

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

Clinical Condition: **Chronic Back Pain: Suspected Sacroiliitis/Spondyloarthropathy**

Variant 1: **Inflammatory sacroiliac or back symptoms. Suspected axial spondyloarthropathy. Initial evaluation.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
X-ray sacroiliac joints	9		☼ ☼
X-ray spine	9	Complementary examination to x-ray of the sacroiliac joints.	☼ ☼ ☼
CT sacroiliac joints without IV contrast	1		☼ ☼ ☼
CT sacroiliac joints with IV contrast	1		☼ ☼ ☼
CT sacroiliac joints without and with IV contrast	1		☼ ☼ ☼ ☼
CT spine without IV contrast	1		☼ ☼ ☼
CT spine with IV contrast	1		☼ ☼ ☼
CT spine without and with IV contrast	1		☼ ☼ ☼ ☼
MRI sacroiliac joints without and with IV contrast	1		O
MRI sacroiliac joints without IV contrast	1		O
MRI spine without and with IV contrast	1		O
MRI spine without IV contrast	1		O
Tc-99m bone scan with SPECT spine	1		☼ ☼ ☼
FDG-PET CT whole body	1		☼ ☼ ☼ ☼
US sacroiliac joints	1		O
<u>Rating Scale:</u> 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Clinical Condition: Chronic Back Pain: Suspected Sacroiliitis/Spondyloarthropathy

Variant 2: Inflammatory sacroiliac symptoms. Suspected axial spondyloarthropathy. Radiographs negative or equivocal.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
MRI sacroiliac joints without and with IV contrast	8	Contrast may be helpful in initial evaluation for inflammatory changes. MRI of the sacroiliac joints without contrast is a reasonable alternative examination.	O
MRI sacroiliac joints without IV contrast	8	Alternative to MRI with and without contrast.	O
CT sacroiliac joints without IV contrast	7	This procedure may be helpful in identifying subtle erosions, especially in patients unable to undergo MRI examination.	☼☼☼
Tc-99m bone scan with SPECT spine	4	This procedure may be helpful to localize source of pain, but generally not helpful for establishing an inflammatory diagnosis.	☼☼☼
CT sacroiliac joints with IV contrast	1		☼☼☼
CT sacroiliac joints without and with IV contrast	1		☼☼☼☼
FDG-PET CT whole body	1		☼☼☼☼
US sacroiliac joints	1		O
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Variant 3: Inflammatory back pain symptoms. Suspected axial spondyloarthropathy. Radiographs negative or equivocal.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
MRI sacroiliac joints without IV contrast	8		O
CT spine without IV contrast	7	This procedure may be useful in patients unable to have an MRI.	☼☼☼
MRI spine without and with IV contrast	7	MR spine imaging is controversial. Some literature supports this. Benefits of contrast are unclear but may improve identification of subtle soft tissue inflammatory changes.	O
MRI spine without IV contrast	7	Alternative to MR spine imaging with contrast.	O
MRI sacroiliac joints without and with IV contrast	6	Contrast may be useful in initial evaluation.	O
Tc-99m bone scan with SPECT spine	3	This procedure may be helpful to localize source of pain, but generally not helpful for establishing an inflammatory diagnosis.	☼☼☼
CT spine with IV contrast	1	No advantage to using contrast in the literature.	☼☼☼
CT spine without and with IV contrast	1	No advantage to using contrast in the literature.	☼☼☼☼
FDG-PET CT whole body	1		☼☼☼☼
US sacroiliac joints	1		O
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Clinical Condition: Chronic Back Pain: Suspected Sacroiliitis/Spondyloarthropathy

