

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

Clinical Condition: Upper Extremity Swelling

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
US duplex Doppler upper extremity	9	This procedure is standard for arm veins. Other modalities are required for evaluating central veins.	O
X-ray chest	8	This procedure is a simple evaluation of lines, mediastinal contours, and cervical ribs. It is complementary to Doppler if a diagnosis other than DVT is suspected.	☼
MR venography chest without and with IV contrast	8	With this procedure, an asymptomatic side injection is preferred. This procedure is indicated for central veins.	O
MR venography chest without IV contrast	7	This procedure is an alternative to CT when iodinated contrast is contraindicated.	O
X-ray venography upper extremity and SVC	7	Although this procedure is the reference standard, it is complementary and generally reserved for inconclusive noninvasive studies.	☼ ☼ ☼
CT venography chest with IV contrast	7	With this procedure, an asymptomatic side injection is preferred. This procedure is an alternative to MR venography for central veins.	☼ ☼ ☼ ☼
Radionuclide venography upper extremity and chest	3	This procedure has been largely supplanted. It has limited use for central veins when CT and MR venography are both contraindicated.	☼ ☼ ☼
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

UPPER EXTREMITY SWELLING

Expert Panel on Vascular Imaging: Karin E. Dill, MD¹; Shelby J. Bennett, MD²; Michael Hanley, MD³; Dennis F. Bandyk, MD⁴; Kenneth L. Gage, MD, PhD⁵; Marie D. Gerhard-Herman, MD⁶; Heather L. Gornik, MD⁷; Pamela T. Johnson, MD⁸; Isabel B. Oliva, MD⁹; Thomas Ptak, MD, PhD¹⁰; Michael L. Steigner, MD¹¹; Richard Strax, MD¹²; Frank J. Rybicki, MD, PhD.¹³

Summary of Literature Review

Introduction/Background

Upper-extremity deep venous thrombosis (UEDVT) accounts for up to 10% of all diagnosed deep venous thrombi [1,2]. Although relatively rare, the incidence of UEDVT is believed to be rising at least in part due to the increased longevity of patients with chronic disease and the increased frequency of vascular catheter utilization. Thrombosis is classified according to etiology as either primary or secondary to a predisposing factor such as an indwelling catheter, trauma, or extrinsic compression. Additionally, UEDVT involving the axillary vein or any more central vessel can be further described as proximal, with distal UEDVT affecting the brachial, radial, and ulnar veins.

Secondary DVT of the upper extremity is by far the most common type. Indwelling venous devices such as catheters, pacemakers, and defibrillators put patients at the highest risk of thrombus [1,3-8]. Central venous catheters, which are difficult to place, such as those requiring multiple insertion attempts, are noted to have increased incidence of associated thrombus [9]. Other risk factors associated with higher likelihood of UEDVT include advanced age, previous thrombophlebitis, postoperative state, hypercoagulability [3,10,11], heart failure [3], cancer [5,7,8,10-13], right-heart procedures, and intensive care unit admissions [1,8].

The non-O blood group as well as patients with certain abnormally elevated coagulation factors were recently demonstrated to be at increased risk of UEDVT [14]. Although many of the same risk factors for lower-extremity DVT also increase the risk for UEDVT, research is helping to elucidate certain variables unique to thrombi in the upper extremity [1,15].

Primary UEDVT is less common and is diagnosed in about one-third of all UEDVT cases. Etiologies of primary UEDVT include thoracic outlet syndrome and effort-related thrombosis (Paget-Schroetter syndrome), and occasionally it is idiopathic.

Patients who develop UEDVT often present with symptoms of ipsilateral upper-extremity edema, pain, paresthesias and, in some instances, functional impairment [15]. Catheter-associated thrombosis may be asymptomatic, rather manifesting as catheter dysfunction or as an incidental finding upon imaging. Superficial thrombophlebitis is associated with local pain, induration, and, often, a palpable cord. It is rarely, if ever, associated with diffuse arm swelling [16]. Unilateral swelling indicates an obstructive process at the level of the brachiocephalic, subclavian, or axillary veins [16,17]. DVT limited to the brachial veins need not be associated with swelling. Isolated jugular vein thrombosis is asymptomatic and rarely causes swelling. There may be a correlation between upper-extremity and lower-extremity DVT, and investigation of the lower extremities as well should be considered if an upper-extremity thrombus is found in the absence of a local cause [18].

