LEADER 867

Imaging of the hand and wrist in RA

B Taouli, A Guermazi, K E Sack, H K Genant

Interrelationships and comparisons of imaging with clinical disease activity

n the past decade, elucidation of pathophysiological pathways relevant in rheumatoid arthritis (RA) has continued, leading to continuing advances in drug treatment. At the same time, several clinical trials have shown the efficacy of early and aggressive treatment of patients with active disease. Early intervention strategies may reduce functional deterioration and improve long term outcome. Therefore, treatment strategies need to be determined before irreversible damage and functional deterioration occur.

RADIOGRAPHY

Rheumatoid arthritis

Imaging techniques are useful not only for studying the natural history of the disease but also for assessing the response to disease modifying antirheumatic drugs, and-potentially-for selecting those patients who will benefit most from early aggressive treatment. Conventional or digitised radiography of the hand and wrist is the traditional method used to diagnose, determine the stage, and monitor patients with RA, and to assess treatment efficacy in individual patients. Radiography, using several scoring systems, is also pivotal for the evaluation of disease progression and treatment efficacy in RA clinical trials,1-3 with excellent intra- and interobserver agreement.14 However, radiography is insensitive in detecting early erosions, and above all, in assessing synovitis.

MAGNETIC RESONANCE **IMAGING AND ULTRASOUND**

Recently, more powerful and complex imaging modalities have emerged as alternatives or additions to radiography. These include magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)5-11 and ultrasound (US).5 12-18 Several studies have shown the relative usefulness of MRI over radiography in evaluating early RA of the hand and wrist.5 8 11 19 MRI offers distinct advantages over radiography: in addition to its multiplanar capability, it has the ability to directly image the soft tissues, including the synovial pannus and synovial fluid, as well as bone, cartilage, and tendons. Contrast enhancement with gadolinium (Gd-DTPA) given intravenously allows the visualisation of synovitis based on shortening of the T₁ time, and

the subsequent change in signal intensity. Dynamic enhanced MRI using manual or semi- or fully automated techniques20-22 can quantitatively assess synovitis. The measurement of synovial volume can be used to monitor the response to treatment, and also to predict those patients more likely to develop erosions at one year.23 Moreover, semiautomated methods have been developed to measure the volume of bone erosion with MRI, and can be used as surrogate markers of treatment effects in drug trials.24

"Radiography is insensitive in detecting early erosions"

However, the major drawbacks of MRI are its high cost and limited availability, but dedicated low field MRI devices (<1 T) can lower the cost and are an alternative to high field conventional systems.^{5 25} Recent studies have shown that US, using either B mode US, 5 12 13 18 Doppler mode without contrast injection,16 17 or with contrast injection¹⁴ is a sensitive method for the detection of erosions, tenosynovitis, synovial pannus, and joint fluid.

COMPARISON OF MRI AND/OR **US WITH RADIOGRAPHY**

Although long term follow up using radiography has been reported in several longitudinal studies, 26-28 only a few studies have reported the sensitivity of MRI and/or US compared with radiography in the intermediate (>1 year) and long term follow up of patients with RA.29 30 In this issue of the Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases, Backhaus and colleagues report a two year follow up in 49 patients with different arthritic conditions (including 31 with RA) using multi-imaging modalities, including radiography, US (B mode), low field MRI, scintigraphy.31 Paradoxically, despite a decrease in synovitis and tenosynovitis clinically and at imaging (US and MRI), there was an increase in detection of erosions by MRI (and to a lesser extent by US). The authors showed also that at the two year follow up, radiography remained insensitive for the detection of erosions, and that nearly all such erosions were already detected by MRI at

baseline. In addition, many more erosions that were visible at follow up on MRI were not detected by radiography. The study by Backhaus et al raises questions about the relationship between synovitis, bone erosions, and clinical activity in patients with RA.31 McQueen et al have previously shown that in early RA, erosions detected by MRI can progress over one year despite clinical improvement and without concomitant significant changes in synovitis.32 However, their group included patients with early RA, unlike the study by Backhaus et al, probably explaining the difference in the time course of synovitis. Existing publications contain conflicting results about the correlation between synovitis at MRI with clinically active disease.33-36 MRI can detect residual synovitis in patients who apparently are in clinical remission, and the use of quantitative MRI parameters after gadolinium injection can discriminate between patients in "true" versus "apparent" remission.37

Although a direct link between synovitis and bone damage is still controversial, there is strong evidence that early bone changes, such as bone oedema, rarely occur in the absence of synovitis, and several authors have suggested a sequence of MRI changes from synovitis to bone oedema to erosions. 7 38 Patients with a pronounced carpal synovitis by MRI at baseline were more likely to develop erosions at one year23 37 or two vears.3

