IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS)
e-ISSN: 2279-0853, p-ISSN: 2279-0861.Volume 24, Issue 9 Ser.4 (September 2025), PP 64-72
www.iosrjournals.org

Diagnostic Accuracy of Ultrasonography for Knee Pathologies: A Comparative Study with Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Dr. Harish C.H.
Junior Resident, Department of Radiodiagnosis, Ramaiah Medical College, Bangalore, India.

Dr. Anand K.
(Corresponding Author)
Professor, Department of Radiodiagnosis, Ramaiah Medical College, Bangalore, India.

Abstract
Background: *Knee pathology assessment traditionally relies on magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), but ultrasonography (USG) offers a cost-effective, accessible alternative. However, comprehensive comparative data on diagnostic accuracy remains limited.*
Objectives: *To evaluate the diagnostic accuracy of ultrasonography compared to MRI for knee pathology assessment and determine correlation between findings from both imaging modalities.*
Methods: *This descriptive study included 30 patients (mean age 39.0±10.2 years, 66.7% male) with clinically suspected knee pathologies. All patients underwent both USG and MRI examinations. USG was performed using high-frequency linear transducers (7-18 MHz) by an experienced radiologist blinded to MRI findings. Diagnostic accuracy parameters including sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, negative predictive value, and overall accuracy were calculated. Cohen's kappa coefficient assessed inter-rater agreement.*
Results: *USG demonstrated moderate performance for intra-articular structures: MCL (57.1% sensitivity, 69.6% specificity, 66.7% accuracy), medial meniscus (62.5% sensitivity, 63.6% specificity, 63.3% accuracy), and lateral meniscus (60.0% sensitivity, 68.0% specificity, 66.7% accuracy). LCL showed superior performance (66.7% sensitivity, 96.3% specificity, 93.3% accuracy). Perfect concordance (100% sensitivity, specificity, accuracy) was achieved for joint effusion and Baker's cyst. Overall diagnostic accuracy was 71.4% with fair agreement (κ=0.368).*
Conclusion: *Ultrasonography achieves moderate diagnostic performance for accessible knee structures with exceptional capability for fluid detection. While USG demonstrates limitations for intra-articular pathology evaluation, it serves as a valuable complementary tool when appropriately integrated within structured diagnostic algorithms.*
Keywords: *Ultrasonography, Magnetic Resonance Imaging, Knee Pathology, Diagnostic Accuracy, Meniscal Tears, Collateral Ligaments*

I. Introduction

The knee joint represents one of the most complex and frequently injured anatomical structures in the human body, bearing substantial mechanical stress during both routine activities and athletic endeavors (1). Its intricate architecture, comprising multiple ligaments, menisci, articular surfaces, and supporting musculature, must function in perfect harmony to maintain stability and mobility. The vulnerability of the knee stems from its position between the body's two longest lever arms—the femur and tibia—and its reliance on soft tissue structures rather than bony congruity for stability (2). As a weight-bearing joint with minimal inherent osseous stability, the knee depends heavily on its ligamentous and meniscal structures to maintain proper biomechanical function while accommodating complex movements in multiple planes.

The burden of knee pathologies extends beyond individual suffering to create substantial socioeconomic impact through healthcare costs, lost productivity, and decreased quality of life. Epidemiological studies indicate that knee injuries account for approximately 15-50% of all sports injuries, with millions of patients seeking medical attention annually for knee-related complaints worldwide (3). The increasing participation in recreational and competitive sports, coupled with an aging population susceptible to degenerative conditions, has led to a rising incidence of knee disorders. Recent data from the Global Burden of Disease Study demonstrates that knee osteoarthritis alone affects over 250 million people globally, representing a 63% increase in prevalence over the past three decades (4).

Magnetic resonance imaging has established itself as the gold standard for comprehensive evaluation of knee joint pathologies due to its superior soft tissue contrast resolution and multiplanar capabilities (5). MRI provides exceptional visualization of both superficial and deep knee structures, including ligaments, menisci, cartilage, and bone marrow, with reported sensitivity and specificity exceeding 90% for most intra-articular pathologies (6). The ability to obtain detailed anatomical information without ionizing radiation has positioned MRI as the preferred imaging modality for knee assessment in most clinical scenarios.

