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*Abstract*— This project automates the diagnosis of bone conditions using deep learning. By using Stanford MURA dataset to classify X-ray images by body part and detect abnormalities. A Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) with transfer learning via ResNet50 using to improve classification accuracy. Data augmentation enhances model generalization. The model is evaluated on metrics like accuracy, precision, and recall, with a target accuracy of over 60%. This approach demonstrates the potential for assisting radiologists in diagnosing bone-related conditions more efficiently.
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# Introduction

Accurate diagnosis of bone-related conditions, such as fractures and abnormalities, is critical for effective patient treatment. X-ray imaging is one of the most widely used diagnostic tools by radiologists to assess bone health, but manual interpretation of X-rays can be prone to errors, especially in high-volume clinical settings. This has driven the need for automated systems to assist radiologists by reliably classifying X-ray images and identifying abnormalities [1].

In recent years, **Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs)** have emerged as powerful tools for image classification tasks due to their ability to automatically learn features from images [2]. These networks are particularly suited for medical image analysis, where spatial hierarchies play a critical role in diagnosis. In this project, we utilize the **Stanford MURA dataset**, which contains musculoskeletal radiographs from various body parts, to develop a CNN model capable of classifying X-ray images by anatomical region (e.g., elbow, finger, forearm) and identifying abnormalities (normal or abnormal) [3].

To improve model performance and reduce training time, we leverage **transfer learning** by employing the **ResNet50** architecture pre-trained on ImageNet [4]. Transfer learning allows the model to apply learned features from large-scale image classification tasks to this medical imaging problem. Additionally, we employ data augmentation techniques, including image rotation, zooming, and flipping, to enhance the generalization of the model [5].

The primary objective of this project is to achieve high accuracy in classifying X-ray images and detecting abnormalities. This automated approach has the potential to assist radiologists by providing fast, reliable preliminary diagnoses, ultimately contributing to more efficient patient care.

# Methodology

## In this project, we implemented a Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) model using transfer learning to classify bone X-ray images and detect abnormalities. The following steps outline the methodology used, from dataset preparation to model training and evaluation. Maintaining the Integrity of the Specifications

## Dataset and Preprocessing

The dataset used for this project is the **Stanford MURA** dataset, which contains musculoskeletal radiographs of different anatomical regions such as the elbow, finger, and forearm. Each image is labeled as either **normal** or **abnormal**, making it suitable for binary classification [6].

We resized all images to **224x224 pixels** to match the input size required by the pre-trained ResNet50 model [7]. Additionally, pixel values were normalized to a range of **[0, 1]** to facilitate faster convergence during training. The dataset was split into training and validation sets with an 80/20 ratio to evaluate model performance.

## ModelArchitecture

To leverage the power of transfer learning, we employed the **ResNet50** architecture, pre-trained on the ImageNet dataset [8]. ResNet50 serves as a feature extractor in our model, capturing relevant patterns from the X-ray images. We froze the layers of ResNet50 to retain the learned features from ImageNet, thereby reducing the need for extensive training on our smaller dataset.

On top of ResNet50, we added the following layers:

* **Global Average Pooling (GAP)**: This layer was used to reduce the dimensionality of the feature maps from ResNet50 without losing valuable information [9].
* Fully Connected Dense Layer: A dense layer with 256 units and ReLU activation was added to increase the model’s capacity for complex feature interactions.
* **Dropout Layer**: To prevent overfitting, we applied a
* **Dropout layer** with a rate of **0.5** [10].
* **Output Layers**: The model has two output branches:
* A **binary classification output** (sigmoid activation) for detecting normal vs. abnormal conditions [11].
* A **multi-class classification output** (SoftMax activation) for identifying the body part in the X-ray.

## Data Augmentation

To improve the generalization capability of the model and prevent overfitting, we applied data augmentation techniques to the training set. These techniques included:

**Rotation** (up to 20 degrees) [12].

**Width and Height Shifts** (up to 20%) [12].

**Zoom** (up to 20%) [12].

**Horizontal Flipping** [12].

This augmentation process increased the diversity of the training data, enabling the model to learn robust features and reducing the risk of overfitting to the training set.

## Training and Evaluation

The model was trained using **Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD)** with a learning rate of **0.001**. We employed **binary cross-entropy** as the loss function for the abnormality detection task and **categorical cross-entropy** for the body part classification task [13]. The model was trained for **10 epochs** with a **batch size of 32** [14].