"MRI detects more erosions than radiography at two year follow up"

On the other hand, Kirwan et al found only a weak correlation between the changes in the radiographic Larsen scores and the cumulative synovitis scores (evaluated clinically) over a period of two years in the finger joints of patients with RA.39 They argue against a direct causal relationship between synovitis and erosions. However, the clinical evaluation of synovitis and joint tenderness is known to be relatively subjective considerable interobserver variability.40 The study by Backhaus et al indicates that even if erosions and synovitis have the same underlying cause, their evolution over time and response to treatment may differ. Long term follow up with MRI and radiography may answer these questions.

WHICH IMAGING METHOD?

For which patients and when do we need to use MRI and/or US, and what indications remain for radiography? The limitations of radiography in the early stages of disease undermine its ability to select

LEADER 868

patients at high risk for joint damage. None the less, radiography still has a prominent role in the basic investigation of RA. Despite its cost and limited availability, we believe that MRI has a potential role in the initial patient management, at least for identifying those patients at risk of developing structural damage. MRI can also add power to drug trials by reducing the length of the studies and the number of patients, and by adding quantitative surrogate end points, as discussed earlier. However, to achieve these goals, there is a strong need for a standardisation and validation of MRI protocols and scoring systems to make it reproducible and reliable. Indeed, the OMERACT has recently reported only low to moderate interobserver agreement for MRI, especially in the evaluation of joint space narrowing41 and has proposed some general recommendations.42 We believe that US can be useful in experienced hands, but is too operator dependent to be used generally. Finally, the sensitivity, specificity, cost effectiveness, and prognostic value of MRI and US in the long term need to be determined.

Ann Rheum Dis 2002;61:867-869

Authors' affiliations B Taouli, A Guermazi, H K Genant, Department of Radiology, University of California San Francisco, CA, USA K E Sack, Department of Rheumatology, University of California San Francisco, CA, USA

Correspondence to: Dr B Taouli, University of California San Francisco, Department of Radiology, 505 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0628, San Francisco, CA 94143, USA; bachir.taouli@radiology.ucsf.edu

REFERENCES

- 1 Genant HK, Jiang Y, Peterfy C, Lu Y, Redei J, Countryman PJ. Assessment of rheumatoid arthritis using a modified scoring method on digitized and original radiographs. Arthritis Rheum 1998;41:1583-90.
- 2 Larsen A, Dale K, Eek M. Radiographic evaluation of rheumatoid arthritis and related
- conditions by standard reference films. Acta Radiol Diagn Stockh 1977;18:481–91. 3 **Sharp JT**, Young DY, Bluhm GB, Brook A, Brower AC, Corbett M, et al. How many joints in the hands and wrists should be included in a score of radiologic abnormalities used to assess rheumatoid arthritis? Arthritis Rheum 1985:28:1326-35.
- 4 Sharp JT, Bluhm GB, Brook A, Brower AC, Corbett M, Decker JL, et al. Reproducibility of multiple-observer scoring of radiologic abnormalities in the hands and wrists of patients with rheumatoid arthritis. Arthritis Rheum 1985;28:16–24.
- 5 Backhaus M, Kamradt T, Sandrock D, Loreck D, Fritz J, Wolf KJ, et al. Arthritis of the finger joints: a comprehensive approach comparing conventional radiography, scintigraphy, ultrasound, and contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging. Arthritis Rheum 1999;42:1232–45.
- 6 Klarlund M, Ostergaard M, Gideon P, Sorensen K, Jensen KE, Lorenzen I. Wrist and finger joint MR imaging in rheumatoid arthritis. Acta Radiol 1999;40:400–9.

7 **McGonagle D**, Conaghan PG, O'Connor P, Gibbon W, Green M, Wakefield R, et al. The relationship between synovitis and bone changes in early untreated rheumatoid arthritis: a controlled magnetic resonance imaging study. Arthritis Rheum 1999;42:1706–11.

- 8 McQueen FM, Stewart N, Crabbe J, Robinson E, Yeoman S, Tan PL, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging of the wrist in early rheumatoid arthritis reveals a high prevalence of erosions at four months after symptom onset. Ann Rheum Dis 1998;57:350-6
- 9 Ostergaard M, Hansen M, Stoltenberg M, Lorenzen I. Quantitative assessment of the synovial membrane in the rheumatoid wrist: an easily obtained MRI score reflects the synovial volume. Br J Rheumatol 1996;35:965–71
- 10 Ostergaard M, Hansen M, Stoltenberg M, Gideon P, Klarlund M, Jensen KE, et al Magnetic resonance imaging-determined synovial membrane volume as a marker of disease activity and a predictor of progressive joint destruction in the wrists of patients with rheumatoid arthritis. Arthritis Rheum 1999;42:918–29.
- 11 Sugimoto H, Takeda A, Hyodoh K. Early-stage rheumatoid arthritis: prospective
- study of the effectiveness of MR imaging for diagnosis. Radiology 2000;216:569–75.

