

1 A novel classifier of radiographic knee osteoarthritis for use on knee DXA images  
2 is predictive of joint replacement in UK Biobank.

3

4 Dr Rhona A Beynon<sup>1</sup>, Dr Fiona R Saunders<sup>2</sup>, Dr Raja Ebsim<sup>3</sup>, Dr Benjamin G Faber<sup>1,4</sup>, Dr Mijin  
5 Jung<sup>1</sup>, Dr Jennifer S Gregory<sup>2</sup>, Dr Claudia Lindner<sup>3</sup>, Prof Richard M Aspden<sup>2</sup>, Prof Nicholas C  
6 Harvey<sup>5,6</sup>, Prof Timothy Cootes<sup>3</sup>, Prof Jonathan H Tobias<sup>1,4</sup>

7 <sup>1</sup>University of Bristol, Musculoskeletal Research Unit, Bristol Medical School, Bristol, United  
8 Kingdom.

9 <sup>2</sup>University of Aberdeen, Centre for Arthritis and Musculoskeletal Health, Aberdeen, United  
10 Kingdom.

11 <sup>3</sup>The University of Manchester, Division of Informatics, Imaging & Data Sciences, School of  
12 Health Sciences, Manchester, United Kingdom.

13 <sup>4</sup>University of Bristol, Medical Research Council Integrative Epidemiology Unit, Bristol,  
14 United Kingdom.

15 <sup>5</sup>University of Southampton, MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Centre, Southampton, United  
16 Kingdom.

17 <sup>6</sup> NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University  
18 Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, United Kingdom.

19

20 Corresponding author: Dr Rhona A Beynon, email: [Rhona.beynon@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:Rhona.beynon@bristol.ac.uk)

21 Key words: Knee osteoarthritis, radiographic osteoarthritis, DXA.

22 Key messages:

- 23 • Radiographic knee osteoarthritis (rKOA) can be semi-automatically derived from DXA  
24 images.  
25 • DXA-derived rKOA shows expected relationships with clinical outcomes of knee  
26 osteoarthritis.  
27 • DXA imaging presents a viable method for classifying rKOA in large-scale epidemiological  
28 research.

## 29 Abstract

### 30 Objectives

31 DXA scans may offer a novel means of evaluating radiographic knee osteoarthritis (rKOA) in  
32 large population studies and through opportunistic screening. We aimed to develop and  
33 apply a semi-automated method for assessing rKOA using ~20,000 knee DXA images from UK  
34 Biobank (UKB) and assess its face validity by checking for expected relationships with clinical  
35 outcomes.

### 36 Methods

37 Right knee DXA scans were manually annotated for osteophytes to derive corresponding  
38 grades. Joint space narrowing (JSN) grades in the medial joint compartment were  
39 determined from automatically measured minimum joint space width. Overall rKOA grade  
40 (0-4) was determined by combining osteophyte and JSN grades. Logistic regression was  
41 employed to investigate the associations of osteophyte, JSN, and rKOA grades with knee pain  
42 and hospital-diagnosed knee osteoarthritis (HES-KOA). Cox proportional hazards modelling  
43 was used to examine the associations of these variables with risk of subsequent total knee  
44 replacement (TKR).

### 45 Results

46 Of the 19,595 participants included (mean age: 63.7), 19.5% had rKOA grade  $\geq 1$  (26.1%  
47 female; 12.5% male). Grade  $\geq 1$  osteophytes and grade  $\geq 1$  JSN were associated with knee  
48 pain, HES-KOA, and TKR. Higher rKOA grades were linked to stronger associations with these  
49 clinical outcomes, with the most pronounced effects observed for TKR. HRs for the

50 association of rKOA grades with TKR were 3.28, 8.75, and 28.63 for grades 1, 2 and 3-4,  
51 respectively.

## 52 Conclusions

53 Our DXA-derived measure of rKOA demonstrated a progressive relationship with clinical  
54 outcomes. These findings support the use of DXA for classifying rKOA in large  
55 epidemiological studies and in future population-based screening.

56

## 57 Introduction

58 Knee osteoarthritis (KOA) is the most common form of osteoarthritis, affecting 5.4 million  
59 people in the UK alone (1). Annually, this results in around 100,000 knee replacements being  
60 performed (2), with demand for these procedures expected to rise by nearly 40% by 2060  
61 (3). Diagnosis of KOA is primarily based on clinical symptoms, with persistent knee pain  
62 being the most common. Radiographically, KOA displays distinctive features such as  
63 osteophyte formation, joint space narrowing (JSN), subchondral sclerosis and cysts. These  
64 features have been integrated into grading systems for use in epidemiological studies,  
65 including the widely used Kellgren-Lawrence (KL) grading system (4), which classifies KOA  
66 severity into five grades, ranging from 0 for “normal” up to 4 for “severe”. Typically, a KL  
67 score of  $\geq 2$ , indicating the presence of a definite osteophyte and possible JSN, is used to  
68 define radiographic knee osteoarthritis (rKOA) in research studies (5). Applying this approach  
69 to large epidemiological studies is challenging due to its time-consuming and subjective  
70 nature (5-9). However, there is growing interest in developing computer-aided techniques to  
71 enhance reliability and reduce the time required to derive these grades. (10-15).

72 To date, large scale epidemiological studies of osteoarthritis have primarily been based on  
73 plain radiographs (X-rays), for which KL scoring was initially developed. Dual-energy X-ray  
74 Absorptiometry (DXA) imaging has recently emerged as a viable alternative (16). Initially  
75 developed for measuring bone mineral density (BMD) at the hip and spine, DXA is widely  
76 used as a tool for diagnosing osteoporosis. Advancements in DXA technology have  
77 significantly improved resolution, enabling the visualisation of features such as osteophytes  
78 and measurements of JSN (16). The very low radiation exposure associated with these

79 devices (17) make them highly suitable for use in large scale epidemiological studies, as well  
80 as offering potential application in population screening.

81 UK Biobank (UKB), a large prospective cohort study, is acquiring hip and knee DXA images  
82 from 100,000 participants (18). A recent proof-of-concept study, involving 40,000 of these  
83 hip DXA scans, suggested DXA images can be used for accurately classifying hip  
84 osteoarthritis; robust associations were observed between grades 2-4 of radiographic hip  
85 osteoarthritis (rHOA) and different clinical outcomes, including a nearly 60-fold greater  
86 likelihood of requiring total hip replacement in individuals with rHOA grade 4 (19). While  
87 similar investigations for the knee are lacking, a prior study based on knee DXA scans in UKB  
88 suggested that a DXA-derived imaging biomarker for knee shape, derived from a statistical  
89 shape model, could predict the need for total knee replacement (TKR) (20).

90 The primary objectives of this study were to develop a semi-automated method for  
91 classifying rKOA using DXA scans, to apply this method to a large dataset of images from  
92 UKB, and to evaluate its face validity by examining its relationship with clinically important  
93 KOA outcomes.

## 94 **Methods**

### 95 **Population**

96 This study included participants from the UKB Extended Imaging Study, a subset of the larger  
97 UKB cohort. UKB enrolled ~500,000 participants aged 40-69 from across the UK between  
98 2006 and 2010, collecting extensive health and lifestyle data. The Extended Imaging Study,  
99 initiated in 2014, aimed to collect medical imaging data, including DXA scans, from 100,000  
100 participants (18). UKB has full ethical approval from the National Information Governance

101 Board for Health and Social Care and the North-West Multi-Centre Research Ethics  
102 Committee (11/NW/0382). All UKB participants provided consent, including permission for  
103 their health to be followed-up through linkage to health-related records. This study was  
104 approved by UKB under application number 17295.

105 DXA-based measures of knee osteoarthritis

106 *DXA-based scoring of osteophytes and joint space narrowing*

107 High resolution knee DXA-scans were acquired using a Lunar iDXA scanner (GE-Healthcare,  
108 Madison, WI, USA), with participants lying in a supine position. A machine-learning  
109 algorithm based on random-forest regression voting (BoneFinder<sup>®</sup>, The University of  
110 Manchester (21)), initially trained on ~7000 manually annotated left knee DXA images,  
111 placed 129 points along the bone contours of the distal femur, proximal tibia, proximal  
112 fibula, and superior patella, excluding osteophytes. Details of this methodology have been  
113 published previously (20). The present study is based on a selection of ~20,000 randomly  
114 selected right knee DXA images with automated point placement checked by trained  
115 annotators (RB, FS).

116 At the time point placement was checked, each image was also evaluated for the presence  
117 of medial and lateral femoral and tibial osteophytes. If osteophytes were present, they were  
118 shaded manually ([Figure 1](#)), and the osteophyte area (mm<sup>2</sup>) was calculated using a custom  
119 tool (University of Manchester). Osteophytes were then automatically graded on a scale of  
120 0-3 based on area thresholds derived from manual grading (**supplementary methods**).

121 Minimum Joint Space Width (mJSW; mm) of the medial joint compartment was  
122 automatically measured between predefined points ([Figure 1](#)) using a custom Python 3.0  
123 script. Medial joint space narrowing (JSN) grades were assigned based on the mJSW

124 measurements: JSN grade 0 for mJSW >3mm; grade 1 for mJSW >2.5mm and  $\leq$ 3mm; grade 2  
125 for mJSW >2mm and  $\leq$ 2.5mm; grade 3 for mJSW <2mm. The medial joint compartment was  
126 selected due to its common involvement in primary KOA, with preliminary analyses  
127 indicating it as the most reliable predictor of clinical outcomes.

### 128 *Generation of rKOA grades*

129 Overall rKOA grades were determined by integrating osteophyte and JSN grades.  
130 Subchondral sclerosis and cysts were not considered because they were rarely observed.  
131 Four osteophyte sites were assessed, each graded on a scale of 0 to 3, resulting in a total  
132 possible score of 12. To adjust for their relative contribution, each site's grade was multiplied  
133 by 0.5, resulting in a maximum combined osteophyte score of 6. This score was then added  
134 to the JSN total, resulting in a maximum sum score of 9 (see [supplementary Table 1](#)). To  
135 provide a five-point overall rKOA grade (similar to the KL radiograph grading system), we  
136 used the following cut-offs: rKOA grade 0, sum score = 0; grade 1 >0 &  $\leq$ 1.5; grade 2 >1.5 &  
137  $\leq$ 3; grade 3 >3 &  $\leq$ 4.5; grade 4 >4.5. [Figure 2](#) illustrates an example image corresponding to  
138 each rKOA grade. Additionally, as a sensitivity analysis, we adjusted mJSW measurements by  
139 normalising them against the mean height of the population before assigning JSN grades  
140 **(Supplementary Methods)**.

### 141 Clinical outcomes

142 A binary variable indicating knee pain lasting for more than three months was created based  
143 on responses obtained from a questionnaire administered during the participants' DXA  
144 appointment. Hospital-diagnosed KOA, hereafter referred to as HES-KOA, was determined  
145 using International Classification of Diseases (ICD) codes (9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> revisions), which were  
146 obtained via linkage to Hospital Episodes Statistics (HES). Records began in 1997 and data

147 were downloaded in July 2023, capturing information up until the end of October 2022. This  
148 variable was analysed cross-sectionally, recognising that KOA is a chronic condition that  
149 could have been present before the diagnosis. TKR had to be subsequent to the scan date  
150 and was based on Office of Population Censuses and Surveys (OPCS) codes, for which an  
151 associated date was obtained. None of the three clinical outcomes were side-specific.

## 152 Statistical analysis

153 Logistic regression was employed to investigate the associations between osteophytes, JSN,  
154 and rKOA grades with knee pain and HES-KOA. The findings are presented as odds ratios  
155 (ORs) alongside their corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs). When assessing the  
156 association of these exposures with TKR, Cox proportional hazards modelling was used, with  
157 results reported as hazard ratios (HRs) along with their 95% CIs. The proportional hazards  
158 assumption was checked using Schoenfeld residuals. Each exposure was compared against a  
159 reference group of individuals with a grade of 0 for that specific exposure. Both crude and  
160 adjusted models were conducted, with adjustments made for age, sex, height, weight, and  
161 ethnicity (**Supplementary Methods**). The primary analysis included both males and females,  
162 with additional separate analyses conducted for each sex. Additionally, an interaction term  
163 for sex was incorporated into the primary models. All analyses were conducted using Stata  
164 version 17 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA).

