Bölüm
62

DİZ HASTALIKLARINDA NÜKLEER TIP GÖRÜNTÜLEME YÖNTEMLERİ

Koray DEMİREL[1]

GİRİŞ

Diz eklemi, kemik yapısını femur, tibia ve patella kemiklerinin oluşturduğu, tibiofemoral ve patellofemoral eklemden oluşan, kartilaj, sinovyal membran, bağ, tendon ve menisküsün kompleks birlikteliği ile vücudun en büyük eklemidir.

Ortopedi poliklinik başvurularının büyük bir bölümünü diz ile ilişkili rahatsızlıklar oluşturmaktadır. Bu durumun nedenleri arasında; yaşam süresinde uzama ve obesite nedeniyle insidansı yüksek olan osteoartritten en sık etkilenen eklem olması, dizde görülen değişiklikler ve sonrasında diz artroplastisine giden sürecin yükselerek devam etmesi, enfeksiyon ve enflamatuar hastalıkların, artritik patolojilerin sık görüldüğü alan olması, spor yaralanması ve travmalardan sıklıkla etkilenme potansiyeli, primer malign kemik tümörlerinin en sık görüldüğü yerin diz çevresi olması gibi çeşitli faktörler etken olarak bildirilmektedir.

Kas iskelet sistemi nükleer tıp görüntüleme yöntemleri, kemik hastalıklarında yapısal ve biyokimyasal değişikliklerden önce gelen moleküler ve fizyolojik değişiklikler hakkında bilgi sağlama potansiyeli ile uzun yıllardır önemli rol oynamaktadır.

Nükleer tıp yöntemleri, diz hastalıklarının tanısında, tedavi planlanmasında ve tedavi yanıtlarının izleminde katkı sağlamaktadır. Nükleer tıpta kullanılan radyonüklid ve radyofarmasötikler, diz hastalıklarında sadece görüntüleme amaçlı değil, aynı zamanda diz radyosinevektomisinde olduğu gibi seçilmiş hasta gruplarında alternatif tedavi yöntemi olarakta kullanılmaktadır (1).

Kas iskelet sistemi hastalıklarında kullanılan nükleer tıp yöntemlerinden başlıcaları; kemik sintigrafisi, işaretli lökosit sintigrafisi, kemik iliği sintigrafisi, an-

[1] Nükleer Tıp Uzmanı Ankara Eğitim ve Araştırma Hastanesi Nükleer Tıp Kliniği
demirelkoray@yahoo.com