Variant 4: Inflammatory sacroiliac symptoms. Suspected axial spondyloarthropathy. Negative radiographs and MRI of the sacroiliac joints.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
X-ray spine	9	Initial examination.	☼ ☼ ☼
MRI spine without IV contrast	8		O
CT spine without IV contrast	7		☼ ☼ ☼
MRI spine without and with IV contrast	5	This procedure may be appropriate but there was disagreement among panel members on the appropriateness rating as defined by the panel's median rating. Contrast generally not necessary, but may be helpful in some situations. Alternative to MR spine without contrast.	O
CT spine with IV contrast	1	No literature to support a benefit to contrast use.	☼ ☼ ☼
CT spine without and with IV contrast	1	No literature to support a benefit to contrast use.	☼ ☼ ☼ ☼
Tc-99m bone scan with SPECT spine	1	This procedure may be helpful to localize source of pain, but generally not helpful for establishing an inflammatory diagnosis.	☼ ☼ ☼
FDG-PET/CT whole body	1		☼ ☼ ☼ ☼
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Variant 5: Spine ankyloses. Suspected fracture.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CT spine area of interest without IV contrast	9	Required as standard of care for exclusion of fracture in patients with ankylosis.	Varies
X-ray spine area of interest	8	If negative, additional imaging required.	Varies
MRI spine area of interest without IV contrast	8	This procedure should be performed in patients with neurologic symptoms.	O
Tc-99m bone scan with SPECT spine	2	This procedure may be helpful to localize source of pain, but generally not helpful for establishing an inflammatory diagnosis.	☼ ☼ ☼
CT spine area of interest with IV contrast	1		Varies
CT spine area of interest without and with IV contrast	1		Varies
MRI spine area of interest without and with IV contrast	1		O
FDG-PET/CT whole body	1		☼ ☼ ☼ ☼
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Clinical Condition: Chronic Back Pain: Suspected Sacroiliitis/Spondyloarthropathy

Variant 6: Known axial spondyloarthropathy. Follow-up for treatment response or disease progression.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
X-ray sacroiliac joints	9		☼☼
X-ray spine area of interest	9	Complementary examination to evaluate symptomatic areas of the spine.	Varies
MRI sacroiliac joints and spine area of interest without IV contrast	8		○
CT sacroiliac joints and spine area of interest without IV contrast	5	CT is generally not performed, but may be helpful for complex anatomy.	Varies
MRI sacroiliac joints and spine area of interest without and with IV contrast	5	This procedure may be appropriate but there was disagreement among panel members on the appropriateness rating as defined by the panel's median rating. Contrast is generally not necessary, but may be useful in certain situations.	○
CT sacroiliac joints and spine area of interest with IV contrast	1		Varies
CT sacroiliac joints and spine area of interest without and with IV contrast	1		Varies
Tc-99m bone scan with SPECT spine	1	This procedure may be helpful to localize source of pain, but generally not helpful for establishing an inflammatory diagnosis.	☼☼☼
FDG-PET/CT whole body	1		☼☼☼☼
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

CHRONIC BACK PAIN: SUSPECTED SACROILIITIS/SPONDYLOARTHROPATHY

Expert Panel on Musculoskeletal Imaging: Stephanie A. Bernard, MD¹; Mark J. Kransdorf, MD²; Francesca D. Beaman, MD³; Ronald S. Adler, MD, PhD⁴; Behrang Amini, MD, PhD⁵; Marc Appel, MD⁶; Erin Arnold, MD⁷; R. Carter Cassidy, MD⁸; Bennett S. Greenspan, MD, MS⁹; Kenneth S. Lee, MD, MBA¹⁰; Michael J. Tuite, MD¹¹; Eric A. Walker, MD¹²; Robert J. Ward, MD¹³; Daniel E. Wessell, MD¹⁴; Barbara N. Weissman, MD.¹⁵

