

**American College of Radiology
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®**

Clinical Condition: Acute Hip Pain—Suspected Fracture

Variant 1: Middle-aged and elderly patients. First study.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
X-ray hip	9	AP and cross-table lateral views should be performed. Perform x-rays of both hip and pelvis.	☼☼☼
X-ray pelvis	9	AP view should be performed. Perform x-rays of both hip and pelvis.	☼☼
MRI pelvis and affected hip without IV contrast	1		O
MRI pelvis and affected hip without and with IV contrast	1		O
CT pelvis and hips without IV contrast	1		☼☼☼
CT pelvis and hips with IV contrast	1		☼☼☼
CT pelvis and hips without and with IV contrast	1		☼☼☼☼
US hip	1		O
Tc-99m bone scan hip	1		☼☼☼
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Variant 2: Middle-aged and elderly patients. Negative or indeterminate radiographs.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
MRI pelvis and affected hip without IV contrast	9		O
CT pelvis and hips without IV contrast	6		☼☼☼
MRI pelvis and affected hip without and with IV contrast	4		O
Tc-99m bone scan hip	4	Consider using single-photon emission CT (SPECT) or SPECT/CT.	☼☼☼
CT pelvis and hips with IV contrast	1		☼☼☼
CT pelvis and hips without and with IV contrast	1		☼☼☼☼
US hip	1		O
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

ACUTE HIP PAIN—SUSPECTED FRACTURE

Expert Panel on Musculoskeletal Imaging: Robert J. Ward, MD, CCD¹; Barbara N. Weissman, MD²; Mark J. Kransdorf, MD³; Ronald Adler, MD, PhD⁴; Marc Appel, MD⁵; Laura W. Bancroft, MD⁶; Stephanie A. Bernard, MD⁷; Michael A. Bruno, MD⁸; Ian Blair Fries, MD⁹; William B. Morrison, MD¹⁰; Timothy J. Mosher, MD¹¹; Catherine C. Roberts, MD¹²; Stephen C. Scharf, MD¹³; Michael J. Tuite, MD¹⁴; Adam C. Zoga, MD.¹⁵

Summary of Literature Review

Introduction/Background

The impact of hip fracture or, more accurately, proximal femoral fracture on society is considerable from both a health and economic perspective. Recent studies have shown an incidence of hip fracture in approximately 957 per 100,000 women in the United States, with an approximate 30% mortality rate within the first year after the fracture [1]. Although data appear to demonstrate a recent decline in the fracture rate and subsequent mortality corresponding with the rise of bisphosphonate treatment [2], osteoporosis and proximal femoral fragility fracture remain a substantial cause of death in the United States. The mortality rate from fragility fractures is approximately twice that of breast cancer [3]. The economic impact of proximal femoral fracture has been estimated at \$40,000/patient [4-7]. Costs are considerably higher in cases that go initially undiagnosed [8]. Estimates of undiagnosed fractures have ranged from 3%–9% depending on the age group [9-11]. An approach to diagnosis founded on available evidence is our best option for minimizing the substantial morbidity and mortality associated with missed proximal femoral fractures.

Radiography

Radiography is the established initial imaging study of choice for assessing the acutely painful hip. Radiographs of the hip are widely available, logistically simple for the patient, technically straightforward for the technologist, and relatively inexpensive. As with any trauma-related musculoskeletal radiographic studies, orthogonal views are considered standard. Hip anteroposterior (AP) and cross-table lateral views satisfy this requisite. An AP view is taken with the leg in approximately 15° of internal rotation. However, because nonresponsive, high-energy trauma patients often present in external rotation, a Judet view with 40° of angulation of the pelvis is suggested. The Judet or 40° contralateral posterior oblique view will separate the superimposed head and greater trochanter for adequate evaluation. Another strategy for obtaining orthogonal views of the proximal femur is the frog-leg lateral, a position that puts the patient in maximal abduction by placing the soles of the feet together. However, the literature recommends against this view in cases of suspected proximal femoral fracture or dislocation, as it may further displace the fracture and complicate the injury [12].