## 165 Results

### 166 Population Characteristics

167 In total, 19,595 right knee DXA scans were available after applying quality control measures.  
168 The mean age of participants was 63.7 years (range 45 to 82 years), with approximately

169 equal sex distribution (51.8 females) ([Table 1](#)). A total of 2,886 (14.7%) reported having had  
170 knee pain for >3 months, 917 (4.7%) had HES-KOA and 271 (1.4%) had undergone TKR  
171 subsequent to their DXA scan. The median time to TKR was 2.6 years (IQR: 1.3 to 4.1 years).

## 172 Prevalence of rKOA

### 173 *Osteophytes and JSN*

174 Osteophytes (grade  $\geq 1$ ) were detected in 2,359 (12.0%) DXA scans ([Table 1](#)), with the  
175 greatest prevalence observed in the medial femur, followed by the lateral tibia, medial tibia,  
176 and lateral femur. Notably, females exhibited a higher frequency of osteophytes across all  
177 sites compared to males. Osteophytes tended to be larger on the femur than on the tibia.  
178 Medial JSN (grade  $\geq 1$ ) was present in 1,847 participants (9.4%) and was almost three times  
179 more common in females. The prevalence of individual osteophyte and JSN grades can be  
180 found in [Supplementary Table 2](#) and [Supplementary Table 3](#), respectively.

### 181 *Overall rKOA grade*

182 A classifier for rKOA was constructed by combining scores for osteophytes and JSN. The  
183 distribution of participants across different rKOA grades is detailed in [Supplementary Table 4](#),  
184 with participant characteristics categorised by rKOA grade presented in [Supplementary Table](#)  
185 [5](#). Among the participants, 15,768 (80.5%) exhibited grade 0 rKOA, while 2,883 (14.7%) had  
186 grade 1, 712 (3.6%) had grade 2, 158 (0.8%) had grade 3 and 74 (0.4%) had grade 4. Due to  
187 the small number of participants with KOA grade 4, rKOA grades 3 and 4 were combined in  
188 subsequent analyses. Among females, 26.1% had an rKOA grade 1 or higher, compared to  
189 12.5% for males.

## 190 Associations between rKOA and knee osteoarthritis outcomes

### 191 *Osteophytes versus knee osteoarthritis outcomes*

192 In adjusted analyses, the presence of one or more osteophyte (grade  $\geq 1$ ) at any site was  
193 associated with knee pain, HES-KOA and TKR, with progressively higher effect estimates (OR  
194 3.38 [95% CI: 3.06, 3.75], 4.67 [4.03, 5.42] and 7.51 [5.84, 9.66], respectively) ([Table 2](#)).  
195 Results from the unadjusted analysis, provided in [Supplementary Table 6](#), demonstrated  
196 similar associations, albeit with larger effect sizes. Osteophytes located at each knee region  
197 were related to all clinical outcomes, with lateral femoral and medial tibial osteophytes  
198 showing the strongest associations with HES-KOA and TKR. Results of the sex-stratified  
199 analysis are detailed in [Supplementary Tables 7](#) and [8](#). The point estimates for the  
200 associations of individual osteophyte sites (grade  $\geq 1$ ) with pain and TKR were higher in males  
201 than in females after adjustment. However, no evidence of a sex interaction was observed  
202 when an interaction term was included in the main model.

203 Higher osteophyte grades were generally more strongly associated with the three clinical  
204 outcomes at all four sites, in both unadjusted and adjusted analyses ([Figure 3](#); tabulated in  
205 [Supplementary Tables 9](#) (unadjusted) and [10](#) (adjusted)). However, some exceptions were  
206 observed: grade 2 medial tibial osteophytes showed slightly weaker associations with pain  
207 compared with grade 1 osteophytes; grade 3 lateral tibial osteophytes showed slightly  
208 weaker associations with HES-KOA compared with grade 2 osteophytes; grade 2 lateral  
209 femoral osteophytes showed slightly weaker associations with TKR compared with grade 1  
210 osteophytes. Although the trend was less evident in the sex-stratified analyses,  
211 ([Supplementary Tables 11-14](#)), the ORs and HRs for grade 3 osteophytes were generally

212 larger than for grade 1. There was no evidence that sex modified the associations of  
213 osteophyte grades with clinical outcomes ([Supplementary Tables 9](#) and [10](#)).

214 *JSN versus knee osteoarthritis outcomes*

215 JSN (grade  $\geq 1$ ) was associated with all three clinical outcomes, with effect sizes almost 50%  
216 less than that of osteophytes (knee pain: adjusted OR 1.45 [1.28,1.65]; HES-KOA: OR 2.23  
217 [1.85, 2.67] and TKR: HR 3.23 [2.45, 4.26]) ([Table 2](#)). In sex stratified analyses, ORs and HRs  
218 for the association of JSN (grade  $\geq 1$ ) with clinical outcomes were found to be higher in males  
219 compared with females ([Supplementary Tables 7](#) and [8](#)) and there was evidence of a sex  
220 interaction for all outcomes ([Table 2](#)). As JSN grades increased, there was a corresponding  
221 increase in effect estimates ([Figure 3](#)), which stronger associations for HES-KOA compared  
222 with pain, and for TKR compared with HES-KOA. This trend remained consistent among  
223 females ([Supplementary Tables 13](#) and [14](#)) but was less evident in males ([Supplementary](#)  
224 [Tables 11](#) and [12](#)), though individual grades were still strongly associated with all three KOA  
225 outcomes. There was some evidence of a sex-interaction ([9](#) and [10](#)).

226 *rKOA versus knee OA outcomes*

227 The relationship between rKOA grades and clinical outcomes showed a consistent pattern of  
228 increasing strength of association with greater rKOA grade, which was observed across all  
229 three outcomes ([Figure 4](#); tabulated in [Supplementary Table 15](#)). Adjusted ORs for pain  
230 ranged from 2.04 (1.84, 2.26) for grade 1 rKOA to 7.08 (5.41, 9.27) for grades 3-4. Similarly,  
231 for HES-OA, the adjusted ORs varied from 2.67 (2.25, 3.16) for grade 1 rKOA to 10.24 (7.53,  
232 13.93) for grades 3-4. Regarding TKR, HRs ranged from 3.97 (2.90, 5.42) for grade 1 to 21.11  
233 (14.28, 31.19) for grades 3-4. In sex-stratified analyses ([Supplementary Table 15](#)), rKOA  
234 measures remained associated with all three outcomes, with a clear progressive trend in

235 females. In males, grade 2 rKOA had a stronger association with HES-KOA and TKR compared  
236 to grades 3-4, although grades 3-4 were still associated. Sex interactions were apparent for  
237 certain rKOA grades. Specifically, in adjusted models, there was evidence suggesting that the  
238 associations of rKOA grade 2 and rKOA grades 3-4 with HES-KOA and TKR were modified by  
239 sex. We conducted a sensitivity analysis to ensure that the observed associations between  
240 rKOA grades and clinical outcomes were not confounded by variations in participant height,  
241 as the shorter stature in females may have explained their greater prevalence of JSN. After  
242 deriving rKOA grades using height-normalised mJSW (prevalence detailed in [Supplementary](#)  
243 [Table 16](#)), the results showed a similar sex interaction in the relationship between rKOA  
244 grade and clinical outcomes ([Supplementary Table 17](#)).

## 245 Discussion

246 We aimed to create a novel classifier for rKOA based on knee DXA scans. Using semi-  
247 automated techniques to minimise subjective interpretation, we annotated and graded  
248 osteophytes and JSN on knee DXA scans from nearly 20,000 UKB participants to derive rKOA  
249 grade. Our study revealed an overall rKOA prevalence of 19.5%, consistent with previous  
250 estimates of rKOA based on plain radiographs (X-rays), though reported ranges vary widely  
251 (22). These variations likely stem from differences in participant selection, demographics,  
252 and the specific characteristics of the study populations. For instance, Cui et al. reported  
253 prevalence rates of rKOA (defined as  $KL \geq 2$ ) ranging from 9% to 55% across 19 studies  
254 conducted between 2001 to 2020, with a pooled estimate of 28.7% (23). All of these studies  
255 were notably smaller in scale compared to the present investigation. Specifically, the study  
256 reporting a 9% prevalence rate included 1,128 individuals from the USA with a mean age of  
257 62 (range 34-90), whereas the study with a 55% prevalence rate involved 3,040 Japanese

258 participants with a mean age of 70 (SD: 11). Our finding that women exhibited a higher rate  
259 than men (26.1% vs. 12.5%) aligns with the existing literature, which consistently shows a  
260 higher prevalence of KOA among women, especially over the age of 40 years (24, 25).

261 To evaluate the face validity of our measure of rKOA, we investigated associations with  
262 clinical outcomes related to KOA, namely prolonged knee pain, HES-KOA, and subsequent  
263 TKR. These outcomes serve as proxies for increasing severity, with TKR representing end-  
264 stage osteoarthritis. We observed robust and progressively increasing associations between  
265 grades of rKOA and all three outcomes. Furthermore, rKOA grades demonstrated stronger  
266 relationships with more advanced outcomes, with approximately seven-fold, ten-fold, and  
267 nineteen-fold increased risks of knee pain, HES-KOA, and TKR, respectively, for individuals  
268 classified with rKOA grades 3-4 compared to those with grade 0. These relationships  
269 appeared to reflect associations of both osteophyte and JSN grade with clinical outcomes,  
270 both of which were used to derived rKOA grade. That said, the presence of pain correlated  
271 more strongly with the presence of osteophytes than with JSN, which is consistent with  
272 some studies (26, 27), but not all (28). Taken together, these findings suggest that rKOA may  
273 have clinical relevance, given its relationship with outcomes such as pain and risk of TKR.  
274 While NICE guidelines prioritise symptom-based diagnosis (29), our results suggest that  
275 imaging could be beneficial in certain cases, potentially complementing clinical assessments  
276 and aiding in treatment decisions. Moreover, our proposed method for evaluating rKOA  
277 offers a means of evaluating structural changes associated with KOA in large cohorts. This  
278 could in turn to provide a basis for identifying new risk factors, including genetic factors,  
279 which could lead to the discovery of novel therapeutic targets.

280 Interestingly, we found evidence of a sex difference in the associations of JSN and rKOA with  
281 KOA outcomes, with generally higher effect estimates observed in males in sex-stratified  
282 analyses. This discrepancy may be attributed to narrower joint space width in healthy  
283 females compared with males, possibly due to their smaller stature, making JSN (derived  
284 from mJSW) a less specific measure for osteoarthritis in females. This could in turn result in  
285 weaker associations with clinical outcomes. However, results of the sensitivity analysis show  
286 that these differences persist even after normalising mJSW by mean height, suggesting that  
287 radiographic evidence of KOA may not correspond as closely with clinical outcomes in  
288 women. Other studies support this by demonstrating that, given the same level of  
289 radiographic severity, women tend to experience more intense pain and physical limitations  
290 than men (25, 30).

291 Similar to the conventional KL grading system, our DXA-derived classification system  
292 prioritises the assessment of osteophytes and JSN, as these features are considered hallmark  
293 signs of osteoarthritis progression and have been associated with knee symptoms (31-35).  
294 While sclerosis is a component of the KL grading system, definitive sclerosis was observed  
295 too infrequently on DXA images for inclusion in our classifier. This may represent a significant  
296 limitation given that some studies suggest sclerosis is associated with knee pain (28, 36). On  
297 the other hand, our classifier offers several distinct advantages. For example, KL grading  
298 often introduces ambiguity with terms like “definite” osteophyte and “possible” JSN,  
299 (assuming a continuous progression of these structural changes), which can lead to  
300 discrepancies between raters and across studies (5-9). In contrast, we automated the  
301 measurement of mJSW, enabling us to establish quantitative cut-offs for JSN. While  
302 osteophytes were manually identified, our classifier uses specific area-based cut-offs to  
303 define osteophyte grade, thereby avoiding the subjective scoring used in KL grading.