However, despite its diagnostic advantages, MRI presents several limitations that impact its widespread utilization. The high cost of MRI examinations, ranging from $1,000 to $3,000 per study in many healthcare systems, creates significant financial barriers for patients and healthcare providers (7). Limited availability, particularly in resource-constrained settings and developing countries, further restricts access to this technology. Additionally, MRI examinations often involve lengthy scheduling delays, with average waiting times exceeding two weeks in many healthcare systems, potentially postponing diagnosis and subsequent treatment initiation (8). Contraindications including certain implanted medical devices, claustrophobia affecting up to 15% of patients, and the time-consuming nature of examinations (typically 30-45 minutes) further limit MRI utilization.

Ultrasonography has emerged as a promising alternative diagnostic tool for evaluating knee pathologies. As a modality that uses high-frequency sound waves to generate real-time images, ultrasonography offers several distinct advantages over MRI. The cost-effectiveness of ultrasonography, typically 80-90% less expensive than MRI, makes it accessible to a broader patient population (9). The wider availability of ultrasound equipment, even in resource-limited settings, facilitates immediate examination in clinical settings, emergency departments, or sports facilities. The portable nature of modern ultrasound systems enables point-of-care applications, providing immediate diagnostic information that can guide clinical decision-making without delays associated with scheduled imaging.

Technological advancements in ultrasonography equipment have significantly enhanced image resolution and diagnostic capabilities. High-frequency linear transducers (7-18 MHz) now provide axial resolution of 200-300 microns and lateral resolution of 450-600 microns, approaching the detail level of MRI for superficial structures (10). The development of advanced imaging techniques including tissue harmonic imaging, compound imaging, and elastography has further expanded the diagnostic potential of ultrasonography in musculoskeletal applications. Moreover, the real-time dynamic assessment capability of ultrasonography provides functional information not available with static imaging modalities, allowing evaluation of structures during movement and stress testing.

Despite these advantages, the diagnostic utility of ultrasonography in knee pathologies has been subject to debate. Historical limitations included restricted assessment of deeper structures such as cruciate ligaments and the central portions of menisci, operator dependency, and variable diagnostic accuracy across different pathologies (11). Recent literature has reported variable accuracy of ultrasonography in diagnosing different knee pathologies, with sensitivities ranging from 57.9% to 97.5% and specificities from 83.3% to 97.6%, depending on the specific structure being examined and the expertise of the operator.

Several systematic reviews and meta-analyses have explored the diagnostic performance of ultrasonography for knee pathologies. A comprehensive meta-analysis by Wang et al., including 1,192 patients from 11 studies, reported pooled sensitivity of 84.4% and specificity of 90.3% for ultrasonography in diagnosing anterior cruciate ligament tears (12). For meniscal pathology, Dai et al. conducted a meta-analysis of seven prospective studies encompassing 551 patients, demonstrating pooled sensitivity of 88% and specificity of 90% for ultrasonography in detecting meniscal injuries (13). These findings suggest that ultrasonography may have greater diagnostic capability than previously recognized, particularly when performed by experienced operators using modern equipment.

The correlation between ultrasonography and MRI findings in knee pathologies represents a critical area of investigation. Understanding this relationship can help establish the appropriate role of ultrasonography in the diagnostic algorithm for knee disorders and potentially enable more efficient utilization of healthcare resources. Cook et al. prospectively compared ultrasonography and MRI for meniscal assessment in 60 patients with acute knee injuries, demonstrating no significant difference in overall diagnostic accuracy between the two modalities (14). Similarly, for collateral ligament injuries, studies have demonstrated substantial agreement between ultrasonography and MRI findings, with accuracy rates approaching 94% for complete tears.

The integration of ultrasonography into clinical practice for knee evaluation depends not only on its standalone diagnostic accuracy but also on its correlation with the established gold standard, MRI. If ultrasonography can reliably detect certain knee pathologies with accuracy comparable to MRI, it could serve as an initial screening tool, reserving MRI for cases with equivocal findings or suspected deep structural involvement. This approach could potentially reduce diagnostic costs, decrease waiting times, and improve overall patient care efficiency. Recent health economic analyses suggest that implementing ultrasonography as a first-line imaging modality for appropriate knee pathologies could reduce imaging costs by up to 60% while maintaining diagnostic accuracy above 85% for most accessible structures (15).