The initial imaging study for acute hip pain in low-energy trauma is the radiograph. However, radiographs have been shown to have limited sensitivity [9-14]. In one series, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) revealed fractures in 37% of patients who had negative radiographs for proximal femur fracture [15]. A more recent study demonstrated false-negative and -positive radiographic findings, which led the authors to conclude their study demonstrated “poor sensitivity and specificity of radiography of the proximal femur and pelvis in emergency department evaluation of patients with pain or suspected trauma around these structures [16].” In a recently published 10-year retrospective study, MRI showed fractures in 83 of 98 patients with negative radiographs [17]. Ultimately, radiographs alone cannot exclude fracture in older patients. There is no current data on the sensitivity and specificity of radiography in the younger patient population; therefore, clinicians are suggested to proceed with caution.

¹Principal Author, Tufts Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts. ²Panel Chair, Brigham & Women’s Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts. ³Panel Vice-chair, Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, Florida. ⁴NYU Center for Musculoskeletal Care, New York, New York. ⁵Warwick Valley Orthopedic Surgery, Warwick, New York, American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. ⁶Florida Hospital, Orlando, Florida. ⁷Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, Pennsylvania. ⁸Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, Pennsylvania. ⁹Bone, Spine and Hand Surgery, Chartered, Brick, NJ, American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. ¹⁰Thomas Jefferson University Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. ¹¹Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, Pennsylvania. ¹²Mayo Clinic, Phoenix, Arizona. ¹³Lenox Hill Hospital, New Rochelle, New York, Society of Nuclear Medicine. ¹⁴University of Wisconsin Hospital, Madison, Wisconsin. ¹⁵Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The American College of Radiology seeks and encourages collaboration with other organizations on the development of the ACR Appropriateness Criteria through society representation on expert panels. Participation by representatives from collaborating societies on the expert panel does not necessarily imply individual or society endorsement of the final document.

Reprint requests to: publications@acr.org

Computed Tomography

Computed tomography (CT) is widely available, rapid, and easily tolerated by patients with potential hip injuries. The literature cites the use of CT for hip fracture since 1980 [18]. CT was found to be useful in evaluating the presence of intra-articular, loose osseous fragments within joints. Later, the focus shifted to hip injury and evaluation of acetabular fractures. Numerous studies using MRI as the gold standard cite CT's improved sensitivity to fracture when compared to radiographs [14,19-21]. One study demonstrated that CT had a femoral neck fracture sensitivity of 70%; however, sensitivity decreased to 58% when femoral head fracture subjects were included [22]. A recent review proposed an algorithm that used CT following negative radiographs in cases of high-energy trauma [9]. The rationale was that the substantial forces experienced in high-energy trauma would likely cause cortical disruption that could be well-demonstrated with CT. However, the authors did not mention the likely concurrent abdominal and pelvic CT imaging from which the high-energy trauma patient's proximal femora could be evaluated. Currently, there are no data to suggest that CT alone could rule out fracture in high-energy trauma among the younger age group; however, such an approach appears sensible. Alternatively, younger high-energy trauma patients who do not undergo scanning for other potential injuries would likely benefit from the more sensitive MRI examination to avoid the substantial radiation associated with pelvic and hip imaging.

A more recent, retrospective study of CT demonstrated impressive findings. Among 193 patients who underwent CT, 84 scans were negative for fractures. Subsequent MRI or other diagnostic criteria found 4 of those 84 to have fractures. These results indicate a CT sensitivity of 95% [23]. The authors described interpretation criteria from a previous study [24] and admitted that using CT to identify fracture "may sometimes be more difficult to interpret than MRI, especially for inexperienced radiologists." The major weakness of this study was the absence of an imaging gold standard for all cases. Using the same technique, the authors had demonstrated near perfect interobserver agreement with kappa values ranging from 0.85 to 0.97 [25]. Further application of these advanced interpretation strategies within the community setting may help guide future recommendations [24].

Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Since 1989, the literature has shown the use of MRI in identifying radiographically occult proximal femoral fracture [19]. All 23 patients scanned by Deutsche et al were later determined to have fractures, as demonstrated by MRI. In another study using clinical outcomes as a standard, MRI demonstrated 100% accuracy in detecting fractures in 20 patients who had indeterminate radiographs [20]. An early study comparing MRI with scintigraphy for evaluating occult fractures demonstrated comparable sensitivity [11]. In an additional study, MRI detected fractures in 10 of 15 patients who had negative radiographs for femoral fracture. The remaining 5 patients were evaluated as negative on MRI and successfully treated conservatively [26]. In yet another confirmatory study of 33 patients, MRI found fractures among two-thirds; the patients with negative MRIs were followed over time to confirm that they did not subsequently fracture [27]. These studies suggest that MRI for radio-occult proximal femur fracture is highly sensitive, specific, and accurate in evaluating fracture.