304 Importantly, we observed strong correlations between these osteophyte grades and all three  
305 KOA outcomes, validating their use in future studies. By leveraging advancements in  
306 computer vision technologies, it may become feasible to fully automate the shading of  
307 osteophytes, enabling the widespread application of our classifier in large-scale  
308 epidemiological studies.

309 To our knowledge, no other automated or semi-automated classification system for rKOA on  
310 knee DXA images has been described previously. That said, various machine learning and  
311 deep-learning methods have been reported to analyse rKOA on X-rays. Rather than  
312 developing a classification system based on thresholds for JSN and osteophyte size, as here,  
313 X-ray based studies have generally trained models on diagnoses made by radiologists. For  
314 example, Thomas et al. developed an automated model to detect the presence of rKOA,  
315 defined as KL grade  $\geq 2$ , using X-rays previously graded by a committee of radiologists (10).  
316 Their model, employing a convolutional neural network, demonstrated performance similar  
317 to that of radiologists. Similarly, Tiulpin et al. utilized deep-learning methods to accurately  
318 predict KL grade from knee X-rays, achieving an area under the ROC curve of 0.98 for  
319 detecting rKOA (KL  $\geq 2$ ) (37).

320 In terms of limitations, although our clinical outcomes related to KOA were not side-specific,  
321 our classification of rKOA was based solely on right knees. However, this approach likely  
322 reduces effect estimates rather than introducing biased associations. Additionally, HES-KOA,  
323 while specific, may be insensitive since obtaining an ICD code necessitates a hospital  
324 admission. Furthermore, since our classification system was developed using data from UKB,  
325 future studies should replicate our findings to validate their generalizability. A further  
326 limitation is that, unlike previous studies based on X-rays, DXA images are acquired with

327 participants in a supine position, as opposed to weight bearing, meaning the mJSW is usually  
328 larger (38). Like X-rays, being two-dimensional, DXA scans provide a limited view of  
329 osteophytes and can be distorted by minor changes in patient positioning, potentially  
330 obscuring osteophytes from view. The lower prevalence of lateral femoral osteophytes  
331 observed in our analysis compared to other sites may indicate potential issues related to  
332 rotation during image acquisition.

333 In conclusion, we have developed a semi-automated classifier for rKOA for use on knee DXA  
334 images, based on combinations of osteophytes at four locations within the knee joint, and  
335 medial JSN. Having applied this classifier to right knee DXA images from ~20,000 UKB  
336 participants, we observed expected prevalence rates for rKOA, including higher rates in  
337 females than males. Moreover, rKOA showed expected progressive associations with clinical  
338 outcomes namely knee pain, HES-OA and TKR. Based on these findings, we propose that  
339 knee DXA scans can provide a valuable tool in ascertaining rKOA in large cohort studies, as  
340 well as pointing to their possible use in population-based screening.

## 341 Acknowledgements

342 The authors would like to thank the participants of the UK Biobank.

## 343 Funding

344 This research was funded in whole, or in part, by the Wellcome Trust [Grant numbers:  
345 209233/Z/17/Z, 223267/Z/21/Z]. BGF is funded by an NIHR Academic Clinical Lectureship. CL  
346 is funded by a Sir Henry Dale Fellowship jointly funded by the Wellcome Trust and the Royal  
347 Society (223267/Z/21/Z). NCH is supported by grants from Medical Research Council (MRC)  
348 [MC\_PC\_21003; MC\_PC\_21001] and the NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre.

349 **Conflict of interest**

350 The other authors have declared no conflicts of interest. For the purpose of open access, the  
351 authors have applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript  
352 version arising from this submission.

353 **Data availability**

354 The data from this study will be available from UK Biobank in an upcoming data release. To  
355 access these resources, users must register with UK Biobank at:  
356 <https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/enable-your-research/register>. The BoneFinder® knee  
357 module and Markup-Tool are freely available on request: <https://bone-finder.com/>

Table 1: Baseline descriptive statistics of the study population.

	All (n=19,595)	Female (n=10,146)	Male (n=9449)
<b>Demographics</b>			
		<i>Mean (Range)</i>	
Age (years)	63.73 (45, 82)	63.03 (45, 82)	64.49 (45, 82)
Height (cm)	170.20 (135, 202)	163.59 (135, 198)	177.29 (150, 202)
Weight (kg)	75.27 (36, 169)	67.96 (36, 169)	83.12 (48, 160)
Ethnic background		<i>Frequency (%)</i>	
White	18963 (96.77%)	9827 (96.86%)	9136 (96.69%)
Asian	263 (1.34%)	124 (1.22%)	139 (1.47%)
Chinese	54 (0.28%)	36 (0.35%)	18 (0.19%)
Black	116 (0.59%)	63 (0.62%)	53 (0.56%)
Mixed	91 (0.46%)	49 (0.48%)	42 (0.44%)
Other	110 (0.56%)	61 (0.60%)	49 (0.52%)
Unknown	52 (0.27%)	22 (0.22%)	30 (0.32%)
<b>Radiographic measures</b>			
		<i>Frequency (%)</i>	
OP any location	2359 (12.04%)	1473 (14.52%)	886 (9.38%)
OP all locations	71 (0.36%)	43 (0.42%)	28 (0.30%)
Medial femoral OP	1328 (6.78%)	900 (8.87%)	428 (4.53%)
Lateral femoral OP	303 (1.55%)	194 (1.91%)	109 (1.15%)
Medial tibial OP	1003 (5.12%)	596 (5.87%)	407 (4.31%)
Lateral tibial OP	1243 (6.34%)	748 (7.37%)	495 (5.24%)
medial JSN	1847 (9.43%)	1427 (14.06%)	420 (4.44%)
		<i>Mean (Range)</i>	
Total OP area (mm <sup>2</sup> )	24.28 (1.99, 316.62)	22.88 (1.99, 316.62)	26.59 (2.12, 266.69)
Medial femoral OP area (mm <sup>2</sup> )	18.29 (1.99, 142.71)	17.28 (1.99, 142.71)	20.42 (3.95, 123.22)
Lateral femoral OP area (mm <sup>2</sup> )	20.72 (2.46, 155.11)	17.26 (2.46, 68.56)	26.90 (3.29, 155.11)
Medial tibial OP area (mm <sup>2</sup> )	11.57 (2.05, 118.09)	10.56 (2.05, 118.09)	13.06 (2.12, 95.09)
Lateral tibial OP area (mm <sup>2</sup> )	12.14 (2.18, 121.00)	11.38 (2.19, 121.00)	13.28 (2.18, 90.43)
Medial mJSW (mm)	3.90 (0, 7.27)	3.61 (0, 6.31)	4.21 (0.37, 7.27)
Lateral mJSW (mm)	4.15 (0.47, 7.87)	3.73 (0.48, 7.74)	4.59 (0.47, 7.87)
<b>Clinical outcomes</b>			
		<i>Frequency (%)</i>	
Knee pain >3 months	2886 (14.73%)	1500 (14.78%)	1386 (14.67%)
HES-KOA	917 (4.68%)	425 (4.19%)	492 (5.21%)
TKR	271 (1.38%)	141 (1.39%)	130 (1.38%)
		<i>Median (IQR)</i>	
Time to TKR (years)	2.60 (1.31, 4.10)	2.54 (1.46, 3.96)	2.68 (1.31, 4.62)


Abbreviations: HES-KOA, Knee Osteoarthritis Based on Hospital Episodes Statistics; mJSW, Minimum Joint Space Width; OP, Osteophyte; TKR, Total Knee Replacement.

Table 2: The adjusted associations of osteophytes and joint space narrowing (grades  $\geq 1$ ) with knee osteoarthritis outcomes

	Pain			HES-KOA			TKR		
	OR	95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value	HR	95% CI	p-value
Any OP	3.38	(3.74, 0.00)	$1.0 \times 10^{-123}$	4.67	(4.03, 5.42)	$2.7 \times 10^{-93}$	7.51	(5.84, 9.66)	$8.4 \times 10^{-56}$
OP at all locations	3.90	(6.30, 0.00)	$3.1 \times 10^{-08}$	4.37	(2.48, 7.68)	$3.2 \times 10^{-07}$	5.77	(2.94, 11.31)	$3.4 \times 10^{-07}$
Medial femoral OP	3.50	(3.96, 0.00)	$1.2 \times 10^{-87}$	3.84	(3.23, 4.57)	$8.5 \times 10^{-52}$	5.20	(3.98, 6.80)	$2.6 \times 10^{-33}$
Lateral femoral OP	3.39	(4.30, 0.00)	$1.7 \times 10^{-23}$	6.19	(4.71, 8.14)	$4.1 \times 10^{-39}$	7.93	(5.60, 11.23)	$2.0 \times 10^{-31}$
Medial tibial OP	4.17	(4.77, 0.00)	$2.8 \times 10^{-93}$	5.43	(4.55, 6.47)	$9.4 \times 10^{-39}$	8.06	(6.21, 10.46)	$1.9 \times 10^{-55}$
Lateral tibial OP	2.90	(3.30, 0.00)	$3.0 \times 10^{-59}$	3.65	(3.06, 4.36)	$6.1 \times 10^{-47}$	4.86	(3.72, 6.35)	$5.8 \times 10^{-31}$
JSN	1.45	(1.65, 0.00)	$7.0 \times 10^{-09*}$	2.23	(1.85, 2.67)	$1.0 \times 10^{-17*}$	3.23	(2.45, 4.26)	$8.0 \times 10^{-17*}$

Logistic regression and cox proportional hazards modelling results showing the associations of osteophyte and JSN grades (grade  $\geq 1$  vs 0) with knee pain, hospital diagnosed knee osteoarthritis and knee replacement, respectively (n=19,595). Models were adjusted for age, sex, height, weight and ethnicity. Abbreviations: CI, Confidence Interval; HES-KOA, Knee Osteoarthritis Based on Hospital Episodes Statistics; HR, Hazard Ratio; JSN, Joint Space Narrowing; OP, Osteophyte; OR Odds Ratio; TKR, Total Knee Replacement. \*Denotes a sex-interaction term with  $p < 0.05$ .

Figure 1: An example DXA scan with osteophytes marked up




The left panel displays a DXA image of the knee without annotations, while the right panel shows the same DXA image with osteophytes manually shaded. Osteophytes are indicated by colours corresponding to their locations: red for the medial femur, green for the lateral femur, yellow for the medial tibia, and blue for the lateral tibia. Minimum joint space width (mJSW) was measured at specific points in the medial and lateral compartments. For the distal femur, mJSW was measured between medial points 24-30 and lateral points 15-20. For the proximal tibia, mJSW was measured between medial points 68-73 and lateral points 57-62.

Figure 2: Example DXA scans representing each grade of radiographic knee osteoarthritis




Radiographic knee osteoarthritis (rKOA) grades were generated by integrating data on osteophyte grades and joint space narrowing (JSN) grades. The images show progression from Grade 0 to Grade 4, demonstrating increasing severity of osteoarthritic changes. Grade 0 indicates no radiographic features of osteoarthritis, while Grades 1 to 4 show progressively more significant joint space narrowing and osteophyte formation.

Figure 3: Associations of Osteophyte grades and medial joint space narrowing grades with knee osteoarthritis outcomes.



The graphs depict both crude and adjusted odds ratios and hazard ratios, accompanied by 95% confidence intervals, for knee pain, HES-KOA, and TKR, across different grades of osteophytes and JSN (n=19,595). Models are adjusted for age, sex, height, weight, and ethnicity. Abbreviations: CI, Confidence Interval; HES-KOA, Knee Osteoarthritis based on Hospital Episode Statistics; JSN, Joint Space Narrowing; OP, Osteophyte; TKR, Total Knee Replacement.