 12 Grassi W, Filippucci E, Farina A, Salaffi F, Cervini C. Ultrasonography in the evaluation of bone erosions. Ann Rheum Dis
- 2001;60:98–103.

 13 **Hau M**, Kneitz C, Tony HP, Keberle M, Jahns R, Jenett M. High resolution ultrasound detects a decrease in pannus vascularisation of small finger joints in patients with rheumatoid arthritis receiving treatment with soluble tumour necrosis factor alpha receptor (etanercept). Ann Rheum Dis 2002;61:55–8.

 14 Klauser A, Frauscher F, Schirmer M, Halpern E, Pallwein L, Herold M, et al. The value of
- contrast-enhanced color Doppler ultrasound in the detection of vascularization of finger joints in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. Arthritis Rheum 2002;46:647–53.

 15 **Qvistgaard E**, Rogind H, Torp-Pedersen S,
- Terslev L, Danneskiold-Samsoe B, Bliddal H. Quantitative ultrasonography in rheumatoid arthritis: evaluation of inflammation by Doppler technique. Ann Rheum Dis 2001;60:690–3.
- 16 Stone M, Bergin D, Whelan B, Maher M, Murray J, McCarthy C. Power Doppler ultrasound assessment of rheumatoid hand synovitis. J Rheumatol 2001;28:1979–82.
- 17 **Szkudlarek M**, Court-Payen M, Strandberg C, Klarlund M, Klausen T, Ostergaard M. Power Doppler ultrasonography for assessment of synovitis in the metacarpophalangeal joints of patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a comparison with dynamic magnetic resonance imaging. Arthritis Rheum 2001;44:2018-23
- 18 Wakefield RJ, Gibbon WW, Conaghan PG, O'Connor P, McGonagle D, Pease C, et al. The value of sonography in the detection of bone erosions in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a comparison with conventional radiography. Arthritis Rheum 2000;43:2762–70.
- 19 Klarlund M, Ostergaard M, Jensen KE, Madsen JL, Skjodt H, Lorenzen I. Magnetic resonance imaging, radiography, and scintigraphy of the finger joints: one year follow up of patients with early arthrifis. The TIRA Group. Ann Rheum Dis 2000;59:521–8. 20 **Gaffney K**, Cookson J, Blades S, Coumbe A,
- Blake D. Quantitative assessment of the rheumatoid synovial microvascular bed by gadolinium-DTPA enhanced magnetic resonance imaging. Ann Rheum Dis 1998;57:152–7
- 21 Rand T, Imhof H, Czerny C, Breitenseher M, Machold K, Turetschek K, et al. Discrimination between fluid, synovium, and cartilage in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: contrast enhanced spin echo versus non-contrast-enhanced fat-suppressed gradient echo MR imaging. Clin Radiol 1999;54:107–10.

22 **Ostergaard M**, Ejbjerg B, Stoltenberg M, Gideon P, Volck B, Skov K, *et al.* Quantitative magnetic resonance imaging as marker of synovial membrane regeneration and recurrence of synovitis after arthroscopic knee joint synovectomy: a one year follow up study. Ann Rheum Dis 2001;60:233–6.

- Savnik A, Malmskov H, Thomsen HS, Graff LB, Nielsen H, Danneskiold-Samsoe B, et al. MRI of the wrist and finger joints in inflammatory joint diseases at 1-year interval: MRI features to predict bone erosions. Eur Radiol 2002;12:1203–10.
- 24 Ostrowitzki S, Redei J, Carano R, Lynch JA, Zaim S, Miaux Y, et al. Multispectral MRI analysis quantifies erosive changes in the hands of patients with rheumatoid arthritis in a 2 year longitudinal study. Arthritis Rheum 1 999;42 (suppl): 1023.
- 25 Savnik A, Malmskov H, Thomsen HS, Bretlau T, Graff LB, Nielsen H, et al. MRI of the arthritic small joints: comparison of extremity MRI (0.2 T) vs high-field MRI (1.5 T). Eur Radiol 2001;11:1030–8.
- 26 Pincus T, Callahan LF, Fuchs HA, Larsen A, Kaye J. Quantitative analysis of hand radiographs in rheumatoid arthritis: time course of radiographic changes, relation to joint examination measures, and comparison
- of different scoring methods. J Rheumatol 1995;22:1983–9. 27 Sharp JT, Wolfe F, Mitchell DM, Bloch DA. The progression of erosion and joint space narrowing scores in rheumatoid arthritis during the first twenty-five years of disease.
 Arthritis Rheum 1991;34:660–8.