The present study aims to evaluate the diagnostic accuracy of ultrasonography for various knee pathologies and determine its correlation with MRI findings in a clinical setting. By systematically examining the performance of ultrasonography across different knee structures and pathologies, this research seeks to define the optimal role of ultrasonography in the diagnostic algorithm for knee disorders. Understanding the specific strengths and limitations of ultrasonography compared to MRI will enable clinicians to make evidence-based decisions regarding imaging modality selection, potentially optimizing both diagnostic accuracy and resource utilization in the evaluation of knee pathologies.

II. Aims and Objectives

The primary objective of this study was to evaluate the diagnostic accuracy of ultrasonography in detecting various knee pathologies when compared to magnetic resonance imaging as the reference standard. The secondary objective was to determine the correlation between knee pathologies identified through ultrasonography and those detected by magnetic resonance imaging, with specific focus on meniscal injuries, collateral ligament pathologies, and associated findings including joint effusion and Baker's cysts.

III. Materials and Methods

Study Design and Setting

This descriptive study was conducted from May 2023 to January 2025 at the Department of Radiodiagnosis, M.S. Ramaiah Hospitals, Bangalore, India. The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee (Reference: EC/2023/45), and all procedures were performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and good clinical practice guidelines.

Study Population

The study population consisted of patients presenting to the Department of Radiodiagnosis with clinically suspected knee pathologies who underwent both ultrasonography and magnetic resonance imaging examinations. Consecutive sampling technique was employed to enroll patients meeting the eligibility criteria during the study period.

Sample Size Calculation

Sample size was calculated based on a previous study by Singh et al., which observed sensitivities of 78.2%, 84.6%, and 84.6% for detecting anterior cruciate ligament, medial collateral ligament, and lateral collateral ligament injuries, respectively. Expecting similar results with a 95% confidence level and 15% relative precision, a minimum of 30 subjects were required. The formula used was: $n = (Z^2\alpha/2 \times p \times q)/d^2$, where $Z\alpha/2 = 1.96$ (standard normal deviate for 95% confidence level), p = expected sensitivity (78.2%), q = 1-p (21.8%), and d = relative precision (15% of p = 11.73%).

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion criteria comprised patients above 18 years of age with knee pathologies detected by both ultrasonography and magnetic resonance imaging who provided informed consent for participation. Exclusion criteria included patients with prior history of knee surgery, knee joint surface abnormalities preventing ultrasonographic examination (including ulcers, lipomas, diffuse subcutaneous tissue edema, and surgical staples or sutures), patients with limited range of knee joint movement, and those diagnosed with benign or malignant neoplasms of the knee.

Clinical Assessment Protocol

After obtaining written informed consent, all subjects underwent comprehensive clinical evaluation. Demographic information including age, gender, and occupation was documented. Clinical history encompassed mechanism of injury (traumatic/sports-related, degenerative, or occupational), duration of symptoms (categorized as acute: <1 week, subacute: 1-4 weeks, subchronic: 1-6 months, or chronic: >6 months), and presenting symptoms including pain location, swelling, mechanical symptoms, and functional limitations. Physical examination findings were systematically recorded using standardized data collection forms.

Ultrasonography Examination Protocol

Ultrasonographic examinations were performed using high-resolution equipment including VOLUSON E8 and E10 (Wipro GE) with SP10-16-D wide band linear transducer (frequency 7-18 MHz) and PHILIPS AFFINITI 70G with L12-3 wide band linear transducer (frequency 3-12 MHz). All examinations were conducted by a single radiologist with more than five years of experience in musculoskeletal ultrasonography who remained blinded to MRI findings throughout the study period.

Patients were examined in supine position with the knee flexed at 20-30 degrees for most structures, with specific modifications for certain anatomical regions. For medial compartment evaluation, the patient's leg was rotated externally with slight knee flexion, allowing visualization of the medial collateral ligament as a two-layered structure and the medial meniscus as a hyperechoic wedge-shaped reflective structure. Lateral compartment examination required internal leg rotation while maintaining slight flexion, facilitating assessment of the lateral collateral ligament and lateral meniscus. Each structure was evaluated in at least two perpendicular planes (longitudinal and transverse) to avoid anisotropy artifacts and comprehensively assess three-dimensional anatomy.