Summary of Literature Review

Introduction/Background

The axial spondyloarthropathies (axSpAs) are a group of inflammatory arthritides that include ankylosing spondylitis, psoriatic arthritis, reactive arthritis, and inflammatory bowel disease related spondyloarthropathies. These axSpAs involve the sacroiliac (SI) joints and/or the spine. It is estimated that as much as 5% of chronic back pain is caused by an underlying axSpA [1]. Symptoms may begin in childhood or early adulthood and can lead to loss of mobility and function. As there is no one pathognomonic test, the diagnosis of axSpAs is often challenging and is based on a combination of physical exam, biological data (HLA-B27, C-reactive protein), and imaging findings. An axSpA typically presents prior to 45 years of age. The pain is chronic (3 months or more duration) and insidious in onset, with “inflammatory symptoms” that, depending of the criteria used, can include morning stiffness, pain that improves with exercise but not rest, pain that awakens in the second half of the night, and alternating buttock pain [2]. There has been an evolution of the diagnostic criteria for the axSpAs from originally requiring conventional radiographic evidence of sacroiliitis as part of the modified New York Criteria [3] to the Assessment of SpondyloArthritis International Society (ASAS) classification system that now includes combinations of clinical findings with or without imaging evidence of sacroiliitis [4]. The most pronounced change in the classification has been the inclusion of SI inflammatory lesions on magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) as an imaging means of early identification of patients with “pre-radiographic” spondyloarthropathy [4-6]. Effective new biological therapies, such as the tumor necrosis factor- α antagonists, which have the potential to arrest disease progression and prevent the development of disability, make early diagnosis and treatment prior to radiographic joint damage essential [7].

Overview of Imaging Modalities

Radiographs are recommended as the first imaging modality for evaluation in cases of suspected axSpA [8]. The main limitation of conventional radiography is a low sensitivity for detecting abnormalities in the early stages of the disease. Radiographic findings represent the structural consequences of inflammatory changes and often lag behind the onset of clinical symptoms by 7 or more years [9].

Current diagnostic algorithms for axSpAs recommend MRI of the SI joints as the next appropriate imaging method when there is an absence of radiographic findings to help establish the diagnosis [4,5,10]. Fluid-sensitive MR sequences such as T2-weighted fat-saturated or short tau inversion recovery (STIR) allow identification of the characteristic bone marrow lesions and areas of soft-tissue inflammatory change [5]. Intravenous gadolinium-DTPA contrast-enhanced, fat-saturated, T1-weighted images may allow for further evaluation of inflammation in subchondral bone and adjacent soft tissues as well as differentiation of synovitis from fluid in the joints [5,11]. MR inflammatory changes have been shown to be predictive of later progression to radiographic erosive disease as well as correlate with a likelihood of response to treatment [12,13].

In patients unable to undergo MRI, computed tomography (CT) may be helpful, demonstrating an improved sensitivity over conventional radiographs for detection of subtle bone erosions and reparative changes. CT allows better assessment of the complex anatomy of the SI joints as well as of early enthesitis-related bone production in

¹Principal Author, Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, Pennsylvania. ²Panel Chair, Mayo Clinic, Phoenix, Arizona. ³Panel Vice-chair, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky. ⁴NYU Center for Musculoskeletal Care, New York, New York. ⁵University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas. ⁶James J. Peters VA Medical Center, Bronx, New York, American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. ⁷Orthopaedics and Rheumatology of the North Shore, Skokie, Illinois, American College of Rheumatology. ⁸UK Healthcare Spine and Total Joint Service, Lexington, Kentucky, American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. ⁹Medical College of Georgia at Georgia Regents University, Augusta, Georgia. ¹⁰University of Wisconsin Hospital & Clinics, Madison, Wisconsin. ¹¹University of Wisconsin Hospital & Clinics, Madison, Wisconsin. ¹²Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, Pennsylvania. ¹³Tufts Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts. ¹⁴Mayo Clinic, Jacksonville, Florida. ¹⁵Specialty Chair, Brigham & Women’s Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts.

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

the posterior elements and costovertebral articulations of the spine [14-16]. CT, however, lacks sensitivity for the direct inflammatory changes of early axSpA prior to erosion and thus remains primarily an adjunct imaging method.

