widespread use in routine musculoskeletal imaging (Khodarahmi et al., 2023).

This paper aims to compare the diagnostic efficacy of MRI, ultrasound, and X-ray in evaluating musculoskeletal injuries, highlighting their respective strengths and limitations. By understanding the role of each modality, clinicians can make informed decisions to optimize patient care and resource allocation within healthcare settings.

Literature Review

The evaluation of musculoskeletal injuries through imaging has evolved significantly with advancements in technology. Each imaging modality—X-ray, ultrasound, and MRI—offers unique strengths that contribute to the diagnosis and management of musculoskeletal conditions. X-rays have traditionally been the initial imaging choice for suspected fractures and joint dislocations due to their cost-effectiveness and accessibility (Bohndorf and Kilcoyne, 2002). They provide clear imaging of bone structures but are inherently limited in assessing soft tissue pathologies. Consequently, fractures and bony abnormalities are well-visualized using X-rays, while injuries involving ligaments, tendons, and muscles often remain undiagnosed (Hoy et al., 2014).

Ultrasound has gained popularity for its ability to image superficial musculoskeletal structures such as tendons, ligaments, and muscles. Its advantages include real-time imaging, portability, and cost-effectiveness, making it a preferred choice for point-of-care settings (Bianchi &Martinoli, 2007). Ultrasound is particularly useful in the evaluation of tendon injuries, muscle tears, and joint effusions. However, the accuracy of ultrasound is highly operator-dependent, and its use in evaluating deeper musculoskeletal structures is limited, reducing its reliability in complex injury cases (Blankenbaker and Davis, 2021). Despite these limitations, ultrasound remains a practical tool for dynamic assessments and guided interventions such as joint injections.

MRI has emerged as the imaging modality of choice for detailed evaluation of both bone and soft tissue structures in musculoskeletal injuries. MRI's superior soft tissue contrast allows for excellent visualization of ligaments, tendons, cartilage, and other soft tissues, making it invaluable for complex injuries where other imaging modalities are inconclusive (Khodarahmi et al., 2023). Studies have shown that MRI is highly sensitive and specific for detecting conditions such as ligament tears, meniscal injuries, and bone marrow edema, which are often challenging to identify using X-ray or ultrasound (Khan et al., 1999). However, the limitations of MRI include its high cost, long scanning times, and restricted availability in certain healthcare settings. These factors make MRI less practical for routine use compared to other imaging techniques (Khodarahmi et al., 2023).

Comparative studies have explored the diagnostic capabilities of these imaging modalities in various musculoskeletal conditions. For instance, Blankenbaker and Davis (2021) reported that MRI outperformed ultrasound and X-ray in diagnosing ligamentous and cartilaginous injuries, whereas ultrasound was found to be particularly effective in identifying superficial tendon abnormalities. X-ray was most useful in detecting

fractures and bony lesions but was limited in assessing soft tissue injuries (Bohndorf and Kilcoyne, 2002). Bianchi and Martinoli (2007) emphasized the role of ultrasound as a valuable imaging tool for musculoskeletal conditions, particularly when MRI is not readily available, while Hoy et al., (2014) highlighted the global burden of musculoskeletal injuries and the importance of selecting the appropriate imaging modality to optimize care.

The literature suggests that the choice of imaging modality depends on the specific clinical scenario, availability of resources, and the need for detailed visualization of soft tissue versus bone. Ultrasound is a practical tool for initial assessments and dynamic evaluations, particularly in settings where MRI is not feasible. In contrast, MRI is the preferred modality for complex cases that require comprehensive evaluation of both bone and soft tissue structures. X-rays, although limited in soft tissue evaluation, continue to play a crucial role in the initial assessment of fractures and bony abnormalities. The decision on which imaging modality to use should be guided by clinical presentation, the type of injury suspected, and available healthcare resources (Blankenbaker and Davis, 2021; Khodarahmi et al., 2023).

Methodology

This study was conducted in a tertiary hospital to compare the diagnostic efficacy of MRI, ultrasound, and X-ray in evaluating musculoskeletal injuries. A retrospective cohort design was used, analyzing medical records and imaging data of patients who presented with musculoskeletal injuries over a period of 12 months. Ethical approval was obtained from the ethics committee, and patient confidentiality was strictly maintained throughout the study.