Magnetic Resonance Imaging Protocol

MRI examinations were performed using a Siemens Avanto 18-channel 1.5 Tesla unit with dedicated knee coil. The standardized imaging protocol consisted of coronal T2 fat suppression and proton density weighted sequences, sagittal T1, proton density, and gradient echo sequences, axial proton density fat suppression sequence, and coronal 3D proton density SPACE sequence. All MRI examinations were interpreted by a radiologist with more than ten years of experience in musculoskeletal MRI who remained blinded to ultrasonography findings.

IV. Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were summarized as mean ± standard deviation for continuous variables and frequencies with percentages for categorical variables. Diagnostic accuracy of ultrasonography compared to MRI (reference standard) was assessed using sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, negative predictive value, and overall accuracy. The correlation between ultrasonography and MRI findings was evaluated using Cohen's kappa coefficient, interpreted as: <0.20 (poor agreement), 0.21-0.40 (fair agreement), 0.41-0.60 (moderate agreement), 0.61-0.80 (substantial agreement), and >0.80 (almost perfect agreement). McNemar's test assessed systematic bias between diagnostic methods. Chi-square test evaluated categorical variables, while Mann-Whitney U test compared continuous variables between groups. Kruskal-Wallis test assessed differences across multiple groups. Statistical significance was set at $p<0.05$. All analyses were performed using SPSS version 26.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA).

V. Results

Table 1: Demographic and Clinical Characteristics of Study Population (n=30)

Parameter	Value	Percentage
Age (years)		
Mean ± SD	39.0 ± 10.2	-
18-30	8	26.7%
31-40	8	26.7%
41-50	9	30.0%
>50	5	16.7%
Gender		
Male	20	66.7%
Female	10	33.3%
Side Affected		
Right	16	53.3%
Left	14	46.7%
Symptom Duration		
<1 week	7	23.3%
1-4 weeks	9	30.0%
1-6 months	10	33.3%
>6 months	4	13.3%
Mechanism of Injury		
Traumatic/Sports	20	66.7%
Degenerative	6	20.0%
Occupational	4	13.3%

The study population demonstrated a mean age of 39.0 ± 10.2 years with relatively uniform distribution across age categories. Male predominance was observed with a 2:1 male-to-female ratio ($\chi^2 = 3.33$, $p = 0.068$). Right knee involvement occurred in 53.3% of cases versus left knee in 46.7%, indicating no significant laterality bias. The majority of patients presented with subchronic symptoms (1-6 months: 33.3%), followed by subacute presentations (1-4 weeks: 30.0%). Traumatic/sports-related injuries constituted the predominant mechanism (66.7%), consistent with the demographic profile of the study population.

Table 2: Diagnostic Performance of Ultrasonography for Individual Knee Structures

Structure	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	Accuracy (%)	Kappa (95% CI)
MCL	57.1	69.6	40.0	82.1	66.7	0.254 (0.032-0.476)
LCL	66.7	96.3	66.7	96.3	93.3	0.650 (0.198-1.000)
Medial Meniscus	62.5	63.6	55.6	70.0	63.3	0.258 (0.026-0.490)
Lateral Meniscus	60.0	68.0	37.5	85.0	66.7	0.246 (0.003-0.489)
Joint Effusion	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	1.000 (1.000-1.000)
Baker's Cyst	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	1.000 (1.000-1.000)

Ultrasonography demonstrated variable diagnostic performance across different knee structures. For medial collateral ligament assessment, sensitivity was 57.1% with specificity of 69.6%, yielding an overall accuracy of 66.7%. The lateral collateral ligament showed superior performance with 66.7% sensitivity and excellent specificity of 96.3%, achieving 93.3% overall accuracy. Meniscal evaluation revealed moderate performance, with medial meniscus demonstrating 62.5% sensitivity and 63.6% specificity, while lateral meniscus showed 60.0% sensitivity and 68.0% specificity. Notably, ultrasonography achieved perfect concordance with MRI for joint effusion and Baker's cyst detection, with 100% sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy for both findings.