Figure 4: Associations of rKOA grade with knee osteoarthritis outcomes



The plots present both unadjusted and adjusted associations between rKOA grade, derived from a composite measure of osteophyte and JSN grades, and knee osteoarthritis outcomes (n=19,595). The models include adjustments for age, sex, height, weight, and ethnicity, with 95% confidence intervals provided. Abbreviations: CI, Confidence Interval; HES-KOA, Knee Osteoarthritis based on Hospital Episode Statistics; JSN, Joint Space Narrowing; rKOA, Radiographic Knee Osteoarthritis; TKR, Total Knee Replacement.

## Supplementary Tables

<b>Combined score</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
0	15,768	80.47
0.5	823	4.2
1	1,678	8.56
1.5	382	1.95
2	428	2.18
2.5	142	0.72
3	142	0.72
3.5	71	0.36
4	55	0.28
4.5	32	0.16
5	29	0.15
5.5	17	0.09
6	11	0.06
6.5	7	0.04
7	3	0.02
7.5	5	0.03
8	1	0.01
9	1	0.01

Supplementary Table 1: The breakdown of the combine score including osteophyte and JSN grades.

Radiographic osteophyte grades, initially multiplied by 0.5, were summed across the four sites on the medial and lateral aspects of the femur and tibia, with a maximum possible score of 6. This score was then combined with the JSN grade, resulting in a maximum possible score of 9 for each individual. Cut-offs were used to assign overall rKOA grades based on these combined scores.

<b>Osteophyte grade</b>	<b>All</b> (n=19,595)		<b>Female</b> (n=10,146)		<b>Male</b> (n=9,449)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Medial Femur</b>						
0	18,267	(93.22)	9,246	(91.13)	9,021	(95.47)
1	732	(3.74)	535	(5.27)	197	(2.08)
2	374	(1.91)	234	(2.31)	140	(1.48)
3	222	(1.13)	131	(1.29)	91	(0.96)
<b>Lateral femur</b>						
0	19,292	(98.45)	9,952	(98.09)	9,340	(98.85)
1	130	(0.66)	100	(0.99)	30	(0.32)
2	78	(0.40)	49	(0.48)	29	(0.31)
3	95	(0.48)	45	(0.44)	50	(0.53)
<b>Medial tibia</b>						
0	18,592	(94.88)	9,550	(94.13)	9,042	(95.69)
1	695	(3.55)	453	(4.46)	242	(2.56)
2	195	(1.00)	90	(0.89)	105	(1.11)
3	113	(0.58)	53	(0.52)	60	(0.63)
<b>Lateral tibia</b>						
0	18,352	(93.66)	9,398	(92.63)	8,954	(94.76)
1	809	(4.13)	502	(4.95)	307	(3.25)
2	237	(1.21)	141	(1.39)	96	(1.02)
3	197	(1.01)	105	(1.03)	92	(0.97)

Supplementary Table 2: Prevalence of Osteophytes by site.

	<b>All</b> (n=19,595)	<b>Female</b> (n=10,146)	<b>Male</b> (n=9,449)
<b>Medial JSN grade</b>			
0	17748 (90.57%)	8719 (85.94%)	9029 (95.56%)
1	1448 (7.39%)	1129 (11.13%)	319 (3.38%)
2	315 (1.61%)	248 (2.44%)	67 (0.71%)
3	84 (0.43%)	50 (0.49%)	34 (0.36%)

Supplementary Table 3: Prevalence of medial joint space narrowing (JSN).

	<b>All</b> (n=19,595)	<b>Female</b> (n=10,146)	<b>Male</b> (n=9,449)
<b>rKOA grade</b>			
0	15768 (80.47%)	7500 (73.92%)	8268 (87.50%)
1	2883 (14.71%)	2027 (19.98%)	856 (9.06%)
2	712 (3.63%)	492 (4.85%)	220 (2.33%)
3	158 (0.81%)	87 (0.86%)	71 (0.75%)
4	74 (0.38%)	40 (0.39%)	34 (0.36%)

Supplementary Table 4: Prevalence of radiographic knee osteoarthritis (rKOA).

	<b>rKOA grade</b>			
	<b>1</b> N=2883	<b>2</b> N=712	<b>3</b> N=158	<b>4</b> N=74
<b>Demographics</b>	Mean (SD)			
Age (years)	65.22 (7.00)	66.44 (6.89)	66.66 (6.38)	66.76 (6.13)
Height (cm)	167.27 (9.08)	167.28 (9.48)	169.84 (9.70)	168.69 (9.99)
Weight (kg)	74.24 (15.76)	76.39 (16.63)	82.61 (17.49)	90.00 (21.88)
<b>Radiographic measures</b>	Frequency (%)			
OP at any site	1668 (57.86%)	459 (64.47%)	158 (100.00%)	74 (100.00%)
OP at all sites	0 (0.00%)	15 (2.11%)	29 (18.35%)	27 (36.49%)
Medial femoral OP	805 (27.92%)	326 (45.79%)	130 (82.28%)	67 (90.54%)
Lateral femoral OP	89 (3.09%)	114 (16.01%)	66 (41.77%)	34 (45.95%)
Medial tibial OP	518 (17.97%)	286 (40.17%)	129 (81.65%)	70 (94.59%)
Lateral tibial OP	773 (26.81%)	294 (41.29%)	115 (72.78%)	61 (82.43%)
Medial JSN	1312 (45.51%)	393 (55.20%)	82 (51.90%)	60 (81.08%)
<b>Clinical outcomes</b>	Frequency (%)			
Knee pain	635 (22.03%)	245 (34.41%)	83 (52.53%)	42 (56.76%)
HES-KOA	225 (7.80%)	140 (19.66%)	45 (28.48%)	24 (32.43%)
Knee replacement	75 (2.60%)	62 (8.71%)	25 (15.82%)	15 (20.27%)

Supplementary Table 5: Participant characteristics by radiographic KOA grade.

Abbreviations: cm, centimetres; HES-KOA, hospital diagnosed knee osteoarthritis; JSN, joint space narrowing; Kg, kilograms; OP, osteophytes; TKR, total knee replacement.

	Pain			HES-KOA			TKR		
	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	HR	95% CI	<i>p</i>
Any OP	3.72	(3.37, 4.10)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	5.39	(4.69, 6.21)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	9.74	(7.67, 12.38)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>
OP at all locations	5.07	(3.18, 8.10)	1.04 x10 <sup>-11</sup>	6.51	(3.76, 11.28)	2.26 x 10 <sup>-11</sup>	10.52	(5.41, 20.44)	3.93 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>
Medial femoral OP	3.95	(3.50, 4.45)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	4.53	(3.84, 5.35)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	7.10	(5.50, 9.18)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>
Lateral femoral OP	4.09	(3.24, 5.16)	2.04 x10 <sup>-32</sup>	8.05	(6.19, 10.49)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	12.36	(8.83, 17.29)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>
Medial tibial OP	4.75	(4.16, 5.43)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	6.70	(5.65, 7.94)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	11.32	(8.82, 14.53)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>
Lateral tibial OP	3.31	(2.93, 3.76)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	4.48	(3.77, 5.31)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	6.76	(5.22, 8.75)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>
JSN	1.53	(1.35, 1.73)	7.19 x 10 <sup>-12*</sup>	2.29	(1.92, 2.72)	1.26 x 10 <sup>-20*</sup>	3.80	(2.92, 4.95)	3.85 x 10 <sup>-23*</sup>

Supplementary Table 6: The unadjusted associations of osteophytes and joint space narrowing (grades >1) with knee OA outcomes in males and females combined.

Abbreviations: CI, Confidence Interval; HES-KOA, Knee osteoarthritis based on Hospital Episodes Statistics; HR, Hazard Ratio; JSN, Joint Space Narrowing; OP, Osteophyte; OR Odds Ratio; TKR, Total Knee Replacement. \*Denotes a sex-interaction term with  $p < 0.05$ .  $n = 19,595$ .

	Pain			HES-KOA			TKR		
	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	HR	95% CI	<i>p</i>
Any OP	3.72	(3.20, 4.33)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	5.12	(4.17, 6.28)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	10.45	(7.41, 14.74)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>
OP at all locations	5.87	(2.79, 12.33)	3.05 x 10 <sup>-06</sup>	6.14	(2.60, 14.52)	3.54 x 10 <sup>-05</sup>	11.06	(4.09, 29.92)	2.24 x 10 <sup>-06</sup>
Medial femoral OP	4.41	(3.61, 5.40)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	4.63	(3.56, 6.04)	6.45 x 10 <sup>-30</sup>	8.68	(5.88, 12.80)	1.15 x 10 <sup>-27</sup>
Lateral femoral OP	4.89	(3.34, 7.16)	3.76 x 10 <sup>-16</sup>	8.02	(5.26, 12.24)	4.74 x 10 <sup>-22</sup>	13.57	(8.04, 22.90)	1.68 x 10 <sup>-22</sup>
Medial tibial OP	4.82	(3.93, 5.93)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	6.42	(4.99, 8.26)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	13.67	(9.54, 19.60)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>
Lateral tibial OP	3.23	(2.66, 3.93)	8.43 x 10 <sup>-32</sup>	4.14	(3.20, 5.35)	2.30 x 10 <sup>-27</sup>	6.86	(4.65, 10.10)	2.15 x 10 <sup>-22</sup>
JSN	2.64	(2.13, 3.28)	1.69 x 10 <sup>-18</sup>	3.77	(2.85, 4.98)	1.81 x 10 <sup>-20</sup>	5.77	(3.80, 8.77)	2.17 x 10 <sup>-16</sup>
				<i>Adjusted</i>					
Any OP	3.46	(2.96, 4.04)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	4.40	(3.57, 5.43)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	8.36	(5.86, 11.91)	7.64 x 10 <sup>-32</sup>
OP at all locations	4.33	(2.03, 9.23)	1.52 x 10 <sup>-04</sup>	4.03	(1.68, 9.68)	0.002	6.03	(2.19, 16.59)	5.00 x 10 <sup>-04</sup>
Medial femoral OP	4.04	(3.29, 4.96)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	3.86	(2.95, 5.06)	1.01 x 10 <sup>-22</sup>	6.59	(4.42, 9.82)	2.11 x 10 <sup>-20</sup>
Lateral femoral OP	4.23	(2.87, 6.24)	3.51 x 10 <sup>-13</sup>	6.34	(4.11, 9.76)	5.45 x 10 <sup>-17</sup>	9.20	(5.38, 15.72)	4.94 x 10 <sup>-16</sup>
Medial tibial OP	4.36	(3.53, 5.37)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	5.33	(4.12, 6.91)	7.63 x 10 <sup>-37</sup>	10.48	(7.21, 15.23)	6.48 x 10 <sup>-35</sup>
Lateral tibial OP	2.92	(2.39, 3.56)	8.07 x 10 <sup>-26</sup>	3.45	(2.66, 4.49)	1.97 x 10 <sup>-20</sup>	5.21	(3.50, 7.75)	4.03 x 10 <sup>-16</sup>
JSN	2.50	(2.00, 3.12)	6.44 x 10 <sup>-16</sup>	3.25	(2.44, 4.33)	7.60 x 10 <sup>-16</sup>	4.45	(2.90, 6.82)	7.26 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>

Supplementary Table 7: The associations of osteophytes and joint space narrowing (grades >1) with knee OA outcomes in males.

Abbreviations: CI, Confidence Interval; HES-KOA, Knee osteoarthritis based on Hospital Episodes Statistics; HR, Hazard Ratio; JSN, Joint Space Narrowing; OP, Osteophyte; OR Odds Ratio; TKR, Total Knee Replacement. Models were adjusted for age, height, weight and ethnic group. n=9,449.