 28 Wolfe F, Sharp JT. Radiographic outcome of recent-onset rheumatoid arthritis: a 19-year
- recent-onset rneumatoia arthritis: a 19-year study of radiographic progression. Arthritis Rheum 1998;41:1571–82.

 29 Jevtic V, Watt I, Rozman B, Kos-Golja M, Praprotnik S, Logar D, et al. Contrast enhanced Gd-DTPA magnetic resonance imaging in the evaluation of rheumatoid arthritis during a clinical trial with DMARDs. A prospective two-year follow-up study on hand joints in 31 patients. Clin Exp Rheumatol 1997;15:151–6.
- 30 McQueen FM, Benton N, Crabbe J, Robinson E, Yeoman S, McLean L, et al. What is the fate of erosions in early rheumatoid arthritis? Tracking individual lesions using x rays and magnetic resonance imaging over the first two years of disease. Ann Rheum Dis 001;60:859-68.
- 31 Backhaus M, Burmester GR, Sandrock D, Loreck D, Hess D, Scholz A, et al. Prospective two year follow up study comparing novel and conventional imaging procedures in patients with arthritic finger joints. Ann Rheum Dis 2002;61:895–904.
- 32 McQueen FM, Stewart N, Crabbe J, Robinson E, Yeoman S, Tan PL, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging of the wrist in early rheumatoid arthritis reveals progression of erosions despite clinical improvement. Ann Rheum Dis 1999;58:156–63.
- 33 Corvetta A, Giovagnoni A, Baldelli S, Ercolani P, Pomponio G, Luchetti MM, et al. MR imaging of rheumatoid hand lesions: comparison with conventional radiology in 31 patients. Clin Exp Rheumatol
- 1992;10:217–22. 34 **Jorgensen C**, Cyteval C, Anaya JM, Baron MP, Lamarque JL, Sany J. Sensitivity of magnetic resonance imaging of the wrist in very early rheumatoid arthritis. Clin Exp Rheumatol 1993;11:163–8.
- 35 Ostergaard M, Gideon P, Sorensen K, Hansen M, Stollenberg M, Henriksen O, et al. Scoring of synovial membrane hypertrophy and bone erosions by MR imaging in clinically active and inactive rheumatoid arthritis of the wrist. Scand J Rheumatol 1995;24:212–18.
- 36 Ostergaard M, Stoltenberg M, Lovgreen-Nielsen P, Volck B, Jensen CH, Lorenzen I. Magnetic resonance imaging-determined synovial membrane and joint effusion volumes in rheumatoid arthritis and osteoarthritis: comparison with the macroscopic and microscopic appearance of the synovium. Arthritis Rheum 1997;40:1856–67.

LEADER 869

- 37 **Huang J**, Stewart N, Crabbe J, Robinson E, McLean L, Yeoman S, *et al.* A 1-year follow-up study of dynamic magnetic resonance imaging in early rheumatoid arthritis reveals synovitis to be increased in shared epitope-positive patients and predictive of erosions at 1 year. Rheumatology (Oxford) 2000;39:407-16.
- 38 **Lee DM**, Weinblatt ME. Rheumatoid arthritis. Lancet 2001;358:903-11.
- 39 Kirwan JR. The relationship between synovitis and erosions in rheumatoid arthritis. Br J Rheumatol 1997;36:225–8.
 40 Eberl DR, Fasching V, Rahlfs V, Schleyer I, Wolf R. Repeatability and objectivity of various measurements in rheumatoid arthritis. A comparative study. Arthritis Rheum 1976; 19:1278-86.
- 41 Ostergaard M, Klarlund M, Lassere M, Conaghan P, Peterfy C, McQueen F, et al.
- Interreader agreement in the assessment of magnetic resonance images of rheumatoid arthritis wrist and finger joints—an international multicenter study. J Rheumatol 2001;28:1143–50.

 42 Conaghan P, Edmonds J, Emery P, Genant H, Gibbon W, Klarlund M, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging in rheumatoid arthritis: summary of OMERACT activities, current status, and plans. J Rheumatol 2001;28:1158–62.



Future content

See which articles have just been accepted for publication and preview the table of contents for the next issue a month before it is published

www.annrheumdis.com