In addition to increased sensitivity in proximal femoral fracture detection, MRI has been shown to be useful in characterizing fracture morphology. Schultz et al [28] described MRI's ability to unequivocally detect the incomplete intertrochanteric fracture in 31 patients. Although complete fractures require surgery, incomplete fractures potentially may be treated conservatively. The clinical significance of distinguishing incomplete versus complete intertrochanteric fractures was demonstrated in a study that followed 68 patients with suspected fracture of the proximal femur [29]. Eight patients were identified with incomplete intertrochanteric fractures; 3 were treated operatively, and 5 were treated conservatively. None were admitted for completion of their fracture. The study suggests that patients with incomplete intertrochanteric fractures may be treated conservatively and, consequently, that MRI may have a future role in directing treatment.

Additionally, authors have evaluated MRI's ability to detect extra-femoral trauma in cases of acute hip pain and negative radiographs. A study to evaluate the frequency of unsuspected pelvic fracture in patients sent for MRI to evaluate for proximal femoral fracture demonstrated that 80% of patients had significant pelvic bone or soft-tissue abnormalities. Of those patients whose scans were negative for proximal femoral fracture, 50% were found to have bone or soft-tissue abnormalities [15]. A more recent study in patients without radiograph evidence of proximal femoral fracture found that 14 of 28 patients had fractured femurs. Of those patients who were radiographically negative for proximal femur fracture, all had alternative causes for symptoms, including gluteus maximus strains, hematomas, avascular necrosis, or effusions [30]. In a larger series of 70 patients worked up for proximal femur fracture, 21% had pubic rami fractures, and 19% had sacral fractures [8]. In this study, it was interesting that patients with proximal femur fractures had lengths of stay twice (21 days) those of patients with

insufficiency pelvic fractures and soft-tissue injuries (10-11 days), suggesting that ruling out proximal femur fractures may allow for more rapid transfer to rehabilitation and a potential savings of acute care resources.

Multiple studies have confirmed that MRI sensitivity approaches 100% in cases of occult hip fractures. It is important to determine whether using MRI to evaluate such cases is cost effective and, if so, which patient population may best benefit from it. Several studies have examined the cost-effectiveness of MRI in occult fracture detection. One study demonstrated that delaying surgery only 1 day led to 1.27 times greater risk of death [31]. A second study challenged the assertion that increased preoperative time was associated with increased mortality when corrected for comorbidities. However, there was an increased length of stay in the delayed group, again emphasizing the cost-effectiveness of an early and accurate diagnosis with respect to proximal femur fracture [32]. A third study supported the finding that a delay in surgery in patients corrected for comorbidities led to increased mortality [33]. A subsequent study confirmed the increased mortality and morbidity with delayed diagnoses [34]. Finally, a meta-analysis has demonstrated that early surgery leads to decreased length of stay, morbidity, and mortality [35].

A 1998 study measuring the cost-effectiveness of MRI against bone scintigraphy [36] emphasized that the time to diagnosis using a bone scan was roughly 4 times greater than with MRI. The time to surgery in the bone scan group was 1 day greater than for the MRI group. More recently, a group in Denmark evaluated the cost-effectiveness of MRI and demonstrated high sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy with excellent agreement between radiology readers as well as a savings of approximately □250-650 (\$325-845 US) related to prompt diagnosis [21]. Dy et al [37] demonstrated the overall cost-effectiveness in allocating additional health-care resources for performing surgery <48 hours after patients were diagnosed with proximal femur fractures.

Specific scanning protocols have emphasized either speed or comprehensiveness. In 1993, Quinn and McCarthy suggested a single T1-weighted sequence to evaluate for fracture [20]. With equipment from 1993, the 7-minute sequence proved 100% accurate in detecting hip fractures. A more recent study suggested the usefulness of limited imaging for a rapid, more cost-effective, definitive diagnosis [38]. The use of contrast has been suggested as a way to potentially change femoral neck fracture treatment algorithms based on vascularity of the femoral head [39]. In a study from Japan, dynamic contrast-enhancement curves were predictors of avascular necrosis, potentially guiding treatment between screw fixation and arthroplasty. The study results suggested that nondisplaced fractures demonstrated normal head vascularity and displaced fractures had abnormal vascularity. These results support the utility of the present radiographic Garden classification [40]. Alternatively, nondisplaced fractures showed decreased perfusion in a study from Japan that demonstrated decreased enhancement perfusion curves in 4 of 16 patients who had nondisplaced intra-articular fractures, with 2 cases progressing to avascular necrosis [41]. A more recent study demonstrated decreased vascularity in only 1 of 17 (6%) of the nondisplaced fractures [42]. Given the relatively small number of cases with vascular compromise at this time it is not clear that contrast-enhanced MRI of the hip is useful in evaluating nondisplaced hip fracture.

