IJVAST | Vol. 2, Issue 2 | June 2026 | Open Access — Peer Reviewed Review Article

A Review Paper on AI-Based Early Detection of Bone Cancer from Medical Imaging using Machine Learning

Gayatri Hingane[1], Shraddha Raut[2]

Department of Computer Science and Engineering

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Technological University, Maharashtra, India

Abstract—Bone cancer is among the most life-threatening malignancies, and its early detection significantly improves patient survival rates. Traditional diagnostic methods relying on radiologists often suffer from subjectivity, fatigue, and limited throughput. Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly Deep Learning and Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs), has demonstrated exceptional promise in automating the detection and classification of bone cancer from medical images including X-Ray, MRI, and CT scans. This review paper systematically analyzes existing literature on AI-based bone cancer detection methods from 2015 to 2024. We examine various CNN architectures such as VGG16, ResNet, InceptionNet, and EfficientNet applied to bone cancer imaging datasets. Key challenges including dataset scarcity, class imbalance, and model interpretability are identified. The paper concludes with future directions emphasizing federated learning, explainable AI, and multi-modal imaging fusion for robust clinical deployment.

Index Terms*—Bone Cancer Detection, Deep Learning, CNN, X-Ray, MRI, CT Scan, Medical Imaging, ResNet, VGG16, Transfer Learning, EfficientNet.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Bone cancer, though relatively rare compared to other cancers, represents a critical medical challenge due to its aggressive nature and the complexity of its early-stage diagnosis. Primary bone cancers such as Osteosarcoma, Ewing Sarcoma, and Chondrosarcoma predominantly affect young patients and are associated with high morbidity and mortality when detected at advanced stages. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), approximately 3,500 new cases of bone cancer are diagnosed annually in the United States alone.

Conventional diagnostic approaches rely heavily on imaging modalities such as plain X-Rays, MRI, and CT scans, followed by biopsy confirmation. However, manual interpretation demands extensive radiological expertise, is time-consuming, and is prone to inter-observer variability. These limitations underscore the urgent need for automated, reliable, and scalable diagnostic tools.

Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly Machine Learning (ML) and its subset Deep Learning (DL), has revolutionized medical image

III. MEDICAL IMAGING MODALITIES

A. X-Ray Imaging

Plain radiography (X-Ray) remains the most widely used imaging modality for initial bone cancer screening, revealing characteristic signs such as periosteal reactions, cortical destruction, and pathological fractures. The MURA dataset from Stanford with 40,561 X-Ray images has been widely used for CNN model development. Key preprocessing steps include CLAHE, image resizing to 224x224 pixels, Gaussian noise removal, and data augmentation.

B. MRI Imaging

MRI provides superior soft tissue contrast and is particularly effective in delineating tumor boundaries, assessing marrow involvement, and detecting skip lesions. MRI sequences including T1-weighted, T2-weighted, STIR, and contrast-enhanced sequences provide complementary information. CNN models have utilized multi-channel input approaches treating different sequences as separate channels to maximize information extraction.

C. CT Scan Imaging

analysis over the past decade. CNNs have shown near-human or super-human performance in various diagnostic imaging tasks. This review surveys state-of-the-art AI-based methods for early bone cancer detection from X-Ray, MRI, and CT imaging.

II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

A. Traditional Bone Cancer Diagnosis

Before the advent of AI, bone cancer diagnosis relied on a sequential multi-step process: clinical examination, imaging-based assessment, laboratory investigations, and histopathological biopsy. Even experienced radiologists reported diagnostic discordance rates of 15-20% in challenging cases, highlighting the critical need for computer-aided detection systems.

B. Emergence of Machine Learning

Early machine learning approaches employed handcrafted feature extraction techniques such as GLCM, HOG, and Gabor filters, followed by classifiers like SVM and Random Forests. While these achieved modest accuracies of 70-80%, they were heavily dependent on domain expertise for feature engineering and struggled to generalize across diverse patient populations.

C. Deep Learning Revolution

The breakthrough of AlexNet at ILSVRC 2012 marked the beginning of the deep learning era. Subsequent architectures including VGGNet (2014), InceptionNet (2015), ResNet (2016), DenseNet (2017), and EfficientNet (2019) demonstrated progressively superior performance. When fine-tuned through Transfer Learning on ImageNet weights, these models achieved diagnostic accuracies exceeding 90% on cancer detection benchmarks.

CT scanning offers excellent visualization of cortical bone architecture, calcification patterns, and periosteal reactions. 3D CT reconstructions enable volumetric analysis of tumor extent critical for surgical planning. Deep learning approaches have leveraged 3D CNNs and hybrid 2D-3D architectures. Preprocessing typically involves Hounsfield Unit (HU) windowing for bone visualization (W: 2000, L: 300).