Bone scintigraphy has the potential for identifying increased bone turnover at the SI joints or spine associated with the axSpAs but lacks sufficient specificity for establishing a diagnosis of inflammatory sacroiliitis [15,17]. If bone scintigraphy is used for symptom localization, given the complexity of the anatomy, it should include single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) imaging. There is limited literature evaluating the role of fluorine-18-2-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose (FDG) positron emission tomography (PET)/CT imaging for evaluation of the active inflammation in axSpA [18-21]. Although the potential for whole-body screening is attractive, and there may be utility in screening for active enthesitis, the body of literature is too limited currently for inclusion in the current general imaging recommendations. Ultrasound (US) with Doppler imaging continues to increase in use in rheumatologic practices and is currently applied to the SpAs in detection of peripheral joint involvement and enthesitis [22]. A few studies have shown potential for the use of US with Doppler imaging of the SI joints both for initial screening for inflammation and for follow-up of treatment response [23-25]. Although this may develop into an inexpensive and useful diagnostic tool, more research is needed before inclusion in the current algorithm for general diagnostic imaging recommendations.

Discussion of Imaging Modalities by Variant

Variant 1: Inflammatory sacroiliac or back symptoms. Suspected axial spondyloarthropathy. Initial evaluation.

The initial imaging should begin with radiographic evaluation of the SI joints. For imaging of the SI joints, a standard anteroposterior (AP) radiograph of the pelvis may be sufficient [26], with an additional AP view with 30°–45° cephalad angulation of the x-ray tube as well as bilateral 30° oblique views often used to minimize the overlap of structures. The ASAS recommends the whole pelvis with the hip joints be included as part of the initial screening AP imaging [8]. Cervical, thoracic and lumbar spine radiographs with a minimum of an initial lateral projection should be obtained based on the regions of the patient's clinical symptoms [8]. Additional oblique views of the spine may be helpful for further evaluation of the facet joints. Decisions for advanced imaging should be made based on the results of radiography and the clinical need for additional assessment.

Variant 2: Inflammatory sacroiliac symptoms. Suspected axial spondyloarthropathy. Radiographs negative or equivocal.

CT of the SI joints without contrast may be helpful in cases when equivocal radiographic abnormalities exist, allowing identification of subtle erosions and soft-tissue ossification [14,16]. In the absence of radiographic findings, MRI of the SI joints is the best examination for the assessment of acute inflammatory changes [10,27]. In addition to T1 sequences, the MRI should include fat-suppressed fluid-sensitive sequences such as T2-weighted fat-suppressed or STIR images [28]. Intravenous gadolinium contrast-enhanced, T1-weighted, fat-saturated sequences may improve detection of subtle inflammatory lesions and differentiation of synovitis from joint fluid during the initial evaluation for axSpA [5,29]. However, contrast-enhanced imaging has not been shown to significantly increase the diagnostic accuracy of MRI for sacroiliitis [30-32]. The use of contrast must be weighed against the potential disadvantages of increased cost, need for intravenous access, and the potential risk of nephrogenic systemic fibrosis or contrast reaction. As discussed in the overview of imaging modalities section above, although quantitative bone scintigraphy, PET/CT, and US may have application on a case-by-case basis and may be included in research protocols, there is not enough literature to support their inclusion in the general recommendations for imaging at this time.

Variant 3: Inflammatory back pain symptoms. Suspected axial spondyloarthropathy. Radiographs negative or equivocal.

Variant 4: Inflammatory sacroiliac symptoms. Suspected axial spondyloarthropathy. Negative radiographs and MRI of the sacroiliac joints.