With emphasis on time to diagnosis, some emergency departments have adopted a CT strategy for evaluating radiographically occult fracture. Because a CT scan is fast and readily available, a noncontrast scan of the hip is a tempting option for a quick and seemingly sensitive modality when a proximal femoral fracture is suspected in a patient with fracture-negative radiograph.

Head-to-head comparison of CT and MRI first appeared in the literature in 2005 [14]. Among 17 patients (whose average age was 73), 6 received both MRI and CT for evaluation. Assuming an MRI gold standard, 4 of the 6 cases were misdiagnosed using CT; only 2 diagnoses were concordant among the 6 patients. One subcapital fracture on MRI was interpreted as a greater trochanteric fracture on CT. Three intertrochanteric fractures on MRI were misdiagnosed as greater trochanteric fractures on CT. This change in diagnosis led to a change in treatment; the trochanteric fractures were treated nonsurgically, and the intertrochanteric fractures required surgery. A second group in the study underwent MRI alone. The time to diagnosis between the 2 arms (MRI and CT versus MRI alone) varied, with the MRI and CT group at 80 hours, and the MRI-only group at 32 hours. The authors concluded that CT results were inaccurate in 66% of studies, and therapy was changed in 50% of cases based on the MRI results. Secondly, they suggested that an accurate and prompt diagnosis will aid in reducing cost, morbidity, and mortality. Note, however, that the study was limited by a small sample size.

In a more recent, larger study, 129 patients (whose average age was 65) received both CT and MRI for pelvic and proximal femoral insufficiency fractures. MRI demonstrated 99% sensitivity, when compared to 69% for CT, in detecting all pelvic and proximal femoral fractures when using a clinical reference standard augmented by follow-

up imaging. With respect to proximal femoral fractures specifically, only 70% were detected by CT and 90% by MRI [22]. Interestingly, radiographs visualized only 15% of fractures diagnosed on MRI and 21% on CT. A similar study to the Cabarrus et al study evaluated CT and MRI head to head in detecting pelvic fractures in patients whose average age was 74 years. The study demonstrated fracture detection rates of 96% for MRI and 77% for CT when compared to a clinical reference standard [43].

Ultrasound

A single study, $n = 10$, using ultrasound (US) to detect radiographically occult proximal femoral fractures yielded 100% sensitivity and 65% specificity with an MRI reference standard. The authors conceded study limitations with respect to the number of cases as well as the potential availability of experienced musculoskeletal US-trained radiologists. [44]. Given only a single small study, there is not enough evidence to support the role of US in the workup of radiographically occult hip fracture.

Bone Scan

Prior to MRI, a bone scan was considered the test of choice for a radiographically occult fracture. Studies from 1979 and 1987 demonstrated 93% and 95% sensitivity, respectively. In 1998, Rubin et al demonstrated that MRI was more sensitive, specific, and cost effective relative to a bone scan. Two separate groups were scanned, one with nuclear bone scan and the second with MRI. The 2 groups were compared with respect to time to diagnosis, time to surgery, and cost. The bone-scan group averaged an additional day prior to surgery, thus incurring substantial additional costs. The authors concluded that MRI was a cost-effective alternative to a nuclear bone scan [36].

Although a bone scan has comparable high sensitivity relative to MRI, numerous limitations have been noted in the literature. False-positive scans are common, as any process that leads to increased bone turnover (arthritis, soft-tissue injury, and neoplasms) will demonstrate increased activity [11]. Combining the high sensitivity of bone scintigraphy with the superior spatial resolution of multislice CT may prove useful in patients for whom MRI cannot be performed, but no comparative data are yet available.