	Pain			HES KOA			TKR		
	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	HR	95% CI	<i>p</i>
<b>Medial femur</b>									
grade 1	2.93	(2.49, 3.45)	$3.50 \times 10^{-38}$	2.86	(2.23, 3.67)	$1.32 \times 10^{-16}$	3.98	(2.66, 5.97)	$2.05 \times 10^{-11}$
grade 2	5.07	(4.12, 6.25)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$	6.09	(4.67, 7.94)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$	9.73	(6.71, 14.09)	$2.76 \times 10^{-33}$
grade 3	6.40	(4.91, 8.36)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$	8.33	(6.10, 11.38)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$	13.38	(8.88, 20.18)	$3.46 \times 10^{-35}$
<b>Lateral femur</b>									
grade 1	3.62	(2.53, 5.17)	$1.65 \times 10^{-12}$	6.62	(4.38, 10.02)	$3.44 \times 10^{-19}$	10.45	(6.20, 17.62)	$1.30 \times 10^{-18}$
grade 2	4.39	(2.79, 6.89)	$1.31 \times 10^{-10}$	5.70	(3.27, 9.91)	$7.44 \times 10^{-10}$	8.21	(3.87, 17.42)	$4.07 \times 10^{-08}$
grade 3	4.54	(3.02, 6.83)	$3.59 \times 10^{-13}$	12.88	(8.44, 19.65)	$2.09 \times 10^{-32}$	18.97	(11.74, 30.66)	$3.05 \times 10^{-33}$
<b>Medial tibia</b>									
grade 1	4.63	(3.96, 5.42)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$	5.33	(4.32, 6.58)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$	8.56	(6.27, 11.70)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$
grade 2	4.36	(3.27, 5.83)	$2.05 \times 10^{-23}$	9.44	(6.83, 13.06)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$	16.19	(10.80, 24.29)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$
grade 3	6.43	(4.44, 9.32)	$8.65 \times 10^{-23}$	11.83	(7.91, 17.69)	$2.77 \times 10^{-33}$	21.17	(13.01, 34.42)	$9.02 \times 10^{-35}$
<b>Lateral tibia</b>									
grade 1	2.98	(2.56, 3.48)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$	3.43	(2.75, 4.29)	$1.37 \times 10^{-27}$	4.56	(3.21, 6.49)	$3.24 \times 10^{-17}$
grade 2	3.67	(2.81, 4.80)	$1.95 \times 10^{-21}$	6.51	(4.72, 8.97)	$2.45 \times 10^{-30}$	10.43	(6.82, 15.95)	$2.88 \times 10^{-27}$
grade 3	4.41	(3.31, 5.88)	$4.76 \times 10^{-24}$	6.80	(4.81, 9.61)	$1.92 \times 10^{-27}$	11.81	(7.59, 18.37)	$6.24 \times 10^{-28}$
<b>JSN</b>									
Grade 1	1.26	(1.09, 1.45)	0.002*	1.69	(1.36, 2.09)	$2.12 \times 10^{-06}$ *	2.50	(1.78, 3.51)	$1.37 \times 10^{-07}$ *
Grade 2	2.20	(1.71, 2.84)	$9.71 \times 10^{-10}$ *	3.69	(2.66, 5.12)	$4.92 \times 10^{-15}$ *	6.48	(4.17, 10.06)	$1.01 \times 10^{-16}$
Grade 3	5.25	(3.41, 8.08)	$4.54 \times 10^{-14}$	9.63	(6.00, 15.46)	$6.81 \times 10^{-21}$ *	17.59	(10.40, 29.75)	$1.05 \times 10^{-26}$ *

Supplementary Table 9: Unadjusted associations of OP grades and JSN grades with knee OA outcomes in males and females combined.

Abbreviations: CI, Confidence Interval; HES-KOA, Knee osteoarthritis based on Hospital Episodes Statistics; HR, Hazard Ratio; JSN, Joint Space Narrowing; OP, Osteophyte; OR Odds Ratio; TKR, Total Knee Replacement. \*Denotes a sex-interaction term with  $p < 0.05$ .  $n = 19,595$ .

	Pain			HES KOA			TKR		
	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	HR	95% CI	<i>p</i>
<b>Medial femur</b>									
grade 1	2.66	(2.25, 3.14)	2.14 x 10 <sup>-30</sup>	2.56	(1.98, 3.30)	5.86 x 10 <sup>-13</sup>	3.10	(2.06, 4.69)	7.08 x 10 <sup>-08</sup>
grade 2	4.48	(3.62, 5.55)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	5.02	(3.82, 6.59)	4.15 x 10 <sup>-31</sup>	6.88	(4.71, 10.07)	2.46 x 10 <sup>-23</sup>
grade 3	5.31	(4.04, 6.98)	3.76 x 10 <sup>-33</sup>	6.28	(4.55, 8.66)	4.57 x 10 <sup>-29</sup>	8.65	(5.67, 13.20)	1.52 x 10 <sup>-23</sup>
<b>Lateral femur</b>									
grade 1	3.09	(2.14, 4.45)	1.50 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>	5.36	(3.50, 8.20)	1.10 x 10 <sup>-14</sup>	6.75	(3.96, 11.48)	2.03 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>
grade 2	3.51	(2.21, 5.56)	9.48 x 10 <sup>-08</sup>	4.12	(2.34, 7.27)	9.85 x 10 <sup>-07</sup>	5.21	(2.44, 11.10)	1.92 x 10 <sup>-05</sup>
grade 3	3.73	(2.45, 5.66)	7.39 x 10 <sup>-10</sup>	9.69	(6.27, 14.98)	1.78 x 10 <sup>-24</sup>	12.25	(7.49, 20.02)	1.66 x 10 <sup>-23</sup>
<b>Medial tibia</b>									
grade 1	4.15	(3.53, 4.87)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	4.54	(3.66, 5.64)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	6.54	(4.75, 9.00)	1.04 x 10 <sup>-30</sup>
grade 2	3.82	(2.84, 5.14)	6.54 x 10 <sup>-19</sup>	7.33	(5.26, 10.22)	6.15 x 10 <sup>-32</sup>	11.02	(7.29, 16.66)	5.08 x 10 <sup>-30</sup>
grade 3	4.94	(3.37, 7.24)	2.41 x 10 <sup>-16</sup>	7.82	(5.16, 11.86)	3.79 x 10 <sup>-22</sup>	11.64	(6.99, 19.37)	3.70 x 10 <sup>-21</sup>
<b>Lateral tibia</b>									
grade 1	2.69	(2.30, 3.15)	6.15 x 10 <sup>-35</sup>	2.94	(2.34, 3.68)	1.37 x 10 <sup>-20</sup>	3.52	(2.46, 5.03)	5.00 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>
grade 2	3.08	(2.35, 4.05)	7.49 x 10 <sup>-16</sup>	5.14	(3.70, 7.14)	1.52 x 10 <sup>-22</sup>	7.14	(4.63, 11.01)	5.76 x 10 <sup>-19</sup>
grade 3	3.61	(2.69, 4.86)	1.53 x 10 <sup>-17</sup>	4.92	(3.44, 7.03)	2.19 x 10 <sup>-18</sup>	7.26	(4.60, 11.46)	1.70 x 10 <sup>-17</sup>
<b>JSN</b>									
Grade 1	1.21	(1.05, 1.41)	0.010*	1.69	(1.35, 2.12)	3.68 x 10 <sup>-06*</sup>	2.23	(1.57, 3.16)	6.64 x 10 <sup>-06*</sup>
Grade 2	2.03	(1.57, 2.64)	9.17 x 10 <sup>-08*</sup>	3.37	(2.40, 4.73)	2.03 x 10 <sup>-12*</sup>	4.98	(3.17, 7.84)	3.83 x 10 <sup>-12*</sup>
Grade 3	4.39	(2.82, 6.83)	5.09 x 10 <sup>-11</sup>	7.37	(4.53, 12.00)	9.30 x 10 <sup>-16*</sup>	11.10	(6.51, 18.92)	9.59 x 10 <sup>-19*</sup>

Supplementary Table 10: Adjusted associations of OP grades and JSN grades with knee OA outcomes in males and females combined.

Abbreviations: CI, Confidence Interval; HES-KOA, Knee osteoarthritis based on Hospital Episodes Statistics; HR, Hazard Ratio; JSN, Joint Space Narrowing; OP, Osteophyte; OR Odds Ratio; TKR, Total Knee Replacement. \*Denotes a sex-interaction term with  $p < 0.05$ . Models were adjusted for age, sex, height, weight and ethnic group.  $n=19,595$ .

	Pain			HES KOA			TKR		
	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	HR	95% CI	<i>p</i>
<b>Medial femur</b>									
grade 1	3.63	(2.70, 4.89)	1.79 x 10 <sup>-17</sup>	3.30	(2.17, 5.01)	2.11 x 10 <sup>-08</sup>	5.84	(3.12, 10.91)	3.16 x 10 <sup>-08</sup>
grade 2	4.30	(3.05, 6.06)	9.05 x 10 <sup>-17</sup>	5.67	(3.74, 8.59)	2.75 x 10 <sup>-16</sup>	11.00	(6.27, 19.31)	6.54 x 10 <sup>-17</sup>
grade 3	6.88	(4.54, 10.43)	9.24 x 10 <sup>-20</sup>	6.24	(3.79, 10.26)	5.55 x 10 <sup>-13</sup>	11.38	(5.93, 21.85)	2.58 x 10 <sup>-13</sup>
<b>Lateral femur</b>									
grade 1	4.58	(2.22, 9.45)	3.87 x 10 <sup>-05</sup>	7.02	(3.11, 15.85)	2.75 x 10 <sup>-06</sup>	18.38	(8.08, 41.79)	3.76 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>
grade 2	4.86	(2.33, 10.13)	2.41 x 10 <sup>-05</sup>	5.04	(2.04, 12.43)	4.52 x 10 <sup>-04</sup>	6.26	(1.55, 25.33)	0.010
grade 3	5.10	(2.92, 8.92)	1.13 x 10 <sup>-08</sup>	10.86	(6.05, 19.49)	1.35 x 10 <sup>-15</sup>	15.01	(7.33, 30.76)	1.36 x 10 <sup>-13</sup>
<b>Medial tibia</b>									
grade 1	4.71	(3.62, 6.12)	5.32 x 10 <sup>-31</sup>	5.08	(3.63, 7.12)	2.71 x 10 <sup>-21</sup>	10.80	(6.75, 17.28)	3.14 x 10 <sup>-23</sup>
grade 2	3.82	(2.56, 5.70)	5.51 x 10 <sup>-11</sup>	9.07	(5.90, 13.97)	1.18 x 10 <sup>-23</sup>	17.38	(10.03, 30.12)	2.46 x 10 <sup>-24</sup>
grade 3	7.90	(4.73, 13.18)	2.63 x 10 <sup>-15</sup>	7.88	(4.41, 14.08)	3.32 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>	19.39	(9.74, 38.62)	3.32 x 10 <sup>-17</sup>
<b>Lateral tibia</b>									
grade 1	2.72	(2.11, 3.49)	7.07 x 10 <sup>-15</sup>	2.94	(2.07, 4.19)	2.22 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>	4.39	(2.50, 7.69)	2.41 x 10 <sup>-07</sup>
grade 2	3.48	(2.28, 5.31)	7.33 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>	5.83	(3.56, 9.56)	2.57 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>	10.53	(5.49, 20.20)	1.44 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>
grade 3	5.10	(3.37, 7.73)	1.52 x 10 <sup>-14</sup>	6.95	(4.29, 11.25)	3.32 x 10 <sup>-15</sup>	11.40	(6.11, 21.29)	2.16 x 10 <sup>-14</sup>
<b>JSN</b>									
Grade 1	2.28	(1.76, 2.93)	2.35 x 10 <sup>-10</sup>	2.81	(1.98, 3.99)	6.22 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>	4.82	(2.92, 7.96)	7.72 x 10 <sup>-10</sup>
Grade 2	3.44	(2.08, 5.69)	1.46 x 10 <sup>-06</sup>	9.22	(5.45, 15.59)	1.15 x 10 <sup>-16</sup>	11.14	(5.42, 22.87)	5.28 x 10 <sup>-11</sup>
Grade 3	5.48	(2.79, 10.78)	8.13 x 10 <sup>-07</sup>	4.33	(1.78, 10.51)	1.21 x 10 <sup>-03</sup>	5.00	(1.23, 20.25)	0.024

Supplementary Table 11: Unadjusted associations of OP grades and JSN grades with knee OA outcomes in males.