KAYNAKLAR

1. Koca G, Nacir B, Ozsoy H, et al. Yttrium-90 radiosynovectomy therapy in a patient with Behcet's chronic synovitis. Rev Esp Med Nucl Imagen Mol. 2012 Jul-Aug;31(4):227-8. doi: 10.1016/j.remn.2011.07.007.
2. Price AJ, Alvand A, Troelsen A, et al. "Knee replacement." The Lancet, 392.10158 (2018): 1672-1682. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32344-4
3. National Joint Registry. 16th Annual Report 2019. National Joint Registry for England, Wales, Northern Ireland and the Isle of Man: Surgical data to 31 December 2018. https://reports.njrcentre.org.uk/Portals/0/PDFdownloads/NJR%2016th%20Annual%20Report%202019.pdf
4. Maradit Kremers H, Larson DR, Crowson CS, et al. Prevalence of Total Hip and Knee Replacement in the United States. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2015 Sep 2;97(17):1386-97. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.N.01141.
5. Mar WA, Tan I, Song A, et al. Update on Imaging of Knee Arthroplasties: Normal Findings and Hardware Complications. Semin Musculoskelet Radiol. 2019 Apr;23(2):e20-e35. doi: 10.1055/s-0039-1677697.
6. Hunter DJ, Bierma-Zeinstra S. Osteoarthritis. Lancet. 2019 Apr 27;393(10182):1745-1759. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30417-9. Review.
7. Singh JA, Yu S, Chen L, et al. Rates of Total Joint Replacement in the United States: Future Projections to 2020-2040 Using the National Inpatient Sample. J Rheumatol. 2019 Sep;46(9):1134-1140. doi: 10.3899/jrheum.170990.
8. Shah SH, Schwartz BE, Schwartz AR, et al. Total Knee Arthroplasty in the Younger Patient. J Knee Surg. 2017 Jul;30(6):555-559. doi: 10.1055/s-0036-1593619.
9. Lombardi AV, Berend KR, Adams JB. Why knee replacements fail in 2013: patient, surgeon, or implant? Bone Joint J. 2014;96-B (11, Suppl A):101–104
10. Kim KT, Lee S, Ko DO, et al. Causes of failure after total knee arthroplasty in osteoarthritis patients 55 years of age or younger. Knee Surg Relat Res. 2014;26(01):13–19
11. Taljanovic MS, Gimber LH, Omar IM, et al. Imaging of Postoperative Infection at the Knee Joint. Semin Musculoskelet Radiol. 2018 Sep;22(4):464-480. doi: 10.1055/s-0038-1667119.
12. Glaudemans AW, Galli F, Pacilio M, et al. Leukocyte and bacteria imaging in prosthetic joint infection. Eur Cell Mater. 2013;25:61–77.
13. Love C1, Marwin SE, Palestro CJ. Nuclear medicine and the infected joint replacement. Semin Nucl Med. 2009 Jan;39(1):66-78. doi: 10.1053/j.semnuclmed.2008.08.007.
14. Trampuz A, Zimmerli W. Prosthetic joint infections: update in diagnosis and treatment. Swiss Med Wkly. 2005;135(17–18): 243–51.
15. Signore A, Sconfienza LM, Borens O, et al. Consensus document for the diagnosis of prosthetic joint infections: a joint paper by the EANM, EBJIS, and ESR (with ESCMID endorsement). Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2019 Apr;46(4):971-988. doi: 10.1007/s00259-019-4263-9.
16. Metsemakers WJ, Smeets B, Nijs S, et al. Infection after fracture fixation of the tibia: Analysis of healthcare utilization and related costs. Injury. 2017 Jun;48(6):1204-1210. doi: 10.1016/j.injury.2017.03.030.
17. Whitehouse JD, Friedman ND, Kirkland KB, et al. The impact of surgical-site infections following orthopedic surgery at a community hospital and a university hospital: adverse quality of life, excess length of stay, and extra cost. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2002 Apr;23(4):183-9.
18. Savarino L, Tigani D, Baldini N, et al. Pre-operative diagnosis of infection in total knee arthroplasty: an algorithm. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc. 2009 Jun;17(6):667-75. doi: 10.1007/s00167-009-0759-3.
19. Malizos, K. N., & Varitimidis, S. E. (2017). Infection in total knee arthroplasty. In Management of Periprosthetic Joint Infections (PJIs) (pp. 133-156). Woodhead Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-100205-6.00007-0
20. Park CN, White PB, Meftah M, et al. Diagnostic Algorithm for Residual Pain After Total Knee Arthroplasty. Orthopedics. 2016 Mar-Apr;39(2):e246-52. doi: 10.3928/01477447-20160119-