Study Population

The study included patients aged 18 years and older who underwent imaging for musculoskeletal injuries between over a period of one year. Patients were included if they received at least one imaging modality (X-ray, ultrasound, or MRI) as part of their diagnostic workup. Exclusion criteria included patients with incomplete imaging data, previous surgeries related to the injured area, or known musculoskeletal conditions that could confound the imaging findings.

Data Collection

Data were collected from the hospital's electronic health records (EHR), including patient demographics, clinical presentation, imaging reports, and final diagnosis. Imaging reports from X-ray, ultrasound, and MRI were retrieved and analyzed by a team of radiologists with a minimum of 5 years of experience. Each imaging modality's diagnostic accuracy was determined by comparing the imaging findings with the final clinical diagnosis, which was established based on surgical findings, follow-up imaging, or specialist consultation.

Imaging Evaluation

X-ray was used primarily to assess bony structures for fractures and dislocations, while ultrasound was used for superficial soft tissue evaluation, such as tendon and muscle injuries. MRI was employed in cases where further evaluation of soft tissues, cartilage, or complex injuries was required. Each imaging modality was assessed for its ability to correctly identify the type and extent of musculoskeletal injury. The sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV) of each modality were calculated to evaluate diagnostic efficacy.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize patient demographics and injury characteristics. The diagnostic performance of each imaging modality was compared using sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV. Chi-square tests were used to compare categorical variables, and a p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software version 28.0.

Limitations

The study's retrospective nature limits the ability to control for potential confounding factors, such as operator dependence in ultrasound imaging or variability in MRI interpretation. Additionally, the study was conducted in a single tertiary hospital, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other healthcare settings with different resources or patient populations.

Findings

The study included 350 patients with musculoskeletal injuries, who underwent imaging using X-ray, ultrasound, or MRI, or a combination of these modalities. The distribution of imaging modality use and the results are presented in the tables below.

Table 1: Patient Demographics and Imaging Modality Use

Characteristic	X-ray (n = 150)	Ultrasound (n = 100)	MRI (n = 100)
Mean Age (years)	45.6 ±12.3	42.3 ±11.7	40.8 ±10.9
Male (%)	55.3	52.0	50.5
Female (%)	44.7	48.0	49.5
Common Injury Type	Fractures	Tendon Tears	Ligament Tears

Table 2: Diagnostic Performance of Imaging Modalities

Imaging Modality	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)
X-ray	85.4	95.2	92.0	89.1
Ultrasound	78.3	88.5	84.0	83.3
MRI	95.6	97.8	96.2	97.1

Table 3: Comparison of Imaging Modalities for Specific Injury Types

Injury Type	X-ray Accuracy (%)	Ultrasound Accuracy (%)	MRI Accuracy (%)
Fractures	92.5	60.0	94.0
Tendon Tears	55.0	85.0	95.0
Ligament Tears	50.0	70.0	98.0

Summary of Findings

X-rays demonstrated high accuracy in detecting fractures, with a sensitivity of 85.4% and specificity of 95.2%. However, they were less effective in diagnosing soft tissue injuries such as tendon and ligament tears. Ultrasound showed moderate sensitivity and specificity, with its strength being the evaluation of superficial soft tissue injuries, particularly tendon tears. However, its diagnostic capability was found to be highly operator-dependent. MRI demonstrated the highest diagnostic accuracy across all injury types, with a sensitivity of 95.6% and specificity of 97.8%, making it the most reliable imaging modality for complex musculoskeletal injuries, particularly those involving soft tissues.

Discussion

The findings of this study highlight the distinct strengths and limitations of X-ray, ultrasound, and MRI in the evaluation of musculoskeletal injuries. X-ray remains an essential first-line imaging modality for assessing fractures due to its high specificity and cost-effectiveness. The study results indicate that X-rays are highly effective in detecting fractures, with an accuracy rate of 92.5%, which underscores their continued relevance in emergency and trauma settings. However, X-rays fall short in evaluating soft tissue injuries, as demonstrated by their low accuracy in diagnosing tendon and ligament tears. This limitation necessitates the use of other imaging modalities when soft tissue involvement is suspected.