Isolated spine inflammatory involvement in the setting of normal SI joints has in the past been considered a rare occurrence but has since been recognized more frequently (6%–23%) on MR examinations [13,33]. Lateral radiographs at minimum of the cervical and lumbar spine, if not already performed, may allow identification of findings that can help establish a diagnosis [8]. CT may allow better visualization of subtle erosive changes or enthesopathic bone formation in the posterior elements or for evaluation of thoracic spine disease. If radiographs are normal and disease is unable to be confirmed by MRI of the sacroiliac joints, spine MRI may be helpful to

support diagnosis and allow the patient access to tumor necrosis factor- α antagonist medications. Although not currently included in the ASAS classification of axSpA, criteria have been proposed for defining the number and severity of classic lesions on spine MRI that are highly suggestive of axSpAs [34-39]. Sagittal imaging has been demonstrated as the best imaging plane for evaluation of axSpA spinal lesions [39]. **Note:** *The spine MRI examination needs to include fluid-sensitive sequences (STIR or T2-weighted fat-saturated) to allow visual identification of the acute inflammatory findings in bone, joints, and soft tissues.* This point is made because standard spine MRI protocols for evaluation of disc disease may not include the fat suppression of the T2 imaging necessary for sensitivity for the inflammatory features of the axSpAs. Gadolinium enhancement is not required but may help in initial evaluation, improving conspicuity of inflammatory changes, especially in the discs, facet joints and entheses [32,40]. (See the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® “[Low Back Pain](#)” [41].)

Variant 5: Spine ankyloses. Suspected fracture.

AxSpA is associated with the development of both osteoporosis and ankylosis of the spine. Spinal fractures in the setting of ankylosis are frequently from low-energy mechanisms, such as a fall from standing or even in the absence of recognizable trauma as presumed insufficiency fractures. Many of these fractures involve all 3 columns of the spine and are unstable, with a high associated rate of neurologic injury [42,43]. Radiographs are an inexpensive initial imaging method of evaluation but have a poor sensitivity for the presence or extent of fracture. CT with multiplanar reformatted images is necessary for exclusion of fracture of the spine in a patient with ankylosis and pain following any report of trauma [44]. If neurological symptoms are present, MRI without contrast would be recommended for the evaluation for spinal cord, nerve root and ligamentous injuries [45]. (See the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® “[Suspected Spine Trauma](#)” [46].)

Variant 6: Known axial spondyloarthritis. Follow-up for treatment response or disease progression.

In conjunction with clinical examination and laboratory biomarkers, conventional radiographs of the SI joints and symptomatic regions of the spine are the primary method of following structural progression of disease. The frequency of radiographic monitoring should be based on the patient’s individual symptoms, with a general recommendation of no more frequently than every 2 years [47]. MRI may be helpful for evaluation of persistent inflammation as a determination of treatment response. Gadolinium-enhanced imaging is not needed to identify active inflammatory lesions, which are equally well identified on fluid-sensitive fat-suppressed imaging (T2-weighted fat-saturated or STIR imaging) [29-32].

Summary of Recommendations

- Initial evaluation for inflammatory arthropathy is best performed with radiographs of the sacroiliac joints and symptomatic areas of the spine.
- MRI plays an essential role in identifying early inflammatory disease when radiographic evidence of disease is absent and should begin with sacroiliac joint imaging.
- MRI of the spine may be helpful in establishing the diagnosis when other imaging is negative. The MRI request should indicate that the examination is being performed to evaluate for possible axial spondyloarthritis as the imaging sequences may need to be modified.
- Gadolinium-enhanced MRI may be helpful at initial assessment, especially when nonenhanced MR images are normal. Intravenous contrast is probably not needed for follow-up MR imaging outside of research protocols or for specific patient indications.
- Patients with ankylosis of the spine have a high incidence of unstable fractures that may occur from seemingly minor trauma. As a result, a high clinical suspicion is needed when these patients present with spine pain and multiplanar CT is required for exclusion of fracture.

Summary of Evidence

Of the 47 references cited in the *ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Chronic Back Pain–Suspected Sacroiliitis/Spondyloarthritis* document, 46 are categorized as diagnostic references including 14 good quality studies, and 12 quality studies that may have design limitations. Additionally, 1 reference is categorized as a well designed therapeutic study. There are 20 references that may not be useful as primary evidence.