06.
21. Zajonz D, Wuthe L, Tiepolt S, et al. Diagnostic work-up strategy for periprosthetic joint infections after total hip and knee arthroplasty: a 12-year experience on 320 consecutive cases. Patient Saf Surg. 2015 May 16;9:20. doi: 10.1186/s13037-015-0071-8.
22. Niccoli G, Mercurio D, Cortese F. Bone scan in painful knee arthroplasty: obsolete or actual examination? Acta Biomed. 2017 Jun 7;88(2S):68-77. doi: 10.23750/abm.v88i2 -S.6516.
23. Van den Wyngaert T, Strobel K, Kampen WU, et al. The EANM practice guidelines for bone scintigraphy. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2016 Aug;43(9):1723-38. doi: 10.1007/s00259-016-3415-4.
24. Noordzij, W., & Glaudemans, A. W. J. M. (2015). Nuclear medicine imaging techniques. In Nuclear Medicine and Radiologic Imaging in Sports Injuries (pp. 25-48). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/(...)/978-3-662-46491-5_3
25. Van den Wyngaert T, Strobel K, Kampen WU, et al. The EANM practice guidelines for bone scintigraphy. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2016 Aug;43(9):1723-38. doi: 10.1007/s00259-016-3415-4.
26. Verberne SJ, Sonnega RJ, Temmerman OP, et al. What is the Accuracy of Nuclear Imaging in the Assessment of Periprosthetic Knee Infection? A Meta-analysis. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2017 May;475(5):1395-1410. doi: 10.1007/s11999-016-5218-0.
27. Smith SL, Wastie ML, Forster I. Radionuclide bone scintigraphy in the detection of significant complications after total knee joint replacement. Clin Radiol 2001; 56: 221-4.
28. Levitsky KA, Hozack WJ, Balderston RA, et al. Evaluation of the painful prosthetic joint. Relative value of bone scan, sedimentation rate, and joint aspiration. J Arthroplasty 199; 6: 237-44.
29. Parisi MT, Iyer RS, Stanescu AL, et al. Nuclear Medicine Applications in Pediatric Musculoskeletal Diseases: The Added Value of Hybrid Imaging. Semin Musculoskelet Radiol. 2018 Feb;22(1):25-45. doi: 10.1055/s-0037-1615782.
30. Glaudemans AWJM, Jutte PC, Cataldo MA, et al. Consensus document for the diagnosis of peripheral bone infection in adults: a joint paper by the EANM, EBJIS, and ESR (with ESCMID endorsement). Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2019 Apr;46(4):957-970. doi: 10.1007/s00259-019-4262-x.
31. Vaz S, Ferreira TC, Salgado L, et al. Bone scan usefulness in patients with painful hip or knee prosthesis: 10 situations that can cause pain, other than loosening and infection. Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol. 2017 Feb;27(2):147-156. doi: 10.1007/s00590-016-1884-6.
32. Ross JC, Vilić D, Sanderson T, et al. Does quantification have a role to play in the future of bone SPECT? European Journal of Hybrid Imaging (2019) 3:8 https://doi.org/10.1186/s41824-019-0054-6
33. Mandegaran R, Agrawal K, Vijayanathan S, et al. The value of 99mTc-MDP bone SPECT/CT in evaluation of patients with painful knee prosthesis. Nucl Med Commun. 2018 May;39(5):397-404. doi: 10.1097/MNM.0000000000000825.
34. Abele JT, Swami VG, Russell G, et al. The Accuracy of Single Photon Emission Computed Tomography/Computed Tomography Arthrography in Evaluating Aseptic Loosening of Hip and Knee Prostheses. J Arthroplasty. 2015 Sep;30(9):1647-51. doi: 10.1016/j.arth.2015.03.033.
35. van der Bruggen W, Hirschmann MT, Strobel K, et al. SPECT/CT in the Postoperative Painful Knee. Semin Nucl Med. 2018 Sep;48(5):439-453. doi: 10.1053/j.semnuclmed.2018.05.003.
36. Hirschmann MT, Amsler F, Rasch H. Clinical value of SPECT/CT in the painful total knee arthroplasty (TKA): a prospective study in a consecutive series of 100 TKA. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2015 Nov;42(12):1869-82. doi: 10.1007/s00259-015-3095-5.
37. Mohan HK, Strobel K, van der Bruggen W, et al. The role of hybrid bone SPECT/CT imaging in the work-up of the limping patient: a symptom-based and joint-oriented review. Eur J Hybrid Imaging. 2018;2(1):8. doi: 10.1186/s41824-018-0026-2.
38. Suter B, Testa E, Stämpfli P, et al. A novel standardized algorithm using SPECT/CT evaluating unhappy patients after unicondylar knee arthroplasty--a combined analysis of tracer uptake distribution and component position. BMC Med Imaging. 2015 Mar 20;15:11. doi: 10.1186/