Abbreviations: CI, Confidence Interval; HES-KOA, Knee osteoarthritis based on Hospital Episodes Statistics; HR, Hazard Ratio; JSN, Joint Space Narrowing; OP, Osteophyte; OR Odds Ratio; TKR, Total Knee Replacement. n=9,449.

	Pain			HES KOA			TKR		
	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	HR	95% CI	<i>p</i>
<i>Categorical</i>									
<b>Medial femur</b>									
grade 1	3.35	(2.48, 4.52)	2.97 x 10 <sup>-15</sup>	2.86	(1.87, 4.36)	1.08 x 10 <sup>-06</sup>	4.83	(2.58, 9.06)	8.97 x 10 <sup>-07</sup>
grade 2	4.00	(2.82, 5.67)	8.06 x 10 <sup>-15</sup>	4.80	(3.14, 7.32)	3.59 x 10 <sup>-13</sup>	8.54	(4.84, 15.08)	1.44 x 10 <sup>-13</sup>
grade 3	6.06	(3.97, 9.23)	5.70 x 10 <sup>-17</sup>	4.76	(2.86, 7.90)	1.68 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>	7.24	(3.70, 14.16)	7.14 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>
<b>Lateral femur</b>									
grade 1	4.20	(2.01, 8.76)	1.29 x 10 <sup>-04</sup>	5.63	(2.46, 12.90)	4.32 x 10 <sup>-05</sup>	12.17	(5.30, 27.90)	3.63 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>
grade 2	3.66	(1.73, 7.76)	6.88 x 10 <sup>-04</sup>	3.34	(1.33, 8.39)	1.03 x 10 <sup>-02</sup>	3.59	(0.88, 14.71)	0.076
grade 3	4.61	(2.62, 8.13)	1.21 x 10 <sup>-07</sup>	9.37	(5.17, 16.99)	1.70 x 10 <sup>-13</sup>	11.39	(5.53, 23.48)	4.30 x 10 <sup>-11</sup>
<b>Medial tibia</b>									
grade 1	4.35	(3.33, 5.68)	2.29 x 10 <sup>-27</sup>	4.37	(3.10, 6.14)	2.60 x 10 <sup>-17</sup>	8.72	(5.42, 14.03)	4.62 x 10 <sup>-19</sup>
grade 2	3.42	(2.27, 5.14)	3.35 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>	7.49	(4.82, 11.62)	2.78 x 10 <sup>-19</sup>	13.09	(7.48, 22.91)	2.21 x 10 <sup>-19</sup>
grade 3	6.61	(3.92, 11.14)	1.34 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>	5.90	(3.25, 10.69)	5.00 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>	13.19	(6.41, 27.15)	2.48 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>
<b>Lateral tibia</b>									
grade 1	2.54	(1.97, 3.28)	6.42 x 10 <sup>-13</sup>	2.54	(1.78, 3.64)	3.10 x 10 <sup>-07</sup>	3.53	(2.01, 6.21)	1.18 x 10 <sup>-05</sup>
grade 2	2.98	(1.94, 4.58)	6.16 x 10 <sup>-07</sup>	4.74	(2.87, 7.84)	1.29 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>	7.73	(3.98, 15.00)	1.50 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>
grade 3	4.35	(2.85, 6.65)	1.09 x 10 <sup>-11</sup>	5.43	(3.32, 8.89)	1.72 x 10 <sup>-11</sup>	8.02	(4.21, 15.28)	2.54 x 10 <sup>-10</sup>
<b>JSN</b>									
Grade 1	2.17	(1.68, 2.81)	4.34 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>	2.46	(1.72, 3.50)	6.91 x 10 <sup>-07</sup>	3.78	(2.28, 6.28)	2.80 x 10 <sup>-07</sup>
Grade 2	3.10	(1.86, 5.19)	1.59 x 10 <sup>-05</sup>	7.76	(4.52, 13.31)	9.89 x 10 <sup>-14</sup>	8.39	(4.05, 17.39)	1.37 x 10 <sup>-08</sup>
Grade 3	5.20	(2.62, 10.32)	2.48 x 10 <sup>-06</sup>	3.68	(1.50, 9.02)	0.004	3.67	(0.90, 14.92)	0.071

Supplementary Table 12: Adjusted associations of OP grades and JSN grades with knee OA outcomes in males.

Abbreviations: CI, Confidence Interval; HES-KOA, Knee osteoarthritis based on Hospital Episodes Statistics; HR, Hazard Ratio; JSN, Joint Space Narrowing; OP, Osteophyte; OR Odds Ratio; TKR, Total Knee Replacement. Models were adjusted for age, sex, height, weight and ethnic group. n=9,449.

	Pain			HES KOA			TKR		
	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	HR	95% CI	<i>p</i>
<b>Medial femur</b>									
grade 1	2.74	(2.25, 3.34)	1.26 x 10 <sup>-23</sup>	3.04	(2.22, 4.17)	5.25 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>	3.34	(1.96, 5.68)	9.18 x 10 <sup>-06</sup>
grade 2	5.67	(4.35, 7.38)	8.54 x 10 <sup>-38</sup>	6.98	(4.93, 9.88)	6.54 x 10 <sup>-28</sup>	9.10	(5.55, 14.93)	2.36 x 10 <sup>-18</sup>
grade 3	6.15	(4.34, 8.71)	1.65 x 10 <sup>-24</sup>	10.99	(7.34, 16.45)	2.92 x 10 <sup>-31</sup>	15.04	(8.83, 25.63)	2.01E x 10 <sup>-23</sup>
<b>Lateral femur</b>									
grade 1	3.36	(2.23, 5.08)	8.04 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>	7.18	(4.43, 11.66)	1.45 x 10 <sup>-15</sup>	8.27	(4.20, 16.30)	1.02 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>
grade 2	4.12	(2.33, 7.31)	1.23 x 10 <sup>-06</sup>	6.53	(3.24, 13.18)	1.64 x 10 <sup>-07</sup>	9.43	(3.85, 23.07)	9.02 x 10 <sup>-07</sup>
grade 3	3.99	(2.19, 7.26)	6.06 x 10 <sup>-06</sup>	15.46	(8.39, 28.50)	1.65 x 10 <sup>-18</sup>	23.96	(12.55, 45.76)	6.44 x 10 <sup>-22</sup>
<b>Medial tibia</b>									
grade 1	4.62	(3.79, 5.62)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	5.95	(4.53, 7.82)	1.11 x 10 <sup>-37</sup>	7.30	(4.81, 11.10)	1.19 x 10 <sup>-20</sup>
grade 2	5.07	(3.33, 7.72)	4.24 x 10 <sup>-14</sup>	9.71	(5.92, 15.91)	1.90 x 10 <sup>-19</sup>	14.97	(8.20, 27.34)	1.24 x 10 <sup>-18</sup>
grade 3	5.08	(2.94, 8.78)	5.52 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>	18.19	(10.32, 32.06)	1.14 x 10 <sup>-23</sup>	23.35	(11.75, 46.42)	2.56 x 10 <sup>-19</sup>
<b>Lateral tibia</b>									
grade 1	3.18	(2.61, 3.86)	5.77 x 10 <sup>-31</sup>	4.08	(3.05, 5.44)	1.43 x 10 <sup>-21</sup>	4.73	(3.00, 7.47)	2.52 x 10 <sup>-11</sup>
grade 2	3.83	(2.70, 5.41)	3.63 x 10 <sup>-14</sup>	7.49	(4.90, 11.44)	1.19 x 10 <sup>-20</sup>	10.49	(5.98, 18.39)	2.45 x 10 <sup>-16</sup>
grade 3	3.87	(2.59, 5.77)	3.47 x 10 <sup>-11</sup>	6.81	(4.13, 11.22)	5.50 x 10 <sup>-14</sup>	12.12	(6.49, 22.66)	5.30 x 10 <sup>-15</sup>
<b>JSN</b>									
Grade 1	1.00	(0.84, 1.20)	0.960	1.49	(1.12, 1.97)	0.005	1.84	(1.15, 2.92)	0.011
Grade 2	1.90	(1.41, 2.56)	2.24 x 10 <sup>-05</sup>	2.67	(1.71, 4.15)	1.46 x 10 <sup>-05</sup>	5.38	(3.06, 9.43)	4.57 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>
Grade 3	5.07	(2.90, 8.87)	1.28 x 10 <sup>-08</sup>	15.98	(8.93, 28.60)	9.93 x 10 <sup>-21</sup>	28.97	(16.21, 51.80)	6.81 x 10 <sup>-30</sup>

Supplementary Table 13: Unadjusted associations of OP grades and JSN grades with knee OA outcomes in females.

Abbreviations: CI, Confidence Interval; HES-KOA, Knee osteoarthritis based on Hospital Episodes Statistics; HR, Hazard Ratio; JSN, Joint Space Narrowing; OP, Osteophyte; OR Odds Ratio; TKR, Total Knee Replacement. n=10,146.

	Pain			HES KOA			TKR		
	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	HR	95% CI	<i>p</i>
<b>Medial femur</b>									
grade 1	2.40	(1.96, 2.93)	2.51 x 10 <sup>-17</sup>	2.40	(1.74, 1.74)	1.03 x 10 <sup>-07</sup>	2.38	(1.39, 4.08)	0.002
grade 2	4.74	(3.61, 6.21)	3.32 x 10 <sup>-29</sup>	5.08	(3.55, 3.55)	6.10 x 10 <sup>-19</sup>	5.75	(3.46, 9.55)	1.46 x 10 <sup>-11</sup>
grade 3	4.77	(3.33, 6.83)	1.78 x 10 <sup>-17</sup>	7.60	(5.00, 5.00)	2.84 x 10 <sup>-21</sup>	9.50	(5.48, 16.46)	1.03 x 10 <sup>-15</sup>
<b>Lateral femur</b>									
grade 1	2.74	(1.79, 4.19)	3.13 x 10 <sup>-06</sup>	5.15	(3.12, 3.12)	1.30 x 10 <sup>-10</sup>	5.07	(2.55, 10.09)	3.82 x 10 <sup>-06</sup>
grade 2	3.39	(1.89, 6.09)	4.43 x 10 <sup>-05</sup>	4.85	(2.37, 2.37)	1.55 x 10 <sup>-05</sup>	6.38	(2.59, 15.70)	5.45 x 10 <sup>-05</sup>
grade 3	2.86	(1.53, 5.34)	0.001	9.80	(5.14, 5.14)	4.07 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>	12.29	(6.22, 24.29)	5.35 x 10 <sup>-13</sup>
<b>Medial tibia</b>									
grade 1	4.01	(3.27, 4.91)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	4.63	(3.50, 3.50)	9.21 x 10 <sup>-27</sup>	5.19	(3.38, 7.95)	4.44 x 10 <sup>-14</sup>
grade 2	4.34	(2.82, 6.68)	2.50 x 10 <sup>-11</sup>	7.15	(4.31, 4.31)	2.77 x 10 <sup>-14</sup>	9.11	(4.93, 16.84)	1.75 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>
grade 3	3.52	(1.99, 6.22)	1.45 x 10 <sup>-05</sup>	10.49	(5.79, 5.79)	9.08 x 10 <sup>-15</sup>	10.61	(5.17, 21.78)	1.21 x 10 <sup>-10</sup>
<b>Lateral tibia</b>									
grade 1	2.77	(2.27, 3.39)	3.50 x 10 <sup>-23</sup>	3.20	(2.38, 2.38)	1.55 x 10 <sup>-14</sup>	3.41	(2.14, 5.42)	2.21 x 10 <sup>-07</sup>
grade 2	3.14	(2.20, 4.48)	3.25 x 10 <sup>-10</sup>	5.45	(3.53, 3.53)	2.21 x 10 <sup>-14</sup>	6.76	(3.81, 11.99)	6.44 x 10 <sup>-11</sup>
grade 3	3.05	(2.01, 4.61)	1.38 x 10 <sup>-07</sup>	4.41	(2.62, 2.62)	2.22 x 10 <sup>-08</sup>	6.65	(3.48, 12.71)	9.50 x 10 <sup>-09</sup>
<b>JSN</b>									
Grade 1	0.96	(0.80, 1.15)	0.665	1.37	(1.03, 1.03)	0.032	1.61	(1.01, 2.57)	0.045
Grade 2	1.74	(1.28, 2.36)	3.61 x 10 <sup>-04</sup>	2.13	(1.35, 1.35)	0.001	3.85	(2.18, 6.82)	3.65 x 10 <sup>-06</sup>
Grade 3	3.76	(2.11, 6.70)	7.28 x 10 <sup>-06</sup>	10.20	(5.55, 5.55)	7.32 x 10 <sup>-14</sup>	15.45	(8.47, 28.16)	4.17 x 10 <sup>-19</sup>

Supplementary Table 14: Adjusted associations of OP grades and JSN grades with knee OA outcomes in females.