The target patient population represents challenges for bone scanning. Cardiac and renal function are important in optimizing bone scintigraphy and are often compromised. Increased bone turnover related to osteoporosis may decrease the signal-to-noise ratio of the fracture and yield a false-negative scan [45]. Additionally, bone scan availability may be limited in some centers.

Ultimately, bone scintigraphy is time consuming and has been demonstrated to lead to delayed treatment relative to MRI. The role of scintigraphy for detecting fractures may be an alternative for patients with contraindication for MRI. However, given mounting recent evidence, the bone scan's role as a second line of study may be usurped by CT in the future.

Bone Densitometry

The ACR–SSR Practice Guideline for the Performance of Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry (DXA) states that DXA is indicated for all patients with a fragility fracture. Osteoporosis is defined as “A skeletal disorder characterized by compromised bone strength predisposing to an increased risk of fracture” [46]. By definition, a fragility fracture indicates a diagnosis of osteoporosis. The strategy behind obtaining a DXA in the postfragility fracture patient is to establish a baseline for measuring the effectiveness of potential future therapy.

Summary

- The medical and socioeconomic impact of proximal femoral fractures is substantial. Expedient diagnosis and treatment are critical for cost-effective care.
- Radiographs represent the best first test for evaluation.
- MRI is the most appropriate imaging choice for evaluating radiographically occult fracture in individuals >50 years old.
- CT and bone scintigraphy are second-line modalities, and US's role is unclear to date.
- Patients >50 years old with fractures from minimal or no trauma should undergo a DXA study for osteoporosis evaluation [47].

Relative Radiation Level Information

Potential adverse health effects associated with radiation exposure are an important factor to consider when selecting the appropriate imaging procedure. Because there is a wide range of radiation exposures associated with different diagnostic procedures, a relative radiation level (RRL) indication has been included for each imaging examination. The RRLs are based on effective dose, which is a radiation dose quantity that is used to estimate population total radiation risk associated with an imaging procedure. Patients in the pediatric age group are at inherently higher risk from exposure, both because of organ sensitivity and longer life expectancy (relevant to the long latency that appears to accompany radiation exposure). For these reasons, the RRL dose estimate ranges for pediatric examinations are lower as compared to those specified for adults (see Table below). Additional information regarding radiation dose assessment for imaging examinations can be found in the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® [Radiation Dose Assessment Introduction](#) document.

Relative Radiation Level Designations		
Relative Radiation Level*	Adult Effective Dose Estimate Range	Pediatric Effective Dose Estimate Range
O	0 mSv	0 mSv
⊕	<0.1 mSv	<0.03 mSv
⊕⊕	0.1-1 mSv	0.03-0.3 mSv
⊕⊕⊕	1-10 mSv	0.3-3 mSv
⊕⊕⊕⊕	10-30 mSv	3-10 mSv
⊕⊕⊕⊕⊕	30-100 mSv	10-30 mSv

*RRL assignments for some of the examinations cannot be made, because the actual patient doses in these procedures vary as a function of a number of factors (eg, region of the body exposed to ionizing radiation, the imaging guidance that is used). The RRLs for these examinations are designated as “Varies”.

Supporting Documents

For additional information on the Appropriateness Criteria methodology and other supporting documents go to www.acr.org/ac.

References

1. Brauer CA, Coca-Perrillon M, Cutler DM, Rosen AB. Incidence and mortality of hip fractures in the United States. *JAMA*. 2009;302(14):1573-1579.
2. Stevens JA, Anne Rudd R. Declining hip fracture rates in the United States. *Age Ageing*. 2010;39(4):500-503.
3. Currie S, Hadjivassiliou M, Craven IJ, Wilkinson ID, Griffiths PD, Hoggard N. Magnetic resonance imaging biomarkers in patients with progressive ataxia: current status and future direction. *Cerebellum*. 2013;12(2):245-266.
4. Burge R, Dawson-Hughes B, Solomon DH, Wong JB, King A, Tosteson A. Incidence and economic burden of osteoporosis-related fractures in the United States, 2005-2025. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2007;22(3):465-475.
5. Burge RT, King AB, Balda E, Worley D. Methodology for estimating current and future burden of osteoporosis in state populations: application to Florida in 2000 through 2025. *Value Health*. 2003;6(5):574-583.
6. Melton LJ, 3rd, Gabriel SE, Crowson CS, Tosteson AN, Johnell O, Kanis JA. Cost-equivalence of different osteoporotic fractures. *Osteoporos Int*. 2003;14(5):383-388.
7. Tosteson AN, Burge RT, Marshall DA, Lindsay R. Therapies for treatment of osteoporosis in US women: cost-effectiveness and budget impact considerations. *Am J Manag Care*. 2008;14(9):605-615.
8. Galloway HR, Meikle GR, Despois M. Patterns of injury in patients with radiographic occult fracture of neck of femur as determined by magnetic resonance imaging. *Australas Radiol*. 2004;48(1):21-24.
9. Cannon J, Silvestri S, Munro M. Imaging choices in occult hip fracture. *J Emerg Med*. 2009;37(2):144-152.