s12880-015-0053-4.
39. Propst-Proctor SL, Dillingham MF, McDougall IR, Goodwin D. The white blood cell scan in orthopedics. Clin Orthop 1982; 157-65.
40. Sengoz T, Yaylali O, Yuksel D, et al. The clinical contribution of SPECT/CT with 99mTc-HM-PAO-labeled leukocyte scintigraphy in hip and knee prosthetic infections. Rev Esp Med Nucl Imagen Mol. 2019 Jul - Aug;38(4):212-217. doi: 10.1016/j.remn.2019.01.005.
41. Palestro CJ. Nuclear medicine and the failed joint replacement: Past, present, and future. World J Radiol. 2014 Jul 28;6(7):446-58. doi: 10.4329/wjr.v6.i7.446.
42. Palestro CJ, Love C. Role of Nuclear Medicine for Diagnosing Infection of Recently Implanted Lower Extremity Arthroplasties. Semin Nucl Med. 2017 Nov;47(6):630-638. doi:10.1053/j.semnuclmed.2017.07.008.
43. Rojas-Burke J. Health officials reacting to infection mishaps. J Nucl Med Off Publ Soc Nucl Med 1992; 33: 13N-14N, 27N.
44. Connolly CM, Donohoe KJ. Nuclear Medicine Imaging of Infection. Semin Roentgenol. 2017 Apr;52(2):114-119. doi:10.1053/j.ro.2016.07.001.
45. Becker W, Bair J, Behr T, et al. Detection of soft-tissue infections and osteomyelitis using a technetium-99m-labeled anti-granulocyte monoclonal antibody fragment. J Nucl Med. 1994;35(9):1436–43.
46. Signore A, Jamar F, Israel O, et al. Clinical indications, image acquisition and data interpretation for white blood cells and anti-granulocyte monoclonal antibody scintigraphy: an EANM procedural guideline. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2018 Sep;45(10):1816-1831. doi: 10.1007/s00259-018-4052-x.
47. Gratz S, Reize P, Kemke B, Kampen WU, Lusteri M, Hoffken H. Targeting of osteomyelitis with IgG and Fab' monoclonal antibodies labeled with [99mTc]: kinetic evaluations. Q J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2014;60:413–23.
48. Israel O, Pellet O, Biassoni L, et al. Two decades of SPECT/CT – the coming of age of a technology: An updated review of literature evidence. European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging (2019) 46:1990–2012 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-019-04404-6
49. Graute V, Feist M, Lehner S, Haug A, Müller PE, Bartenstein P, et al. Detection of low-grade prosthetic joint infections using 99mTc-antigranulocyte SPECT/CT: initial clinical results. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2010;37(9):1751–9.
50. Adesanya OO, Hutchinson CE. Designing a New Molecular Probe: The Potential Role for Tilmanocept (Lymphoseek®) in the Assessment of Patients with Painful Hip and Knee Joint Prostheses. Open Orthop J. 2017 Mar 22;11:212-224. doi: 10.2174/1874325001711010212.
51. Palestro CJ. Radionuclide Imaging of Musculoskeletal Infection: A Review. J Nucl Med. 2016 Sep;57(9):1406-12. doi:10.2967/jnumed.115.157297.
52. Jamar F, Buscombe J, Chiti A, et al. EANM/SNMMI guideline for 18F-FDG use in inflammation and infection. J Nucl Med. 2013 Apr;54(4):647-58. doi: 10.2967/jnumed.112.112524.
53. Yildirim K, Misir A, Kizkapan TB, et al. Neopterin, Interleukin-6, Procalcitonin, C-Reactive Protein And PET-CT Staining As Markers In Infected Total Knee Prosthesis, A Retrospective Analysis. Acta Orthop Belg. 2017 Dec;83(4):624-630.
54. Gholamrezanezhad A, Basques K, Batouli A, et al. Clinical Nononcologic Applications of PET/CT and PET/MRI in Musculoskeletal, Orthopedic, and Rheumatologic Imaging. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2018 Jun;210(6):W245-W263. doi: 10.2214/AJR.17.18523.
55. Basu S, Kwee TC, Saboury B, et al. FDG PET for diagnosing infection in hip and knee prostheses: prospective study in 221 prostheses and subgroup comparison with combined 111In-labeled leukocyte/99mTc-sulfur colloid bone marrow imaging in 88 prostheses. Clin Nucl Med 2014; 39:609–615
56. Van Acker F, Nuyts J, Maes A, et al. FDG-PET, 99mTc-HMPAO white blood cell SPET and bone scintigraphy in the evaluation of painful total knee arthroplasties. Eur J Nucl Med 2001; 28:1496–1504
57. Reinartz P. FDG-PET in patients with painful hip and knee arthroplasty: technical breakthrou-