The 47 references cited in the *ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Chronic Back Pain–Suspected Sacroiliitis/Spondyloarthritis* document were published from 1984-2013.

While there are references that report on studies with design limitations, 15 well designed or good quality studies provide good evidence.

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
○	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. Underwood MR, Dawes P. Inflammatory back pain in primary care. *Br J Rheumatol*. 1995;34(11):1074-1077.
2. Sieper J, van der Heijde D, Landewe R, et al. New criteria for inflammatory back pain in patients with chronic back pain: a real patient exercise by experts from the Assessment of SpondyloArthritis international Society (ASAS). *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2009;68(6):784-788.
3. van der Linden S, Valkenburg HA, Cats A. Evaluation of diagnostic criteria for ankylosing spondylitis. A proposal for modification of the New York criteria. *Arthritis Rheum*. 1984;27(4):361-368.
4. Rudwaleit M, Landewe R, van der Heijde D, et al. The development of Assessment of SpondyloArthritis international Society classification criteria for axial spondyloarthritis (part I): classification of paper patients by expert opinion including uncertainty appraisal. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2009;68(6):770-776.
5. Rudwaleit M, Jurik AG, Hermann KG, et al. Defining active sacroiliitis on magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) for classification of axial spondyloarthritis: a consensual approach by the ASAS/OMERACT MRI group. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2009;68(10):1520-1527.
6. Rudwaleit M, van der Heijde D, Landewe R, et al. The development of Assessment of SpondyloArthritis international Society classification criteria for axial spondyloarthritis (part II): validation and final selection. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2009;68(6):777-783.
7. Haibel H, Rudwaleit M, Listing J, et al. Efficacy of adalimumab in the treatment of axial spondylarthritis without radiographically defined sacroiliitis: results of a twelve-week randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial followed by an open-label extension up to week fifty-two. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2008;58(7):1981-1991.