Table 3: Analysis of Discordant Cases Between Ultrasonography and MRI

Structure	Total Discordant n (%)	False Positives n (%)	False Negatives n (%)	Error Pattern
MCL	10 (33.3%)	7 (23.3%)	3 (10.0%)	USG overdiagnosis
LCL	2 (6.7%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)	Balanced
Medial Meniscus	11 (36.7%)	8 (26.7%)	3 (10.0%)	USG overdiagnosis
Lateral Meniscus	10 (33.3%)	8 (26.7%)	2 (6.7%)	USG overdiagnosis
Associated Findings	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	Perfect concordance
Overall	33 (18.3%)	24 (13.3%)	9 (5.0%)	Liberal bias

Analysis of discordant cases revealed a systematic pattern of liberal diagnostic bias in ultrasonographic assessment. The overall discordance rate was 18.3%, with false positives (13.3%) significantly exceeding false negatives (5.0%), indicating a tendency toward overdiagnosis. McNemar's test showed no statistically significant systematic bias for individual structures (MCL: p=0.219, LCL: p=1.000, medial meniscus: p=0.754, lateral meniscus: p=0.388), though the overall pattern suggests ultrasonography tends to overinterpret normal variants or inflammatory changes as pathological findings.

Table 4: Performance Analysis by Abnormality Type

Structure	Abnormality Type	USG Detection	MRI Detection	Agreement (%)	p-value
MCL					
	Complete tear	2	3	66.7%	0.317
	Partial tear	9	4	44.4%	0.046
LCL					
	Complete tear	1	1	100.0%	1.000
	Partial tear	1	2	50.0%	0.317
Medial Meniscus					
	Tear	2	4	50.0%	0.157
	Extrusion	2	2	100.0%	1.000
	Degeneration	1	2	50.0%	0.317
Lateral Meniscus					
	Tear	1	2	50.0%	0.317

Structure	Abnormality Type	USG Detection	MRI Detection	Agreement (%)	p-value
	Extrusion	2	2	100.0%	1.000
	Degeneration	0	1	0.0%	0.317

Subtype analysis revealed important patterns in ultrasonography's diagnostic capabilities. Perfect agreement (100%) was achieved for meniscal extrusion detection in both medial and lateral compartments, representing a significant finding given the clinical importance of extrusion in joint mechanics and prognosis. Complete ligamentous tears showed better detection rates than partial tears, with MCL partial tears demonstrating particularly poor agreement (44.4%, p=0.046). Degenerative meniscal changes presented significant diagnostic challenges, with 50% agreement for medial meniscus and 0% for lateral meniscus degeneration.

Table 5: Age and Duration Stratified Diagnostic Performance

Parameter	Category	n	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Accuracy (%)	p-value
Age Groups						
	18-30 years	8	71.4	76.9	75.0	Reference
	31-40 years	8	66.7	72.7	70.8	0.542
	41-50 years	9	61.5	69.2	66.7	0.388
	>50 years	5	55.6	66.7	60.0	0.285
Symptom Duration						
	<4 weeks (Acute)	16	70.6	77.8	75.0	Reference
	>4 weeks (Chronic)	14	60.0	68.8	64.3	0.089

Age-stratified analysis demonstrated declining ultrasonographic performance with advancing age. The youngest group (18-30 years) achieved the highest diagnostic accuracy at 75.0%, progressively declining to 60.0% in patients over 50 years. This age-related decline likely reflects increasing pathological complexity and tissue changes affecting acoustic penetration. Temporal analysis revealed superior performance in acute presentations (<4 weeks) with 75.0% accuracy compared to 64.3% in chronic cases (>4 weeks), though this difference approached but did not reach statistical significance (p=0.089).

Statistical analysis confirmed no significant systematic bias between ultrasonography and MRI for individual structure assessments. Chi-square analysis of injury mechanism distribution was highly significant (χ^2=18.47, p=0.001), indicating meaningful differences in pathology patterns across mechanism types. Kruskal-Wallis testing showed no significant accuracy differences across age groups (H=3.42, p=0.331), though numerical trends suggested declining performance with age. Mann-Whitney U tests revealed no significant differences in age distribution between genders (U=78.5, p=0.285) or symptom duration effects (U=92.0, p=0.451).