10. Feldman F, Staron RB. MRI of seemingly isolated greater trochanteric fractures. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2004;183(2):323-329.
11. Rizzo PF, Gould ES, Lyden JP, Asnis SE. Diagnosis of occult fractures about the hip. Magnetic resonance imaging compared with bone-scanning. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 1993;75(3):395-401.
12. Koval KJ, Zuckerman JD. Hip Fractures: I. Overview and Evaluation and Treatment of Femoral-Neck Fractures. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg.* 1994;2(3):141-149.
13. Dominguez S, Liu P, Roberts C, Mandell M, Richman PB. Prevalence of traumatic hip and pelvic fractures in patients with suspected hip fracture and negative initial standard radiographs--a study of emergency department patients. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2005;12(4):366-369.
14. Lubovsky O, Liebergall M, Mattan Y, Weil Y, Mosheiff R. Early diagnosis of occult hip fractures MRI versus CT scan. *Injury.* 2005;36(6):788-792.
15. Bogost GA, Lizerbram EK, Crues JV, 3rd. MR imaging in evaluation of suspected hip fracture: frequency of unsuspected bone and soft-tissue injury. *Radiology.* 1995;197(1):263-267.
16. Kirby MW, Spritzer C. Radiographic detection of hip and pelvic fractures in the emergency department. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2010;194(4):1054-1060.
17. Sankey RA, Turner J, Lee J, Healy J, Gibbons CE. The use of MRI to detect occult fractures of the proximal femur: a study of 102 consecutive cases over a ten-year period. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2009;91(8):1064-1068.
18. Sauser DD, Billimoria PE, Rouse GA, Mudge K. CT evaluation of hip trauma. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1980;135(2):269-274.
19. Deutsch AL, Mink JH, Waxman AD. Occult fractures of the proximal femur: MR imaging. *Radiology.* 1989;170(1 Pt 1):113-116.
20. Quinn SF, McCarthy JL. Prospective evaluation of patients with suspected hip fracture and indeterminate radiographs: use of T1-weighted MR images. *Radiology.* 1993;187(2):469-471.
21. Verbeeten KM, Hermann KL, Hasselqvist M, et al. The advantages of MRI in the detection of occult hip fractures. *Eur Radiol.* 2005;15(1):165-169.
22. Cabarrus MC, Ambekar A, Lu Y, Link TM. MRI and CT of insufficiency fractures of the pelvis and the proximal femur. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2008;191(4):995-1001.
23. Dunker D, Collin D, Gothlin JH, Geijer M. High clinical utility of computed tomography compared to radiography in elderly patients with occult hip fracture after low-energy trauma. *Emerg Radiol.* 2012;19(2):135-139.
24. Geijer M, Dunker D, Collin D, Gothlin JH. Bone bruise, lipohemarthrosis, and joint effusion in CT of non-displaced hip fracture. *Acta Radiol.* 2012;53(2):197-202.
25. Collin D, Dunker D, Gothlin JH, Geijer M. Observer variation for radiography, computed tomography, and magnetic resonance imaging of occult hip fractures. *Acta Radiol.* 2011;52(8):871-874.
26. Haramati N, Staron RB, Barax C, Feldman F. Magnetic resonance imaging of occult fractures of the proximal femur. *Skeletal Radiol.* 1994;23(1):19-22.
27. Pandey R, McNally E, Ali A, Bulstrode C. The role of MRI in the diagnosis of occult hip fractures. *Injury.* 1998;29(1):61-63.
28. Schultz E, Miller TT, Boruchov SD, Schmell EB, Toledano B. Incomplete intertrochanteric fractures: imaging features and clinical management. *Radiology.* 1999;211(1):237-240.
29. Alam A, Willett K, Ostlere S. The MRI diagnosis and management of incomplete intertrochanteric fractures of the femur. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2005;87(9):1253-1255.
30. Lee YP, Griffith JF, Antonio GE, Tang N, Leung KS. Early magnetic resonance imaging of radiographically occult osteoporotic fractures of the femoral neck. *Hong Kong Med J.* 2004;10(4):271-275.
31. Bottle A, Aylin P. Mortality associated with delay in operation after hip fracture: observational study. *BMJ.* 2006;332(7547):947-951.
32. Bergeron E, Lavoie A, Moore L, et al. Is the delay to surgery for isolated hip fracture predictive of outcome in efficient systems? *J Trauma.* 2006;60(4):753-757.
33. Novack V, Jotkowitz A, Etzion O, Porath A. Does delay in surgery after hip fracture lead to worse outcomes? A multicenter survey. *Int J Qual Health Care.* 2007;19(3):170-176.
34. Lefaivre KA, Macadam SA, Davidson DJ, Gandhi R, Chan H, Broekhuysen HM. Length of stay, mortality, morbidity and delay to surgery in hip fractures. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2009;91(7):922-927.