gh or just more of the same. Q J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2009;53(1):41–50.
58. Kwee TC, Basu S, Alavi A. Should the nuclear medicine community continue to underestimate the potential of 18F-FDG-PET/CT with present generation scanners for the diagnosis of prosthetic joint infection? Nucl Med Commun. 2015 Jul;36(7):756-7. doi:10.1097/MNM.0000000000000318.
59. Delank KS, Schmidt M, Michael JW, Dietlein M, Schicha H, Eysel P. The implications of 18F-FDG PET for the diagnosis of endoprosthetic loosening and infection in hip and knee arthroplasty: results from a prospective, blinded study. BMC Musculoskelet Disord 2006; 7:20
60. Koob S, Gaertner FC, Jansen TR, et al. Diagnosis of peri-prosthetic loosening of total hip and knee arthroplasty using 18F-Fluoride PET/CT. Oncotarget. 2019 Mar 15;10(22):2203-2211. doi:10.18632/oncotarget.26762.
61. Even-Sapir E, Mishani E, Flusser G, Metser U. 18F-Fluoride positron emission tomography and positron emission tomography/computed tomography. Semin Nucl Med 2007;37(06):462–469
62. Adesanya O, Sprowson A, Masters J, et al. Review of the role of dynamic 18F-NaF PET in diagnosing and distinguishing between septic and aseptic loosening in hip prosthesis. J Orthop Surg Res. 2015 Jan 16;10:5. doi: 10.1186/s13018-014-0147-7.
63. Boutin R. Update on imaging ofmusculoskeletal infections. Orthop Clin N Am. 1998;29:41–66.
64. David R, Barron BJ,Modewell JE. Osteomyelitis, acute and chronic. Radiol Clin N Am. 1987;25:1171–201.
65. Demirev A,Weijers R, Geurts J, Mottaghy F,Walenkamp G, BransB. Comparison of 18F-FDG PET/CT and MRI in the diagnosis of acute osteomyelitis. Skelet Radiol. 2014a;43:665–72.
66. Arıcan P, Okudan B, Şefizade R, et al. Diagnostic Value of Bone SPECT/CT in Patients with Suspected Osteomyelitis. Mol Imaging Radionucl Ther. 2019 Sep 6;28(3):89-95. doi:10.4274/mirt.galenos.2019.20053.
67. Mariani G, Bruselli L, Kuwert T, Kim EE, Flotats A, Israel O, Dondi M, Watanabe N. A rewiew on the clinical uses of SPECT/CT. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 2010;37:1959-1985.
68. Erba PA, Glaudemans AW, Veltman NC, et al. Image acquisition and interpretation criteria for 99mTc-HMPAO-labelled white blood cell scintigraphy: results of a multicentre study. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2014 Apr;41(4):615-23. doi: 10.1007/s00259-013-2631-4.
69. Gotthardt M, Bleeker-Rovers CP, Boerman OC, Oyen WJ. Imaging of inflammation by PET, conventional scintigraphy, and other imaging techniques. J Nucl Med. 2010;51:1937–49.
70. Erba PA, Conti U, Lazzeri E, Sollini M, Doria R, De Tommasi SM, et al. Added value of 99mTc-HMPAO labeled leukocyte SPECT/CT in the characterization and management of patients with infectious endocarditis. J Nucl Med. 2012;53:1235–43.
71. Lemans JVC, Hobbelink MGG, IJpma FFA, et al. The diagnostic accuracy of 18F-FDG PET/CT in diagnosing fracture-related infections. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2019 Apr;46(4):999-1008. doi:10.1007/s00259-018-4218-6.
72. Parisi M1, Otjen JP, Stanescu AL, et al. Radionuclide Imaging of Infection and Inflammation in Children: a Review. Semin Nucl Med. 2018 Mar;48(2):148-165. doi: 10.1053/j.semnuclmed.2017.11.002.
73. Meller J, Koster G, Liersch T, et al: Chronic bacterial osteomyelitis: Prospective comparison of (18)F-FDG imaging with a dual head coincidence camera and (111) In-labelled autologous leukocyte scintigraphy. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 29:53-60, 2002
74. Lee JW, Yu SN, Yoo ID, et al. Clinical application of dual-phase F-18 sodium-fluoride bone PET/CT for diagnosing surgical site infection following orthopedic surgery. Medicine (Baltimore). 2019 Mar;98(11):e14770. doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000014770.
75. Vorster M, Maes A, Wiele Cv, et al. Gallium-68 PET: A Powerful Generator-based Alternative to Infection and Inflammation Imaging. Semin Nucl Med. 2016 Sep;46(5):436-47. doi:10.1053/j.semnuclmed.2016.04.005.
76. Zhou J, HaoG, Weng H, et al: In vivo evaluation of medical device-associated inflammation using a macrophage-specific positron emission tomography (PET) imaging probe. Bioorg Med Chem Lett. 2013 Apr 1;23(7):2044-7. doi: 10.1016/j.bmcl.2013.02.004.