VI. Discussion

This comprehensive evaluation of 30 patients provides important insights into the diagnostic performance of ultrasonography for knee pathology assessment compared to magnetic resonance imaging as the reference standard. Our findings demonstrate that while ultrasonography achieves moderate diagnostic performance for most intra-articular structures, it excels in specific applications including fluid detection and meniscal extrusion assessment, supporting its role as a complementary rather than replacement modality for knee evaluation.

The moderate diagnostic performance observed for collateral ligament assessment in our study, with MCL achieving 57.1% sensitivity and 69.6% specificity, contrasts with several previous investigations reporting superior accuracy. Cook et al. demonstrated MCL assessment sensitivity of 84.6% in their prospective study of 60 patients with acute knee injuries, though their exclusive focus on acute presentations may account for the performance difference (14). The discrepancy highlights the importance of patient selection and timing of examination, as our study included 46.7% of patients with chronic presentations where tissue remodeling and secondary changes complicate ultrasonographic interpretation. Shetty et al. reported intermediate performance with 78% sensitivity for MCL tears, suggesting that technical factors and operator experience significantly influence diagnostic accuracy.

The superior performance of lateral collateral ligament assessment in our study, with 93.3% overall accuracy despite moderate sensitivity (66.7%), aligns with the excellent specificity observed (96.3%). This high specificity indicates that when ultrasonography identifies LCL pathology, the finding is highly reliable, though the moderate sensitivity suggests potential for missed diagnoses. The substantial inter-rater agreement (κ=0.650) for LCL assessment, the highest among ligamentous structures evaluated, supports the reliability of ultrasonographic evaluation when pathology is detected.

Our finding of moderate performance for meniscal assessment, with sensitivities of 62.5% for medial and 60.0% for lateral meniscus, appears lower than several meta-analyses reporting pooled sensitivities exceeding 80%. Dai et al.'s comprehensive meta-analysis of 551 patients reported pooled sensitivity of 88% and specificity of 90% for ultrasonography in detecting meniscal injuries (13). However, our discovery of perfect concordance (100% agreement) for meniscal extrusion detection represents a clinically significant finding not emphasized in previous studies. Meniscal extrusion, defined as displacement of meniscal tissue beyond the tibial margin, has important implications for joint biomechanics, symptom severity, and prognosis. Nogueira-Barbosa et al. specifically validated ultrasound assessment of medial meniscal extrusion, demonstrating excellent correlation with MRI and supporting our findings. The ability to accurately detect meniscal extrusion using ultrasonography provides immediate assessment capability for this important pathological pattern that influences treatment decisions and prognostic counseling.

The exceptional performance of ultrasonography for associated findings, with perfect concordance for both joint effusion and Baker's cyst detection, strongly supports established literature regarding ultrasonography's superiority for fluid detection. Our 100% sensitivity and specificity for effusion detection among 22 cases (73.3% prevalence) confirms ultrasonography as the gold standard for this assessment. Mandl et al. extensively validated ultrasonography for knee effusion assessment, demonstrating that ultrasound can detect as little as 2-3 ml of intra-articular fluid, superior to both clinical examination and comparable to MRI. This exceptional capability for fluid detection represents a clear clinical advantage, providing immediate, cost-effective assessment without the delays and expense associated with MRI.

The identification of a liberal diagnostic bias in our study, with false positive rates (13.3%) exceeding false negatives (5.0%), has important clinical implications differing from some previous reports. This tendency toward overdiagnosis may reflect challenges in differentiating pathological findings from normal anatomical variants and inflammatory changes on ultrasonography. The systematic overdiagnosis pattern for intra-articular structures, contrasting with perfect concordance for fluid-related pathology, highlights the fundamental technical limitations of ultrasonography in complex anatomical environments. This finding supports implementation of structured diagnostic algorithms where ultrasonography serves as an excellent initial assessment tool for specific indications, with MRI reserved for comprehensive intra-articular evaluation when clinical suspicion remains high despite negative or equivocal ultrasonographic findings.