Abbreviations: CI, Confidence Interval; HES-KOA, Knee osteoarthritis based on Hospital Episodes Statistics; HR, Hazard Ratio; JSN, Joint Space Narrowing; OP, Osteophyte; OR Odds Ratio; TKR, Total Knee Replacement. Models were adjusted for age, height, weight and ethnic group. n=10,146.

rKOA exposure	Unadjusted								
	Pain			HES KOA			TKR		
	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	HR	95% CI	<i>p</i>
	<b>All</b>								
Grade 1	2.09	(1.89, 2.31)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40*</sup>	2.68	(2.27, 3.15)	3.29 x 10 <sup>-32</sup>	4.45	(3.28, 6.03)	5.37 x 10 <sup>-22</sup>
Grade 2	3.87	(3.29, 4.55)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	7.75	(6.30, 9.52)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40*</sup>	15.75	(11.43, 21.71)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40*</sup>
Grades 3-4	8.62	(6.63, 11.21)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	13.40	(9.97, 18.01)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40*</sup>	32.58	(22.50, 47.17)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40*</sup>
	<b>Male</b>								
Grade 1	2.73	(2.31, 3.21)	4.10 x 10 <sup>-33</sup>	3.44	(2.71, 4.37)	3.91 x 10 <sup>-24</sup>	5.90	(3.81, 9.13)	1.83 x 10 <sup>-15</sup>
Grade 2	4.53	(3.43, 6.00)	2.67 x 10 <sup>-26</sup>	11.51	(8.45, 15.68)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	24.54	(15.84, 38.02)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>
Grades 3-4	8.89	(6.02, 13.13)	5.21 x 10 <sup>-28</sup>	7.37	(4.58, 11.87)	2.07 x 10 <sup>-16</sup>	18.44	(9.86, 34.47)	6.79 x 10 <sup>-20</sup>
	<b>Female</b>								
Grade 1	1.87	(1.64, 2.13)	5.75 x 10 <sup>-21</sup>	2.70	(2.13, 3.40)	7.80 x 10 <sup>-17</sup>	4.04	(2.63, 6.21)	2.10 x 10 <sup>-10</sup>
Grade 2	3.66	(2.99, 4.47)	1.59 x 10 <sup>-36</sup>	7.09	(5.31, 9.46)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	12.19	(7.59, 19.58)	4.17 x 10 <sup>-25</sup>
Grades 3-4	8.48	(5.94, 12.09)	4.64 x 10 <sup>-32</sup>	23.09	(15.62, 34.14)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	49.16	(30.31, 79.71)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>
	<b>Adjusted</b>								
	<b>All</b>								
Grade 1	2.04	(1.84, 2.26)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40*</sup>	2.67	(2.25, 3.16)	1.47 x 10 <sup>-29</sup>	3.97	(2.90, 5.42)	5.64 x 10 <sup>-18</sup>
Grade 2	3.65	(3.08, 4.31)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	7.26	(5.85, 9.00)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40*</sup>	12.87	(9.22, 17.96)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40*</sup>
Grades 3-4	7.08	(5.41, 9.27)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	10.24	(7.53, 13.93)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40*</sup>	21.11	(14.28, 31.19)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40*</sup>
	<b>Male</b>								
Grade 1	2.62	(2.22, 3.10)	1.20 x 10 <sup>-29</sup>	3.07	(2.41, 3.91)	1.46 x 10 <sup>-19</sup>	4.90	(3.14, 7.63)	2.33 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>
Grade 2	4.34	(3.27, 5.76)	3.65 x 10 <sup>-24</sup>	10.06	(7.35, 13.78)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	19.61	(12.55, 30.65)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>
Grades 3-4	7.59	(5.10, 11.29)	1.65 x 10 <sup>-23</sup>	5.71	(3.50, 9.30)	2.65 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>	12.62	(6.59, 24.17)	2.13E <sup>-14</sup>
	<b>Female</b>								
Grade 1	1.74	(1.52, 1.99)	3.61 x 10 <sup>-16</sup>	2.34	(1.84, 2.96)	2.51 x 10 <sup>-12</sup>	3.28	(2.12, 5.07)	9.14 x 10 <sup>-08</sup>
Grade 2	3.22	(2.61, 3.97)	3.90 x 10 <sup>-28</sup>	5.58	(4.14, 7.53)	1.74 x 10 <sup>-29</sup>	8.75	(5.39, 14.22)	1.96 x 10 <sup>-18</sup>
Grades 3-4	6.53	(4.52, 9.43)	1.66 x 10 <sup>-23</sup>	15.52	(10.31, 23.35)	<1.0 x 10 <sup>-40</sup>	28.63	(17.09, 47.96)	3.33 x 10 <sup>-37</sup>

Supplementary table 15: Association of radiographic knee osteoarthritis (rKOA) grades with clinical outcomes, overall and stratified by sex.

Abbreviations: CI, Confidence Interval; HES-KOA, Knee Osteoarthritis Based on Hospital Episodes Statistics; HR, Hazard Ratio; JSN, Joint Space Narrowing; OP, Osteophyte; OR Odds Ratio; TKR, Total Knee Replacement. \*Denotes a sex-interaction term with  $p < 0.05$ . Models were adjusted for age, sex, height, weight and ethnic group. Overall,  $n=19,595$ ; males,  $n=9449$ ; females  $n=10,146$

	<b>Total</b> N=19595	<b>Male</b> N=9449	<b>Female</b> N=10146
<b>rKOA grade</b>			
0	14895 (76.01%)	8366 (88.54%)	6529 (64.35%)
1	3312 (16.90%)	787 (8.33%)	2525 (24.89%)
2	1128 (5.76%)	198 (2.10%)	930 (9.17%)
3	182 (0.93%)	69 (0.73%)	113 (1.11%)
4	78 (0.40%)	29 (0.31%)	49 (0.48%)

Supplementary Table 16: Prevalence of height-adjusted radiographic knee osteoarthritis (rKOA)

Radiographic knee osteoarthritis (rKOA) grades were generated based on a combination of osteophyte grades and joint space narrowing (JSN) grades. In the sensitivity analysis, the minimum joint space width (mJSW) of the medial compartment, which was used to define JSN grade, was normalised by the mean height of the population to account for height-related variations in mJSW.

	Pain			HES-KOA			TKR		
	OR	lower CI	<i>p</i>	OR	lower CI	<i>p</i>	HR	lower CI	<i>p</i>
<b>All</b>									
Grade 1	1.93	(1.73, 2.14)	$2.05 \times 10^{-34*}$	2.69	(2.26, 3.20)	$3.18 \times 10^{-29*}$	3.47	(2.51, 4.80)	$4.61 \times 10^{-14*}$
Grade 2	2.61	(2.24, 3.03)	$4.09 \times 10^{-35*}$	5.08	(4.09, 6.32)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40*}$	9.19	(6.51, 12.98)	$2.04 \times 10^{-36*}$
Grades 3-4	7.40	(5.72, 9.58)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$	10.67	(7.90, 14.39)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40*}$	19.72	(13.40, 29.02)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$
Grade $\geq 1$	2.28	(2.08, 2.50)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40*}$	3.62	(3.12, 4.21)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40*}$	5.86	(4.47, 7.69)	$1.76 \times 10^{-37*}$
<b>Males</b>									
Grade 1	2.81	(2.37, 3.33)	$1.95 \times 10^{-32}$	3.91	(3.09, 4.95)	$6.95 \times 10^{-30}$	5.78	(3.76, 8.88)	$1.34 \times 10^{-15}$
Grade 2	4.40	(3.27, 5.92)	$1.36 \times 10^{-22}$	9.18	(6.57, 12.85)	$2.22 \times 10^{-38}$	18.63	(11.74, 29.56)	$2.33 \times 10^{-35}$
Grades 3-4	7.47	(4.95, 11.26)	$8.72 \times 10^{-22}$	5.26	(3.14, 8.81)	$3.05 \times 10^{-10}$	12.06	(6.16, 23.61)	$3.74 \times 10^{-13}$
Grade $\geq 1$	3.37	(2.91, 3.90)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$	4.88	(3.99, 5.96)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$	8.67	(6.06, 12.41)	$3.10 \times 10^{-32}$
<b>Females</b>									
Grade 1	1.56	(1.36, 1.78)	$5.54 \times 10^{-11}$	1.85	(1.45, 2.37)	$7.97 \times 10^{-07}$	2.02	(1.27, 3.22)	0.003
Grade 2	2.11	(1.76, 2.53)	$5.96 \times 10^{-16}$	3.40	(2.55, 4.53)	$9.29 \times 10^{-17}$	5.14	(3.19, 8.29)	$1.94 \times 10^{-11}$
Grades 3-4	6.90	(4.95, 9.63)	$5.65 \times 10^{-30}$	13.93	(9.49, 20.45)	$<1.0 \times 10^{-40}$	21.96	(13.15, 36.66)	$3.36 \times 10^{-32}$
Grade $\geq 1$	1.826	(1.62, 2.05)	$9.71 \times 10^{-24}$	2.63	(2.13, 3.25)	$2.11 \times 10^{-19}$	3.66	(2.50, 5.37)	$2.85 \times 10^{-11}$

Supplementary Table 17: Results of the sensitivity analysis looking at the association of height-adjusted rKOA grades with clinical outcomes.

This table presents the regression results for the association of height-adjusted radiographic knee osteoarthritis (rKOA) grades with knee osteoarthritis outcomes. The outcomes evaluated include prolonged knee pain, hospital-diagnosed knee OA (HES-KOA), and subsequent total knee replacement (TKR). Analyses were adjusted for age, sex (in combined analysis), height, weight and ethnic category. \*Denotes a sex-interaction term with  $p < 0.05$ .

## Supplementary Methods

### Assessment of covariates

The selection of covariates was predetermined based on existing literature associating these variables with knee osteoarthritis risk. Height and weight measurements were taken at the time of the DXA scan, following standardized procedures, while age and sex were self-reported during recruitment. Participants self-reported their ethnicity, which was then categorized into groups including White, Black, Asian, Chinese, Mixed-Heritage and Other.