8. Sieper J, Rudwaleit M, Baraliakos X, et al. The Assessment of SpondyloArthritis international Society (ASAS) handbook: a guide to assess spondyloarthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis.* 2009;68 Suppl 2:ii1-44.
9. Mau W, Zeidler H, Mau R, Majewski A, Freyschmidt J, Deicher H. Outcome of possible ankylosing spondylitis in a 10 years' follow-up study. *Clin Rheumatol.* 1987;6 Suppl 2:60-66.
10. Aydin SZ, Maksymowych WP, Bennett AN, McGonagle D, Emery P, Marzo-Ortega H. Validation of the ASAS criteria and definition of a positive MRI of the sacroiliac joint in an inception cohort of axial spondyloarthritis followed up for 8 years. *Ann Rheum Dis.* 2012;71(1):56-60.
11. Althoff CE, Sieper J, Song IH, et al. Active inflammation and structural change in early active axial spondyloarthritis as detected by whole-body MRI. *Ann Rheum Dis.* 2013;72(6):967-973.
12. Bennett AN, McGonagle D, O'Connor P, et al. Severity of baseline magnetic resonance imaging-evident sacroiliitis and HLA-B27 status in early inflammatory back pain predict radiographically evident ankylosing spondylitis at eight years. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2008;58(11):3413-3418.
13. Rudwaleit M, Schwarzlose S, Hilgert ES, Listing J, Braun J, Sieper J. MRI in predicting a major clinical response to anti-tumour necrosis factor treatment in ankylosing spondylitis. *Ann Rheum Dis.* 2008;67(9):1276-1281.
14. Devauchelle-Pensec V, D'Agostino MA, Marion J, et al. Computed tomography scanning facilitates the diagnosis of sacroiliitis in patients with suspected spondylarthritis: results of a prospective multicenter French cohort study. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2012;64(5):1412-1419.
15. Fam AG, Rubenstein JD, Chin-Sang H, Leung FY. Computed tomography in the diagnosis of early ankylosing spondylitis. *Arthritis Rheum.* 1985;28(8):930-937.
16. Lee YH, Hwang JY, Lee SW, Lee J. The clinical usefulness of multidetector computed tomography of the sacroiliac joint for evaluating spondyloarthropathies. *Korean J Intern Med.* 2007;22(3):171-177.
17. Inanc N, Atagunduz P, Sen F, Biren T, Turoglu HT, Direskeneli H. The investigation of sacroiliitis with different imaging techniques in spondyloarthropathies. *Rheumatol Int.* 2005;25(8):591-594.
18. Strobel K, Fischer DR, Tamborrini G, et al. 18F-fluoride PET/CT for detection of sacroiliitis in ankylosing spondylitis. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging.* 2010;37(9):1760-1765.
19. Taniguchi Y, Arii K, Kumon Y, et al. Positron emission tomography/computed tomography: a clinical tool for evaluation of enthesitis in patients with spondyloarthritides. *Rheumatology (Oxford).* 2010;49(2):348-354.
20. Wendling D, Blagosklonov O, Streit G, Lehuede G, Toussirost E, Cardot JC. FDG-PET/CT scan of inflammatory spondylodiscitis lesions in ankylosing spondylitis, and short term evolution during anti-tumour necrosis factor treatment. *Ann Rheum Dis.* 2005;64(11):1663-1665.
21. Bruijnen ST, van der Weijden MA, Klein JP, et al. Bone formation rather than inflammation reflects ankylosing spondylitis activity on PET-CT: a pilot study. *Arthritis Res Ther.* 2012;14(2):R71.
22. D'Agostino MA, Saraux A, Chary-Valckenaere I, et al. Can we improve the diagnosis of spondyloarthritis in patients with uncertain diagnosis? The EchoSpA prospective multicenter French cohort. *Joint Bone Spine.* 2012;79(6):586-590.
23. Unlu E, Pamuk ON, Cakir N. Color and duplex Doppler sonography to detect sacroiliitis and spinal inflammation in ankylosing spondylitis. Can this method reveal response to anti-tumor necrosis factor therapy? *J Rheumatol.* 2007;34(1):110-116.
24. Mohammadi A, Ghasemi-rad M, Aghdashi M, Mladkova N, Baradaransafa P. Evaluation of disease activity in ankylosing spondylitis; diagnostic value of color Doppler ultrasonography. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2013;42(2):219-224.
25. Arslan H, Sakarya ME, Adak B, Unal O, Sayarlioglu M. Duplex and color Doppler sonographic findings in active sacroiliitis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1999;173(3):677-680.
26. Battistone MJ, Manaster BJ, Reda DJ, Clegg DO. Radiographic diagnosis of sacroiliitis--are sacroiliac views really better? *J Rheumatol.* 1998;25(12):2395-2401.
27. Weber U, Lambert RG, Ostergaard M, Hodler J, Pedersen SJ, Maksymowych WP. The diagnostic utility of magnetic resonance imaging in spondylarthritis: an international multicenter evaluation of one hundred eighty-seven subjects. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2010;62(10):3048-3058.
28. Puhakka KB, Jurik AG, Egund N, et al. Imaging of sacroiliitis in early seronegative spondylarthropathy. Assessment of abnormalities by MR in comparison with radiography and CT. *Acta Radiol.* 2003;44(2):218-229.
29. Althoff CE, Feist E, Burova E, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging of active sacroiliitis: do we really need gadolinium? *Eur J Radiol.* 2009;71(2):232-236.