IV. CNN ARCHITECTURES

Transfer Learning has been the dominant strategy in applying CNN architectures to bone cancer detection. Since large-scale annotated bone cancer datasets are scarce, models pretrained on ImageNet are fine-tuned on bone cancer imaging datasets. This approach dramatically reduces the training data requirement and training time while achieving high performance. Table I summarizes major architectures and their reported performance.

TABLE I — CNN Architectures for Bone Cancer Detection

Architecture	Year	Key Feature	Application	Reported Accuracy
VGG16 / VGG19	2014	Deep 16-19 layer conv.	X-Ray tumor classification	88-92%
ResNet-50/101	2016	Residual skip connections	MRI lesion segmentation	90-95%
InceptionV3	2015	Parallel multi-scale conv.	CT scan feature extraction	89-93%
DenseNet-121	2017	Dense inter-layer connections	Multi-modal bone imaging	91-94%
EfficientNet-B4	2019	Compound scaling	X-Ray & MRI classification	93-97%
U-Net	2015	Encoder-decoder seg.	Tumor boundary segmentation	Dice: 0.85-0.92

V. SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE

The end-to-end AI pipeline progresses from image acquisition through preprocessing, CNN inference, Grad-CAM visualization, and clinical report generation, with optional DICOM integration for hospital information systems. The modular design supports both cloud deployment for high-volume hospitals and edge deployment for low-resource clinical settings.

VI. DATASETS

Key publicly available datasets include: MURA Dataset (Stanford, 40,561 X-Ray images), The Cancer Imaging Archive (TCIA, CT/MRI), BraTS Dataset (~500 MRI cases/year), MIMIC-CXR (227,827 X-Ray images), and Kaggle Bone Cancer Dataset. Table II provides a comprehensive summary with access details.

VII. PERFORMANCE METRICS

Performance evaluation employs: Accuracy, Sensitivity (Recall), Specificity, Precision, F1-Score, AUC-ROC, and Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC). Clinical utility demands particularly high sensitivity (>95%) to minimize false negatives. EfficientNet-based models consistently achieve 93-97% accuracy. Ensemble approaches further improve performance. Table III presents a comparative analysis of existing studies.

VIII. KEY CHALLENGES

Limited and imbalanced datasets remain the primary challenge addressed through SMOTE, data augmentation, and GAN-based synthetic image generation. Model interpretability is addressed through Grad-CAM, LIME, and SHAP. Generalizability across institutions, multi-modal data integration, regulatory approval (FDA/CE marking), and computational resource requirements represent additional barriers to clinical deployment.

TABLE II — Datasets Used in Bone Cancer AI Research

Dataset	Modality	Volume	Classes	Access
MURA (Stanford)	X-Ray	40,561 images	Normal/Abnormal	Public
TCIA	CT/MRI	Varies by study	Multiple types	Public
BraTS	MRI	~500 cases/yr	Tumor grades	Public
MIMIC-CXR	X-Ray	227,827 images	Multiple diagnoses	Public
Kaggle Bone Cancer	X-Ray/MRI	Varies	Benign/Malignant	Public
Institutional	All modalities	Varies	Custom	Restricted

TABLE III — Comparative Analysis of Existing Studies

Author(s)	Year	Method	Dataset Used	Accuracy
Sharma et al.	2021	ML-Based Detection	X-Ray Images	89%
Anisuzzaman et al.	2021	Deep CNN	Histopathology Images	92%
Gawade et al.	2023	CNN + Transfer Learning	Osteosarcoma Dataset	94%
Song et al.	2024	Multi-Modal Deep Learning	X-Ray, CT, MRI	96%

IX. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Federated Learning enables training across multiple hospitals without sharing raw patient data, addressing data scarcity and privacy simultaneously. Explainable AI (XAI) frameworks

X. CONCLUSION

This review has systematically examined AI-based early bone cancer detection from medical imaging. CNN-based models, particularly EfficientNet, ResNet, and U-Net employing transfer learning, achieve promise clinically transparent decisions. Vision Transformers (ViT) and Swin Transformers represent an emerging frontier with competitive performance against CNNs on medical imaging benchmarks.

Multi-modal fusion architectures jointly processing X-Ray, MRI, CT, and genomic data represent the path towards truly precision oncology. Low-cost deployment on mobile devices for rural healthcare and integration with electronic health records (EHR) are further impactful directions.

diagnostic accuracies of 88-97%, approaching radiologist-level performance on benchmark datasets.