Differentiating Causes of Upper-Extremity Swelling

The initial approach to a patient who presents with a swollen upper extremity is exclusion of venous thrombosis because anticoagulation is typically required, and the underlying lesion may require a more aggressive intervention such as thrombolysis. Once the diagnosis of DVT is excluded, other etiologies may need to be evaluated. The combination of clinical features alone can be used to design a clinical prediction score for diagnosing upper-extremity DVT [19]. Blood tests can also be used to detect the presence of DVT. Plasma levels

¹Principal Author and Panel Chair, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. ²Research Author, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. ³Panel Vice-chair, University of Virginia Health System, Charlottesville, Virginia. ⁴University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California, Society of Vascular Surgeons. ⁵Moffitt Cancer Center, Tampa, Florida. ⁶Brigham & Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, American College of Cardiology. ⁷Cleveland Clinic Heart and Vascular Institute, Cleveland, Ohio, American College of Cardiology. ⁸Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Maryland. ⁹University of Arizona College of Medicine, Tucson, Arizona. ¹⁰Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts. ¹¹Brigham & Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts. ¹²Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas. ¹³Specialty Chair, Brigham and 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.

of D-dimer, a degradation product of cross-linked fibrin that is elevated during thromboembolic events, is highly sensitive but not very specific [20]. It is also unreliable to diagnose recurrent DVT or alternative conditions that mimic DVT, and is unable to assess the location and extent of the venous thrombus, which is critical for proper therapeutic management of DVT [21].

Imaging is often required for definitive exclusion of DVT and to document its location and extent. Although contrast x-ray venography is considered the reference standard for evaluating possible UEDVT, and it offers the potential for coincident initiation of therapy, noninvasive imaging is frequently the initial step. The most commonly employed noninvasive imaging includes ultrasound (US), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and computed tomography (CT). Other techniques, such as photoplethysmography, lymphoscintigraphy, and fluorine-18-2-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose positron emission tomography CT (FDG-PET)/CT have been discussed in the literature as part of the workup for upper-extremity swelling, particularly when lymphedema is a potential cause [22-26].

Chest Radiography

Because of the broad differential diagnoses of upper-extremity swelling, a chest radiograph may identify a mass lesion responsible for central venous obstruction or help confirm the presence and location of wires, catheters, or a retained wire or catheter fragment. Rare osseous entities that might be associated with extrinsic compression syndromes, such as a cervical rib, would also be detected.

Radionuclide Imaging

Radionuclide studies can confirm upper-extremity venous obstruction, and have been considered the reference standard for diagnosis of extremity lymphedema [27]. The diagnostic criteria for venous obstruction include failure to visualize one or more of the main venous segments (axillary, subclavian, brachiocephalic, or superior vena cava [SVC]) and visualization of collateral venous channels. This test is typically not able to differentiate intrinsic venous thrombosis from extrinsic compression [2,21-23]. For edema related to lymphatic obstruction, the presence of certain features such as dermal backflow and lymph node asymmetry can increase the diagnostic specificity after intradermal injection [28]. Some authors have indicated that differentiating between primary lymphedema and secondary lymphedema, such as that due to venous obstruction, may be limited when using intradermal lymphangiography alone [29]. Furthermore, MR lymphangiography is currently being evaluated as a radiation-free alternative to conventional, radionuclide lymphoscintigraphy and may play a larger role in the future [30,31].

X-ray Venography

This is the “reference standard” examination for evaluating the upper-extremity veins [32]. The examination carries the risks associated with the injection of an iodinated contrast agent [32,33]. Patient tolerance has been improved, and the risks of adverse events have been reduced with low-osmolar contrast agents. Direct evidence of venous thrombus is based on the visualization of a filling defect in the vein. Less specific findings for venous thrombus include abrupt contrast cut-off, absence of contrast filling, or the presence of collateral channels [34]. Venography can identify fixed venous stenoses and, with upper-extremity maneuvers (abduction), can identify extrinsic venous compression. The utility of these maneuvers has also been described with US [35]. Asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic venous compression with arm abduction should be treated with caution, as this finding can be made in a substantial number of normal individuals. Venography can also identify recurrent acute venous thrombus in patients with a prior history of venous thrombus. Despite its widespread acceptance as a reference standard based on extension of evidence associated with lower-extremity DVT, there are few clinical trials supporting its use.