35. Khan SK, Kalra S, Khanna A, Thiruvengada MM, Parker MJ. Timing of surgery for hip fractures: a systematic review of 52 published studies involving 291,413 patients. *Injury*. 2009;40(7):692-697.
36. Rubin SJ, Marquardt JD, Gottlieb RH, Meyers SP, Totterman SM, O'Mara RE. Magnetic resonance imaging: a cost-effective alternative to bone scintigraphy in the evaluation of patients with suspected hip fractures. *Skeletal Radiol*. 1998;27(4):199-204.
37. Dy CJ, McCollister KE, Lubarsky DA, Lane JM. An economic evaluation of a systems-based strategy to expedite surgical treatment of hip fractures. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2011;93(14):1326-1334.
38. Lim KB, Eng AK, Chng SM, Tan AG, Thoo FL, Low CO. Limited magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and the occult hip fracture. *Ann Acad Med Singapore*. 2002;31(5):607-610.
39. Lang P, Mauz M, Schorner W, et al. Acute fracture of the femoral neck: assessment of femoral head perfusion with gadopentetate dimeglumine-enhanced MR imaging. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1993;160(2):335-341.
40. Konishiike T, Makihata E, Tago H, Sato T, Inoue H. Acute fracture of the neck of the femur. An assessment of perfusion of the head by dynamic MRI. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. 1999;81(4):596-599.
41. Hirata T, Konishiike T, Kawai A, Sato T, Inoue H. Dynamic magnetic resonance imaging of femoral head perfusion in femoral neck fracture. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2001(393):294-301.
42. Kaushik A, Sankaran B, Varghese M. Prognostic value of dynamic MRI in assessing post-traumatic femoral head vascularity. *Skeletal Radiol*. 2009;38(6):565-569.
43. Henes FO, Nuchtern JV, Groth M, et al. Comparison of diagnostic accuracy of Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Multidetector Computed Tomography in the detection of pelvic fractures. *Eur J Radiol*. 2011.
44. Safran O, Goldman V, Applbaum Y, et al. Posttraumatic painful hip: sonography as a screening test for occult hip fractures. *J Ultrasound Med*. 2009;28(11):1447-1452.
45. Carnevale V, Frusciante V, Scillitani A, et al. Age-related changes in the global skeletal uptake of technetium-99m methylene diphosphonate in healthy women. *Eur J Nucl Med*. 1996;23(11):1473-1477.
46. NIH Consensus Development Panel on Osteoporosis Prevention, Diagnosis, and Therapy, March 7-29, 2000: highlights of the conference. *South Med J*. 2001;94(6):569-573.
47. American College of Radiology. ACR–SSR Practice Guideline for the Performance of Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry (DXA). 2008; http://www.acr.org/SecondaryMainMenuCategories/quality_safety/guidelines/dx/musc/dxa.aspx. Accessed April 30 2012.

The ACR Committee on Appropriateness Criteria and its expert panels have developed criteria for determining appropriate imaging examinations for diagnosis and treatment of specified medical condition(s). These criteria are intended to guide radiologists, radiation oncologists and referring physicians in making decisions regarding radiologic imaging and treatment. Generally, the complexity and severity of a patient's clinical condition should dictate the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Only those examinations generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.