Our age-stratified analysis revealing declining ultrasonographic performance with advancing age provides novel insights not extensively addressed in previous literature. The progressive decline from 75.0% accuracy in the 18-30 years group to 60.0% in patients over 50 years likely reflects increasing pathological complexity, development of secondary degenerative changes, and age-related tissue alterations affecting acoustic penetration and interpretation. Englund et al. demonstrated that incidental meniscal findings on MRI increase significantly with age, reaching 36% in asymptomatic individuals over 70 years, which may contribute to the diagnostic challenges observed in older patients. The preserved perfect performance for fluid detection across all age groups confirms that ultrasonography's fundamental capabilities for specific findings remain age-independent.

The temporal patterns observed in our study, with superior performance in acute presentations (<4 weeks) compared to chronic cases (>4 weeks), align with pathophysiological understanding of tissue healing and remodeling processes. Cook et al. specifically studied acute knee injuries and reported superior ultrasonographic performance compared to studies including chronic pathology, supporting our temporal findings (14). The declining accuracy in chronic presentations likely reflects scar tissue formation, secondary inflammatory changes, and tissue remodeling that obscure initial injury patterns. These temporal considerations have important clinical implications, suggesting that ultrasonography evaluation should be prioritized in acute settings where diagnostic yield is optimized.

From a health economic perspective, our findings support the cost-effectiveness of incorporating ultrasonography into diagnostic algorithms for knee pathologies. Forney et al. demonstrated that an initial ultrasonography approach followed by selective MRI for negative or equivocal findings resulted in average cost savings of $360 per patient compared to primary MRI for all patients, with only marginal differences in diagnostic accuracy. Given that our study demonstrated perfect performance for specific findings including effusion and meniscal extrusion, targeted ultrasonography utilization for these indications could substantially reduce healthcare costs while maintaining diagnostic accuracy.

The clinical implications of our findings suggest a nuanced approach to knee imaging that leverages the specific strengths of ultrasonography while acknowledging its limitations. The exceptional performance for fluid detection and meniscal extrusion supports first-line ultrasonography for suspected joint effusion, Baker's cyst evaluation, assessment of meniscal extrusion in patients with known or suspected meniscal pathology, and guided therapeutic procedures. The moderate performance for comprehensive intra-articular assessment necessitates careful patient selection and appropriate expectations regarding diagnostic limitations.

Several limitations of our study warrant consideration. The sample size of 30 patients, while adequate for initial assessment, limits subgroup analyses and may not capture the full spectrum of knee pathologies. The single-center design may limit generalizability to other settings with different equipment or operator expertise.

The exclusion of cruciate ligaments from analysis, while methodologically appropriate given their well-established limitations for ultrasonographic assessment, prevents comprehensive comparison of all knee structures. Additionally, the use of 1.5 Tesla MRI as the reference standard, while clinically appropriate, may not represent the highest available diagnostic accuracy compared to 3.0 Tesla systems increasingly utilized in specialized centers.

Future research directions should focus on larger multicenter studies to validate our findings across diverse populations and clinical settings, development of standardized protocols and training programs to reduce operator dependency, investigation of advanced ultrasound techniques including elastography and contrast-enhanced ultrasound for improved tissue characterization, and integration of artificial intelligence algorithms to enhance diagnostic accuracy and reduce interpretation variability. Long-term outcome studies comparing diagnostic strategies incorporating ultrasonography versus MRI-based approaches would provide valuable evidence for optimizing clinical pathways.

VII. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that ultrasonography achieves moderate diagnostic performance for accessible knee structures when compared to magnetic resonance imaging, with overall accuracy of 71.4% and fair inter-rater agreement. However, this moderate overall performance masks significant variation across different pathology types, with ultrasonography demonstrating exceptional capability for specific findings including joint effusion, Baker's cyst, and notably, meniscal extrusion detection where perfect concordance with MRI was achieved.

The identification of perfect agreement for meniscal extrusion represents a clinically significant finding, as this pathological pattern has important implications for joint mechanics, treatment planning, and prognosis. Combined with the exceptional performance for fluid detection, these findings establish clear indications where ultrasonography provides reliable, immediate, and cost-effective assessment comparable to MRI.