To evaluate the model’s performance, we monitored metrics such as **accuracy, precision, recall**, and **loss** for both the training and validation sets. Additionally, we used a **confusion matrix** to assess the quality of predictions for both tasks [15].

# Results and Discussion

## Performance Metrics

The model was evaluated on the **Stanford MURA dataset** using key performance metrics such as **accuracy**, **precision**, **recall**, and **loss** for both training and validation sets. Over the course of **10 epochs**, the model achieved a training accuracy of **87.2%** for abnormality detection and **82.6%** for body part classification. The validation accuracy was slightly lower, reaching **84.9%** for abnormality detection and **80.2%** for body part classification. This indicates that the model was able to generalize relatively well to unseen data, though there is some room for improvement in body part classification.

## Confusion Matrix Analysis

To further evaluate the classification performance, we generated confusion matrices for both tasks. For the abnormality detection task, the confusion matrix showed that the model correctly classified **85%** of abnormal cases and **82%** of normal cases. The **precision** for detecting abnormalities was **83%**, while the **recall** was **85%**, indicating that the model performed well in identifying abnormal cases with few false negatives [16]. However, the misclassification rate for normal cases suggests that the model could be improved by fine-tuning the decision threshold or incorporating additional training data [17].

In the body part classification task, the confusion matrix revealed that the model struggled slightly more, particularly when distinguishing between **elbow** and **forearm** X-rays. The precision for identifying elbows was **78%**, while the precision for forearms was **75%**, suggesting that these classes may share overlapping features that the model finds challenging to differentiate. However, for **finger** X-rays, the precision was higher at **87%**, indicating the model was more confident in distinguishing this class from the others.

## Overfitting Consideration

The **training vs. validation accuracy** curves show a small gap between the two, indicating a slight overfitting issue. The **Dropout layer** with a rate of **0.5** and data augmentation helped mitigate overfitting, but further measures could be taken to reduce this gap, such as increasing the dropout rate or adding regularization techniques [18]. Future work could also focus on increasing the size of the dataset, which would allow the model to generalize better on unseen data.

## Comparison with Existing Work

Compared to similar works using deep learning for medical image analysis, our model’s performance is competitive. Prior research on X-ray image classification has reported similar accuracy levels when using **transfer learning** with models such as **VGG16** and **InceptionV3** [19]. The use of **ResNet50** in our work allowed us to leverage deep, pre-trained features, which are crucial for complex tasks like medical image classification. However, there is potential for improving performance by integrating more advanced techniques such as **attention mechanisms** or using **ensemble models** [20].

## Limitations

One key limitation of this project is the relatively small dataset size, which restricts the model’s ability to learn more diverse features, especially for more complex cases such as fractures or subtle abnormalities. Additionally, the dataset primarily focuses on specific anatomical regions (elbow, finger, forearm), which limits the generalizability of the model to other body parts. Incorporating a broader dataset covering more anatomical regions would likely improve the model’s performance in real-world applications [21].

# Conclusion

This project successfully implemented a deep learning approach for classifying bone X-ray images and detecting abnormalities using transfer learning. By leveraging the pre-trained **ResNet50** architecture, we were able to achieve competitive performance in both body part classification and abnormality detection on the **Stanford MURA** dataset. The use of **data augmentation** and **dropout** helped to prevent overfitting and improve the model’s ability to generalize to unseen data.

The results indicate that the model has potential for real-world application, particularly in assisting radiologists by automating the initial diagnosis of musculoskeletal conditions. The overall accuracy for detecting abnormalities and identifying anatomical regions was high, demonstrating the effectiveness of deep learning in medical image analysis. While there is still room for improvement, the system provides a solid foundation for future work in this area, with the goal of improving patient outcomes through faster and more accurate diagnoses.

# Future Word

While the results of this project are promising, there are several avenues for future improvements. One area for enhancement is expanding the dataset to include more diverse and complex X-ray images, covering a wider range of anatomical regions and conditions. A larger and more varied dataset would improve the model’s ability to generalize to real-world clinical scenarios.

Additionally, further exploration of more advanced deep learning architectures such as **InceptionV3** and **EfficientNet** could potentially boost classification accuracy. Techniques such as **attention mechanisms** could also be incorporated to help the model focus on important regions in the X-ray images, improving abnormality detection.

Finally, future work could investigate the use of **ensemble learning**, where multiple models are combined to achieve more robust predictions. Fine-tuning hyperparameters and exploring techniques like **transfer learning** from other medical image datasets could further enhance model performance.
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