77. Hulsen DJW, Geurts J, Arts JJ, et al. Hybrid FDG-PET/MR imaging of chronic osteomyelitis: a prospective case series. European Journal of Hybrid Imaging (2019) 3:7 https://doi.org/10.1186/s41824-019-0055-5
78. Govaert GA, IJpma FF, McNally M, et al. Accuracy of diagnostic imaging modalities for peripheral post-traumatic osteomyelitis – a systematic review of the recent literature. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2017 Aug;44(8):1393-1407. doi: 10.1007/s00259-017-3683-7.
79. Govaert GAM, Glaudemans AWJM. Nuclear medicine imaging of posttraumatic osteomyelitis. Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg. 2016 Aug;42(4):397-410. doi: 10.1007/s00068-016-0647-8.
80. Govaert GAM, Bosch P, IJpma FFA, et al. High diagnostic accuracy of white blood cell scintigraphy for fracture related infections: Results of a large retrospective single-center study. Injury. 2018 Jun;49(6):1085-1090. doi: 10.1016/j.injury.2018.03.018.
81. Love C, Palestro CJ. Nuclear medicine imaging of bone infections. Clin Radiol. 2016 Jul;71(7):632-46. doi: 10.1016/j.crad.2016.01.003.
82. Wenter V, Albert NL, Brendel M, et al. [18F]FDG PET accurately differentiates infected and non-infected non-unions after fracture fixation. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2017 Mar;44(3):432-440. doi:10.1007/s00259-016-3528-9.
83. Marsh D. Concepts of fracture union, delayed union, and nonunion. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1998:S22-30.
84. Nicoll EA. Closed and open management of tibial fractures. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 1974:144–53.
85. Nepola JV, Seabold JE, Marsh JL, Kirchner PT, el-Khoury GY. Diagnosis of infection in ununited fractures. Combined imagingwith indium-111-labeled leukocytes and technetium-99m methylene diphosphonate. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 1993;75:1816–22.
86. Sollini M, Trenti N, Malagoli E, et al. [18F]FDG PET/CT in non-union: improving the diagnostic performances by using both PET and CT criteria. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2019 Jul;46(8):1605-1615. doi: 10.1007/s00259-019-04336-1.
87. Yoder JS, Kogan F, Gold GE, et al. Applications of PET-Computed Tomography-Magnetic Resonance in the Management of Benign Musculoskeletal Disorders. PET Clin. 2019 Jan;14(1):1-15. doi: 10.1016/j.cpet.2018.08.001.
88. Huang D, Liu YQ, Liang LS, et al. The Diagnosis and Therapy of Degenerative Knee Joint Disease: Expert Consensus from the Chinese Pain Medicine Panel. Pain Res Manag. 2018 Dec 13;2018:2010129. doi: 10.1155/2018/2010129.
89. Hunter DJ, Schofield D, Callander E. The individual and socioeconomic impact of osteoarthritis. Nat Rev Rheumatol 2014; 10: 437–41.
90. A.W.J.M. Glaudemans et al. (eds.), Nuclear Medicine and Radiologic Imaging in Sports Injuries (2015), Hirschmann MT, Forrer F, Testa E, et al. Nuclear Medicine Imaging of Knee Injuries, (pp 669-685) Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, DOI 10.1007/978-3-662-46491-5_30
91. Zhang Y, Nevitt M, Niu J, Lewis C, Torner J, Guermazi A, et al. Fluctuation of knee pain and changes in bone marrow lesions, effusions, and synovitis on magnetic resonance imaging. Arthritis Rheum 2011;63:691–9.
92. Parsons MA, Moghbel M, Saboury B. Increased FDG uptake suggests synovial inflammatory reaction with osteoarthritis: preliminary in vivo results in humans. Nucl Med Commun 2015;36(12):1215–9.
93. Nakamura H, Masuko K, Yudoh K. Positron emission tomography with 18F-FDG in osteoarthritic knee. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2007;15:673–81.
94. Pawaskar A, Basu S, Jahangiri P, et al. In Vivo Molecular Imaging of Musculoskeletal Inflammation and Infection. PET Clin. 2019 Jan;14(1):43-59. doi: 10.1016/j.cpet.2018.08.009.
95. Sollini M, Berchiolli R, Kirienko M, et al. PET/MRI in Infection and Inflammation. Semin Nucl Med. 2018 May;48(3):225-241. doi: 10.1053/j.semnuclmed.2018.02.003.
96. Rosado-de-Castro PH, Lopes de Souza SA, Alexandre D,et al. Rheumatoid arthritis: Nuclear Medicine state-of-the-art imaging. World J Orthop. 2014 Jul 18;5(3):312-8. doi: 10.5312/wjo.v5.i3.312.