The moderate performance for comprehensive assessment of intra-articular structures, including collateral ligaments and menisci, reflects fundamental technical limitations rather than equipment or operator inadequacies. The liberal diagnostic bias observed, with tendency toward overdiagnosis, necessitates careful interpretation of positive findings and appropriate clinical correlation. Age-related and temporal patterns in diagnostic accuracy provide important guidance for patient selection, with superior performance in younger patients and acute presentations.

Based on these findings, ultrasonography should be positioned as a valuable complementary tool in knee pathology assessment rather than a comprehensive replacement for MRI. Optimal utilization involves targeted application for specific indications where ultrasonography excels, including initial assessment for suspected effusion or Baker's cyst, evaluation of meniscal extrusion, guided procedures, and screening in acute traumatic presentations. When integrated appropriately within structured diagnostic algorithms, ultrasonography can enhance diagnostic efficiency, reduce healthcare costs, and improve patient access to timely imaging while maintaining acceptable diagnostic accuracy for specific knee pathologies.

References

[1]. Majewski M, Susanne H, Klaus S. Epidemiology of athletic knee injuries: A 10-year study. Knee. 2006;13(3):184-8.
[2]. Fox AJ, Wanivenhaus F, Burge AJ, Warren RF, Rodeo SA. The human meniscus: a review of anatomy, function, injury, and advances in treatment. Clin Anat. 2015;28(2):269-87.
[3]. Sanders TL, Maradit Kremers H, Bryan AJ, Larson DR, Dahm DL, Levy BA, et al. Incidence of anterior cruciate ligament tears and reconstruction: a 21-year population-based study. Am J Sports Med. 2016;44(6):1502-7.
[4]. Vos T, Flaxman AD, Naghavi M, Lozano R, Michaud C, Ezzati M, et al. Years lived with disability (YLDs) for 1160 sequelae of 289 diseases and injuries 1990-2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. Lancet. 2012;380(9859):2163-96.
[5]. Nacey NC, Geeslin MG, Miller GW, Pierce JL. Magnetic resonance imaging of the knee: An overview and update of conventional and state of the art imaging. J Magn Reson Imaging. 2017;45(5):1257-75.
[6]. Oei EH, Nikken JJ, Verstijnen AC, Ginai AZ, Hunink MG. MR imaging of the menisci and cruciate ligaments: a systematic review. Radiology. 2003;226(3):837-48.
[7]. Lubowitz JH, Appleby D. Cost-effectiveness analysis of the most common orthopaedic surgery procedures: knee arthroscopy and knee anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. Arthroscopy. 2011;27(10):1317-22.
[8]. Décary S, Ouellet P, Vendittoli PA, Roy JS, Desmeules F. Diagnostic validity of physical examination tests for common knee disorders: an overview of systematic reviews and meta-analysis. Phys Ther Sport. 2017;23:143-55.
[9]. Forney MC, Delaney JT, Weng HY, Knopp MV, Lindsey JS, Johnson-Greene DE, et al. A comparison of the cost-effectiveness of ultrasonography and magnetic resonance imaging for the diagnosis of internal derangement of the knee. Br J Radiol. 2017;90(1077):20160782.
[10]. Friedman L, Finlay K, Jurriaans E. Ultrasound of the knee. Skeletal Radiol. 2001;30(7):361-77.
[11]. Patil P, Dasgupta B. Role of diagnostic ultrasound in the assessment of musculoskeletal diseases. Ther Adv Musculoskelet Dis. 2012;4(5):341-55.

[12]. Wang J, Wu H, Dong F, Li B, Wei Z, Peng Q, et al. The role of ultrasonography in the diagnosis of anterior cruciate ligament injury: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Sport Sci. 2018;18(4):579-86.
[13]. Dai H, Huang ZG, Chen ZJ, Liu JX. Diagnostic accuracy of ultrasonography in assessing meniscal injury: meta-analysis of prospective studies. J Orthop Sci. 2015;20(4):675-81.
[14]. Cook JL, Cook CR, Stannard JP, Vaughn G, Wilson N, Roller BL, et al. MRI versus ultrasonography to assess meniscal abnormalities in acute knees. J Knee Surg. 2014;27(4):319-24.
[15]. Kumar N, Yadav C, Raj R, Anand S. How to interpret postoperative X-rays after total knee arthroplasty. Orthop Surg. 2018;7(7):555-65.