### Generation of a rKOA osteophyte grades

In this study, osteophyte area cut-offs were generated using a combination of manually graded osteophyte grades and shading of osteophyte area. Binary variables were first created for Grade 2 and Grade 3 osteophytes in both the medial and lateral femur regions. These variables were assigned a value of 0 if the manually graded osteophyte was below the specified grade and a value of 1 if the manually graded osteophyte matched the specified grade. Optimal cut-points for osteophyte area were then estimated using the Youden Index method, which determines the optimal threshold for classification based on a continuous predictor variable, by maximizing the sum of sensitivity and specificity. The reference variable was the binary outcome variable, while the classification variable was the continuous osteophyte area measurement. The empirical optimal cut-points for Grade 2 and Grade 3 osteophytes were as follows: medial femur (grade 2: 14.72 mm<sup>2</sup>, grade 3: 25.78 mm<sup>2</sup>), lateral femur (14.03 mm<sup>2</sup>, 24.62 mm<sup>2</sup>), medial tibia (12.20 mm<sup>2</sup>, 20.28 mm<sup>2</sup>), and lateral tibia (10.53 mm<sup>2</sup>, 18.65 mm<sup>2</sup>). Based on these cut-offs, osteophyte grades were determined accordingly:

Grade	Medial Femur		Lateral Femur		Medial Tibia		Lateral Tibia	
	lower	upper	lower	upper	lower	upper	lower	upper
1	>0 mm <sup>2</sup>	≤15 mm <sup>2</sup>	>0 mm <sup>2</sup>	≤14 mm <sup>2</sup>	>0 mm <sup>2</sup>	≤12 mm <sup>2</sup>	>0 mm <sup>2</sup>	≤11 mm <sup>2</sup>
2	≥15 mm <sup>2</sup>	<26 mm <sup>2</sup>	≥14 mm <sup>2</sup>	<25 mm <sup>2</sup>	≥12 mm <sup>2</sup>	≤20 mm <sup>2</sup>	≥11 mm <sup>2</sup>	≤19 mm <sup>2</sup>
3	≥26 mm <sup>2</sup>		≥25 mm <sup>2</sup>		≥20 mm <sup>2</sup>		≥19 mm <sup>2</sup>	

These grades were then multiplied by 0.5, summed (with a maximum value of 6), and added to the JSN grade (which has a maximum value of 3) to derive a combined score, with a maximum value of 9. Subsequently, the overall rKOA grade was determined based on this combined score, as detailed in the main text.

### Sensitivity analysis

Height normalisation of medial joint space width (mJSW) was performed to mitigate potential confounding effects of participant height on mJSW measurements. Initially, a linear regression analysis was conducted using height as the independent variable and mJSW as the dependent variable. This regression provided a beta coefficient representing the change in mJSW per unit change in height. Subsequently, for each participant, the difference between their height and the mean height of the study population was calculated. This difference was multiplied by the beta coefficient to derive an inflation factor, which served to adjust each individual's mJSW measurement based on their height deviation from the mean. Adjustments were made by adding the inflation factor for individuals taller than the mean height and subtracting it for those shorter. These normalised mJSW values were then used to redefine Joint Space Narrowing (JSN) grades as before (JSN grade 0 for mJSW >3mm, grade 1 for mJSW >2.5mm and <3mm, grade 2 for mJSW >2mm and <2.5mm, and grade 3 for mJSW <2mm). The revised JSN grades were integrated with osteophyte grades to

compute overall radiographic knee osteoarthritis (rKOA) grade, consistent with the methodology detailed in the main text. This approach ensured that mJSW measurements accurately reflected joint space narrowing independent of height variations.

## References

1. Versus Arthritis. The state of musculoskeletal health 2023. Arthritis and other musculoskeletal conditions in numbers. 2023 [Available from: <https://www.versusarthritis.org/about-arthritis/data-and-statistics/the-state-of-musculoskeletal-health/>].
2. National Joint Registry. 20th NJR Annual Report 2023 [Available from: <https://reports.njrcentre.org.uk/Portals/0/PDFdownloads/NJR%2020th%20Annual%20Report%202023.pdf>].
3. Matharu GS, Culliford DJ, Blom AW, Judge A. Projections for primary hip and knee replacement surgery up to the year 2060: an analysis based on data from The National Joint Registry for England, Wales, Northern Ireland and the Isle of Man. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl*. 2022;104(6):443-8.
4. Kellgren JH, Lawrence JS. Radiological assessment of osteo-arthrosis. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 1957;16(4):494-502.
5. Kohn MD, Sassoon AA, Fernando ND. Classifications in Brief: Kellgren-Lawrence Classification of Osteoarthritis. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2016;474(8):1886-93.
6. Riddle DL, Jiranek WA, Hull JR. Validity and reliability of radiographic knee osteoarthritis measures by arthroplasty surgeons. *Orthopedics*. 2013;36(1):e25-32.
7. Wright RW, Group M. Osteoarthritis Classification Scales: Interobserver Reliability and Arthroscopic Correlation. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2014;96(14):1145-51.
8. Kessler S, Guenther KP, Puhl W. Scoring prevalence and severity in gonarthrosis: the suitability of the Kellgren & Lawrence scale. *Clin Rheumatol*. 1998;17(3):205-9.
9. Sheehy L, Culham E, McLean L, Niu J, Lynch J, Segal NA, et al. Validity and sensitivity to change of three scales for the radiographic assessment of knee osteoarthritis using images from the Multicenter Osteoarthritis Study (MOST). *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2015;23(9):1491-8.
10. Thomas KA, Kidzinski L, Halilaj E, Fleming SL, Venkataraman GR, Oei EHG, et al. Automated Classification of Radiographic Knee Osteoarthritis Severity Using Deep Neural Networks. *Radiol Artif Intell*. 2020;2(2):e190065.
11. Tiulpin A, Thevenot J, Rahtu E, Lehenkari P, Saarakkala S. Automatic Knee Osteoarthritis Diagnosis from Plain Radiographs: A Deep Learning-Based Approach. *Sci Rep*. 2018;8(1):1727.
12. Pi SW, Lee BD, Lee MS, Lee HJ. Ensemble deep-learning networks for automated osteoarthritis grading in knee X-ray images. *Sci Rep*. 2023;13(1):22887.
13. Yoon JS, Yon CJ, Lee D, Lee JJ, Kang CH, Kang SB, et al. Assessment of a novel deep learning-based software developed for automatic feature extraction and grading of radiographic knee osteoarthritis. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2023;24(1):869.
14. Swiecicki A, Li N, O'Donnell J, Said N, Yang J, Mather RC, et al. Deep learning-based algorithm for assessment of knee osteoarthritis severity in radiographs matches performance of radiologists. *Comput Biol Med*. 2021;133:104334.
15. Oka H, Muraki S, Akune T, Mabuchi A, Suzuki T, Yoshida H, et al. Fully automatic quantification of knee osteoarthritis severity on plain radiographs. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2008;16(11):1300-6.
16. Yoshida K, Barr RJ, Galea-Soler S, Aspden RM, Reid DM, Gregory JS. Reproducibility and Diagnostic Accuracy of Kellgren-Lawrence Grading for Osteoarthritis Using Radiographs and Dual-Energy X-ray Absorptiometry Images. *J Clin Densitom*. 2015;18(2):239-44.

17. Damilakis J, Adams JE, Guglielmi G, Link TM. Radiation exposure in X-ray-based imaging techniques used in osteoporosis. *Eur Radiol*. 2010;20(11):2707-14.
18. Littlejohns TJ, Holliday J, Gibson LM, Garratt S, Oesingmann N, Alfaró-Almagro F, et al. The UK Biobank imaging enhancement of 100,000 participants: rationale, data collection, management and future directions. *Nature Communications*. 2020;11(1):2624.
19. Faber BG, Ebsim R, Saunders FR, Frysz M, Lindner C, Gregory JS, et al. A novel semi-automated classifier of hip osteoarthritis on DXA images shows expected relationships with clinical outcomes in UK Biobank. *Rheumatology (Oxford)*. 2022;61(9):3586-95.
20. Beynon RA, Saunders FR, Ebsim R, Frysz M, Faber BG, Gregory JS, et al. Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry derived knee shape may provide a useful imaging biomarker for predicting total knee replacement: Findings from a study of 37,843 people in UK Biobank. *Osteoarthr Cartil Open*. 2024;6(2):100468.
21. Lindner C, Thiagarajah S, Wilkinson JM, arc OC, Wallis GA, Cootes TF. Fully automatic segmentation of the proximal femur using random forest regression voting. *IEEE Trans Med Imaging*. 2013;32(8):1462-72.
22. Pereira D, Peleteiro B, Araujo J, Branco J, Santos RA, Ramos E. The effect of osteoarthritis definition on prevalence and incidence estimates: a systematic review. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2011;19(11):1270-85.
23. Cui A, Li H, Wang D, Zhong J, Chen Y, Lu H. Global, regional prevalence, incidence and risk factors of knee osteoarthritis in population-based studies. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2020;29-30:100587.
24. Srikanth VK, Fryer JL, Zhai G, Winzenberg TM, Hosmer D, Jones G. A meta-analysis of sex differences prevalence, incidence and severity of osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2005;13(9):769-81.
25. Segal NA, Nilges JM, Oo WM. Sex differences in osteoarthritis prevalence, pain perception, physical function and therapeutics. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2024.
26. Lanyon P, O'Reilly S, Jones A, Doherty M. Radiographic assessment of symptomatic knee osteoarthritis in the community: definitions and normal joint space. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 1998;57(10):595-601.
27. Cicuttini FM, Baker J, Hart DJ, Spector TD. Association of pain with radiological changes in different compartments and views of the knee joint. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 1996;4(2):143-7.
28. Neogi T, Felson D, Niu J, Nevitt M, Lewis CE, Aliabadi P, et al. Association between radiographic features of knee osteoarthritis and pain: results from two cohort studies. *BMJ*. 2009;339:b2844.
29. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Osteoarthritis in over 16s: diagnosis and management 2022 [17.07.24]. Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng226/chapter/Recommendations#diagnosis>.
30. Tschon M, Contartese D, Pagani S, Borsari V, Fini M. Gender and Sex Are Key Determinants in Osteoarthritis Not Only Confounding Variables. A Systematic Review of Clinical Data. *J Clin Med*. 2021;10(14).
31. Lethbridge-Cejku M, Scott WW, Jr., Reichle R, Ettinger WH, Zonderman A, Costa P, et al. Association of radiographic features of osteoarthritis of the knee with knee pain: data from the Baltimore Longitudinal Study of Aging. *Arthritis Care Res*. 1995;8(3):182-8.
32. Fan T, Ruan G, Antony B, Cao P, Li J, Han W, et al. The interactions between MRI-detected osteophytes and bone marrow lesions or effusion-synovitis on knee symptom progression: an exploratory study. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2021;29(9):1296-305.

33. Kornaat PR, Bloem JL, Ceulemans RY, Riyazi N, Rosendaal FR, Nelissen RG, et al. Osteoarthritis of the knee: association between clinical features and MR imaging findings. *Radiology*. 2006;239(3):811-7.
34. Muraki S, Akune T, En-Yo Y, Yoshida M, Suzuki T, Yoshida H, et al. Joint space narrowing, body mass index, and knee pain: the ROAD study (OAC1839R1). *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2015;23(6):874-81.
35. Muraki S, Oka H, Akune T, En-yo Y, Yoshida M, Suzuki T, et al. Independent association of joint space narrowing and osteophyte formation at the knee with health-related quality of life in Japan: a cross-sectional study. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2011;63(12):3859-64.
36. Szebenyi B, Hollander AP, Dieppe P, Quilty B, Duddy J, Clarke S, Kirwan JR. Associations between pain, function, and radiographic features in osteoarthritis of the knee. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2006;54(1):230-5.
37. Tiulpin A, Saarakkala S. Automatic Grading of Individual Knee Osteoarthritis Features in Plain Radiographs Using Deep Convolutional Neural Networks. *Diagnostics (Basel)*. 2020;10(11).
38. Abdullah SS, Rajasekaran MP. Do Weight-Bearing Knee Digital Radiographs Help to Track the Severity of OA? *Indian J Orthop*. 2022;56(4):664-71.