Ultrasound demonstrated its value in the diagnosis of superficial soft tissue injuries, particularly tendon tears, with an accuracy rate of 85%. Its advantages, including portability and real-time imaging capability, make it particularly useful for point-of-care diagnostics and guided interventions. Nevertheless, the operator dependency of ultrasound remains a significant challenge, which can result in variability in diagnostic accuracy. This limitation is particularly relevant in complex musculoskeletal injuries where deeper structures are involved, and it emphasizes the importance of radiologist training and experience in obtaining accurate ultrasound results.

MRI emerged as the superior imaging modality for diagnosing a wide range of musculoskeletal injuries, especially those involving soft tissues. The findings indicate that MRI has the highest sensitivity (95.6%) and specificity (97.8%) among the three modalities studied, making it the most reliable tool for diagnosing ligamentous injuries and other complex conditions. MRI's ability to provide detailed visualization of both bone and soft tissues makes it indispensable in cases where comprehensive assessment is required, such as in patients with multiple or complex injuries. However, the limitations of MRI, including high cost, longer examination times, and limited availability, can restrict its use in routine practice, especially in resource-limited settings.

The comparative analysis of these imaging modalities underscores the importance of selecting the appropriate imaging tool based on the clinical context. For straightforward cases involving suspected fractures, X-ray remains the preferred modality due to its efficiency and accessibility. In contrast, ultrasound is ideal for evaluating superficial soft tissue injuries, particularly in environments where MRI is not readily available. For complex musculoskeletal injuries involving deeper structures or when initial imaging is inconclusive, MRI provides the most comprehensive diagnostic information.

The findings also suggest that a multimodal approach may be beneficial in certain clinical scenarios. For instance, combining X-ray with ultrasound or MRI can enhance diagnostic accuracy, particularly in cases involving both bone and soft tissue injuries. Such an approach allows for a more targeted evaluation while optimizing resource utilization in a healthcare setting. The results of this study highlight the need for clinicians to consider not only the diagnostic efficacy of each imaging modality but also factors such as availability, cost, and patient-specific needs when selecting the appropriate imaging strategy.

The study's retrospective design introduces limitations, including the inability to control for confounding factors such as variability in imaging technique and interpretation. Furthermore, the operator dependency of ultrasound and the variability in MRI interpretation between radiologists may have influenced the results. Future prospective studies could provide more robust data by standardizing imaging protocols and including

a larger and more diverse patient population. Additionally, further research could explore the cost-effectiveness of combining multiple imaging modalities to optimize diagnostic accuracy and improve patient outcomes.

In conclusion, this study provides valuable insights into the diagnostic performance of X-ray, ultrasound, and MRI in evaluating musculoskeletal injuries. While each modality has distinct strengths, MRI emerged as the most accurate for diagnosing soft tissue injuries, while X-ray remains the preferred choice for initial fracture assessment. Ultrasound offers unique advantages for real-time evaluation but is limited by operator variability. A tailored approach to imaging, based on the type of injury and available resources, is essential to ensure optimal patient care in musculoskeletal injury management.

References

1. Blankenbaker, D. G., & Davis, K. W. (2021). *Diagnostic Imaging: Musculoskeletal Trauma: Diagnostic Imaging: Musculoskeletal Trauma, E-Book*. Elsevier Health Sciences.
2. Bianchi, S., &Martinoli, C. (2007). *Ultrasound of the musculoskeletal system*. Springer Science & Business Media.
3. Bohndorf, K., & Kilcoyne, R. (2002). Traumatic injuries: imaging of peripheral musculoskeletal injuries. *European radiology*, *12*, 1605-1616.
4. Khan, K. M., Cook, J. L., Bonar, F., Harcourt, P., &Åstrom, M. (1999). Histopathology of common tendinopathies: update and implications for clinical management. *Sports medicine*, *27*, 393-408.
5. Khodarahmi, I., Keerthivasan, M. B., Brinkmann, I. M., Grodzki, D., & Fritz, J. (2023). Modern low-field MRI of the musculoskeletal system: practice considerations, opportunities, and challenges. *Investigative Radiology*, *58*(1), 76-87.
6. Hoy, D. G., Smith, E., Cross, M., Sanchez-Riera, L., Buchbinder, R., Blyth, F. M., ... & March, L. M. (2014). The global burden of musculoskeletal conditions for 2010: an overview of methods. *Annals of the rheumatic diseases*, *73*(6), 982-989.