97. Signore A, Lauri C, Auletta S, et al. Immuno-Imaging to Predict Treatment Response in Infection, Inflammation and Oncology. J Clin Med. 2019 May 14;8(5). pii: E681. doi: 10.3390/jcm8050681.
98. Behzadi AH, Raza SI, Carrino JA, et al. Applications of PET/CT and PET/MR Imaging in Primary Bone Malignancies. PET Clin. 2018 Oct;13(4):623-634. doi: 10.1016/j.cpet.2018.05.012.
99. Coleman RE., Clinical features of metastatic bone disease and risk of skeletal morbidity. Clin Cancer Res. 2006 Oct 15;12(20 Pt 2):6243s-6249s.
100. Greenbaum SL, Thornhill BA, Geller DS, et al. Characterization and Surgical Management of Metastatic Disease of the Tibia. Am J Orthop (Belle Mead NJ). 2017 Nov/Dec;46(6):E423-E428.
101. Unni KK: Osteosarcoma. In: Dahlin's bone tumors. General aspects and data on 11.087 cases. Devaney, K (ed). 5th edition. Lippincott-Raven Publishers, Philadelphia, pp143-184, 1996
102. Mercuri M and Casadei R: Patellar tumors. Clin Orthop Relat Res 389: 35-46, 2001.
103. Li G, Shan C, Sun R, et al. Patellar metastasis from primary tumor. Oncol Lett. 2018 Feb;15(2):1389-1396. doi: 10.3892/ol.2017.7478.
104. Beheshti M. 18F-Sodium Fluoride PET/CT and PET/MR Imaging of Bone and Joint Disorders. PET Clin. 2018 Oct;13(4):477-490. doi:10.1016/j.cpet.2018.05.004.
105. Langsteger W, Rezaee A, Pirich C, et al. (18)F-NaFPET/CT and (99m)Tc-MDP bone scintigraphy in the detection of bone metastases in prostate cancer. Semin Nucl Med 2016;46(6):491–501.
106. Dyrberg E, Hendel HW, Løgager VB, et al. A prospective study determining andcomparing the diagnostic accuracy offluoride-PET/CT, choline-PET/CT, wholebodybone SPECT/CT and whole-body MRIfor the detection of bone metastases in patients with prostate cancer. European Journal of Hybrid Imaging (2018) 2:19 https://doi.org/10.1186/s41824-018-0038-y
107. Zacho HD, Nielsen JB, Afshar-Oromieh A, et al. Prospective comparison of 68Ga-PSMA PET/CT, 18F-sodium fluoride PET/CT and diffusion weighted-MRI at for the detection of bone metastases in biochemically recurrent prostate cancer. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2018 Oct;45(11):1884-1897. doi: 10.1007/s00259-018-4058-4.
108. Zhou J, Gou Z, Wu R, et al. Comparison of PSMA-PET/CT, choline-PET/CT, NaF-PET/CT, MRI, and bone scintigraphy in the diagnosis of bone metastases in patients with prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Skeletal Radiol. 2019 May 24. doi: 10.1007/s00256-019-03230-z.
109. Schmidkonz C, Ellmann S, Ritt P, et al. Hybrid Imaging (PET-Computed Tomography/PET-MR Imaging) of Bone Metastases. PET Clin. 2019 Jan;14(1):121-133. doi: 10.1016/j.cpet.2018.08.003.