30. de Hooge M, van den Berg R, Navarro-Compan V, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging of the sacroiliac joints in the early detection of spondyloarthritis: no added value of gadolinium compared with short tau inversion recovery sequence. *Rheumatology (Oxford)*. 2013;52(7):1220-1224.
31. Madsen KB, Egund N, Jurik AG. Grading of inflammatory disease activity in the sacroiliac joints with magnetic resonance imaging: comparison between short-tau inversion recovery and gadolinium contrast-enhanced sequences. *J Rheumatol*. 2010;37(2):393-400.
32. Baraliakos X, Hermann KG, Landewe R, et al. Assessment of acute spinal inflammation in patients with ankylosing spondylitis by magnetic resonance imaging: a comparison between contrast enhanced T1 and short tau inversion recovery (STIR) sequences. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2005;64(8):1141-1144.
33. Marzo-Ortega H, McGonagle D, O'Connor P, et al. Baseline and 1-year magnetic resonance imaging of the sacroiliac joint and lumbar spine in very early inflammatory back pain. Relationship between symptoms, HLA-B27 and disease extent and persistence. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2009;68(11):1721-1727.
34. Bennett AN, Rehman A, Hensor EM, Marzo-Ortega H, Emery P, McGonagle D. Evaluation of the diagnostic utility of spinal magnetic resonance imaging in axial spondylarthritis. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2009;60(5):1331-1341.
35. Bennett AN, Rehman A, Hensor EM, Marzo-Ortega H, Emery P, McGonagle D. The fatty Romanus lesion: a non-inflammatory spinal MRI lesion specific for axial spondyloarthropathy. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2010;69(5):891-894.
36. Bochkova AG, Levshakova AV, Bunchuk NV, Braun J. Spinal inflammation lesions as detected by magnetic resonance imaging in patients with early ankylosing spondylitis are more often observed in posterior structures of the spine. *Rheumatology (Oxford)*. 2010;49(4):749-755.
37. Blachier M, Coutanceau B, Dougados M, et al. Does the site of magnetic resonance imaging abnormalities match the site of recent-onset inflammatory back pain? The DESIR cohort. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2013;72(6):979-985.
38. Maksymowych WP, Chiowchanwisawakit P, Clare T, Pedersen SJ, Ostergaard M, Lambert RG. Inflammatory lesions of the spine on magnetic resonance imaging predict the development of new syndesmophytes in ankylosing spondylitis: evidence of a relationship between inflammation and new bone formation. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2009;60(1):93-102.
39. Hermann KG, Baraliakos X, van der Heijde DM, et al. Descriptions of spinal MRI lesions and definition of a positive MRI of the spine in axial spondyloarthritis: a consensual approach by the ASAS/OMERACT MRI study group. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2012;71(8):1278-1288.
40. Wang YX, Griffith JF, Deng M, et al. Vertebral body corner oedema vs gadolinium enhancement as biomarkers of active spinal inflammation in ankylosing spondylitis. *Br J Radiol*. 2012;85(1017):e702-708.
41. American College of Radiology. ACR Appropriateness Criteria®: Low Back Pain. Available at: <https://acsearch.acr.org/docs/69483/Narrative/>.
42. Westerveld LA, Verlaan JJ, Oner FC. Spinal fractures in patients with ankylosing spinal disorders: a systematic review of the literature on treatment, neurological status and complications. *Eur Spine J*. 2009;18(2):145-156.
43. Caron T, Bransford R, Nguyen Q, Agel J, Chapman J, Bellabarba C. Spine fractures in patients with ankylosing spinal disorders. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2010;35(11):E458-464.
44. Campagna R, Pessis E, Feydy A, et al. Fractures of the ankylosed spine: MDCT and MRI with emphasis on individual anatomic spinal structures. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2009;192(4):987-995.
45. Wang YF, Teng MM, Chang CY, Wu HT, Wang ST. Imaging manifestations of spinal fractures in ankylosing spondylitis. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2005;26(8):2067-2076.
46. American College of Radiology. ACR Appropriateness Criteria®: Suspected Spine Trauma. Available at: <https://acsearch.acr.org/docs/69359/Narrative/>.
47. Zochling J, van der Heijde D, Burgos-Vargas R, et al. ASAS/EULAR recommendations for the management of ankylosing spondylitis. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2006;65(4):442-452.

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.