Despite significant progress, challenges related to dataset availability, model interpretability, and clinical generalizability remain. Addressing these through federated learning, explainable AI, and multi-modal data fusion will be critical for translating research findings into clinical tools that genuinely improve patient outcomes in bone oncology.

XI. REFERENCES

[1] G. Litjens et al., "A survey on deep learning in medical image analysis," Medical Image Analysis, vol. 42, pp. 60-88, 2017.
[2] P. Rajpurkar et al., "MURA: Large dataset for abnormality detection in musculoskeletal radiographs," arXiv:1712.06957, 2017.
[3] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, "Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition," arXiv:1409.1556, 2014.
[4] K. He et al., "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in Proc. CVPR, pp. 770-778, 2016.
[5] O. Ronneberger et al., "U-Net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation," in Proc. MICCAI, pp. 234-241, 2015.
[6] M. Tan and Q. Le, "EfficientNet: Rethinking model scaling for CNNs," in Proc. ICML, pp. 6105-6114, 2019.
[7] R. R. Selvaraju et al., "Grad-CAM: Visual explanations from deep networks," in Proc. ICCV, pp. 618-626, 2017.
[8] G. Huang et al., "Densely connected convolutional networks," in Proc. CVPR, pp. 4700-4708, 2017.
[9] A. Esteva et al., "Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks," Nature, vol. 542, pp. 115-118, 2017.
[10] A. Dosovitskiy et al., "An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale," arXiv:2010.11929, 2020.
[11] K. Sampath et al., "CNN-based architectures for early diagnosis of bone cancer using CT images," Scientific Reports, vol. 14, p. 2144, 2024.
[12] A. Sharma et al., "Bone cancer detection using feature extraction based machine learning model," Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine, 2021.
[13] D. M. Anisuzzaman et al., "A deep learning study on osteosarcoma detection from histological images," Biomedical Signal Processing and Control, vol. 69, p. 102931, 2021.
[14] C. E. Von Schacky et al., "Multitask deep learning for segmentation and classification of primary bone tumors," Radiology, vol. 301, no. 2, pp. 398-406, 2021.
[15] X. Liu et al., "Detection and segmentation of pelvic bones metastases in MRI images based on deep learning," Frontiers in Oncology, vol. 11, p. 773299, 2021.
[16] H. Boulehmi et al., "Bone cancer diagnosis using GGD analysis," in Proc. 15th Int. Multi-Conf. SSD, pp. 246-251, 2018.
[17] K. Sujatha et al., "Screening and identify the bone cancer/tumor using image processing," in Proc. ICCTCT, pp. 1-5, 2018.
[18] A. Shukla and A. Patel, "Bone cancer detection from X-ray and MRI through image segmentation," Int. J. Recent Technology and Engineering, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 273-278, 2020.
[19] H. B. Arunachalam et al., "Viable and necrotic tumor assessment from whole slide images of osteosarcoma," PLOS ONE, vol. 14, no. 4, p. e0210706, 2019.
[20] S. Gawade et al., "Application of CNNs for osteosarcoma bone cancer detection," Healthcare Analytics, vol. 3, p. 100163, 2023.
[21] Z. Zhao et al., "Deep neural network based AI assisted diagnosis of bone scintigraphy," Scientific Reports, vol. 10, p. 17046, 2020.
[22] O. Bandyopadhyay et al., "Bone-cancer assessment and destruction pattern analysis in long-bone X-ray image," Journal of Digital Imaging, vol. 32, pp. 300-313, 2019.
[23] J. Wu et al., "A residual fusion network for osteosarcoma MRI image segmentation," Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience, 2022.
[24] R. Shen et al., "Osteosarcoma patients classification using plain X-rays and metabolomic data," in Proc. IEEE EMBC, pp. 690-693, 2018.

[25] C. Y. Chang et al., "Automated detection of sclerotic spinal lesions on body CTs using deep CNN," Skeletal Radiology, vol. 51, pp. 391-399, 2022.
[26] L. Song et al., "A deep learning model for classification of primary bone tumors based on multimodal images," Cancer Imaging, vol. 24, no. 1, p. 135, 2024.
[27] Z. Xie et al., "A radiograph-based deep learning model improves classification of primary bone tumors," European Journal of Radiology, vol. 176, p. 111496, 2024.
[28] T. Altameem, "Fuzzy rank correlation-based segmentation for bone cancer identification," Neural Computing and Applications, vol. 32, pp. 6847-6856, 2019.
[29] D. Anand et al., "A deep convolutional extreme machine learning method to detect bone cancer," Int. J. Intelligent Systems and Applications in Engineering, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 39-47, 2022.
[30] A. Shrivastava and M. K. Nag, "Enhancing bone cancer diagnosis through image extraction and machine learning," Technology and Health Care, 2024.