Venous Ultrasound

Duplex US is a relatively inexpensive test that can exclude DVT and help identify a proximal venous obstruction. It is noninvasive, can be performed at the patient’s bedside, and can be used for serial evaluation. Diagnostic criteria for direct evidence of thrombus, as in the lower extremity, include loss of compression of imaged vein walls when pressure is applied on the skin during real-time imaging, and visualization of echogenic material in the vein. Indirect evidence of thrombus includes altered blood-flow patterns [11,33,34,36-38]. Loss of compressibility is consistent with acute DVT but can also occur in the presence of chronic venous thrombosis [11,34]. US is most useful in evaluation of veins peripheral to the subclavian, such as the jugular, axillary, basilic, cephalic, and brachial veins. Compression cannot be used to evaluate subclavian or more central veins, as bony structures prevent visualization and/or compression of the vessel lumen.

A full examination also includes evaluation of the Doppler velocity profiles obtained from blood in the major veins and color-flow Doppler imaging. Dampening of cardiac pulsatility or respiratory variation waveforms on Doppler examination are reliable indicators of central venous obstruction [6,38,39]. In addition, respiratory maneuvers such as rapid inspiration or “sniffing” should normally cause the walls of the subclavian veins to collapse due to rapid venous emptying [32,39,40]. Impairment of this collapse may indicate a central obstructive process [4,38,39]. However, a central thrombus will cause the same alterations in blood flow as a mass encasing or compressing the central (SVC, brachiocephalic) veins or a benign stricture. Color-flow imaging can be used to image the presence or absence of flow within the vein and is useful in evaluating venous segments where compression maneuvers cannot be applied (eg, to the central subclavian vein) [4,11,39], although a study has suggested that if *only* blood flow abnormalities are seen, conventional venography may be necessary [11].

Grayscale imaging can be used to identify echogenic thrombus. However, acute hypoechoic thrombi may be missed using grayscale imaging alone. Adjunctive use of color-flow images can help in confirming the presence or absence of hypoechoic thrombus and can also help determine if a clot is obstructive or partially obstructive. Correlative studies between US and venography show diagnostic sensitivities and specificities above 80% [4,6,11,13,32-34,38,40-42].

Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Approaches to venous imaging using MRI include black-blood and flow-based or contrast-enhanced bright-blood techniques [43]. Black-blood techniques include conventional T1 or T2 spin-echo [37,44] or fast spin-echo imaging. However, the black-blood effect on routine spin-echo imaging may not be consistent, and newer double inversion-recovery techniques provide more reliable black-blood imaging [43]. Using black-blood imaging, the presence of thrombus is inferred from focal high signal, often with venous enlargement, but it must be differentiated from a variety of flow artifacts [44]. The high signal in thrombus on T1 imaging decreases after 6 months, and the technique is less useful for chronic thrombus [45].

Flow-based bright-blood MR venography (MRV) techniques include time of flight (TOF) [43,46,47] and phase contrast [43,44]. For venous imaging, TOF is limited to a 2-D implementation due to signal saturation of slow flow [48]. Since vessels with primarily in-plane flow are more difficult to image due to saturation [48]; 2-D TOF is often useful in the axial plane to image flow in the jugular veins, right brachiocephalic vein, and SVC, which are oriented primarily in the superior-inferior direction. TOF venography can be used to image the subclavian vein, but more time-consuming sagittal acquisitions are preferred due to the direction of flow, and breathing artifacts may also impair imaging quality [10,48,49]. Phase contrast has not been widely used for upper-extremity venography due to the slow flows that must be detected [48]. Recently, balanced gradient-echo (steady-state free precession) and cardiac-gated 3-D fast spin-echo techniques have been implemented for noncontrast MR vessel imaging. Although these techniques have not been evaluated for chest venography, they appear promising [48,50,51]. Balanced gradient-echo images alone are insensitive for detecting central venous thrombus [52], partly because of the variable signal intensity of thrombus over time, as acute thrombus is relatively isointense to blood with this sequence. Cardiac-gated 3-D fast spin-echo techniques can help differentiate transient flow artifacts from true filling defects that persist over the cardiac cycle.

Contrast-enhanced MRV [46,53,54] can also be used by implementing 2-D or 3-D T1 gradient-echo images with fat saturation after administration of a single or a double dose of MR contrast [48]. Typically, venous phase images are obtained after an MR arteriogram by simply allowing enough time delay for the contrast bolus to enter the venous or equilibrium phase [43,48]. Fibrin-specific MR contrast agents can further enhance all thrombi and may even detect thrombi not readily visible in precontrast imaging [55]. The use of time-resolved (TR) imaging techniques allows visualization of flow and has been shown to reduce both the contrast volume and acquisition time while improving specificity when used as an adjunct to conventional MR sequences [56,57]. It has found use in protocols for whole-body venography [58] and was shown to produce images of comparable diagnostic quality but lower specificity compared to conventional MRV [59] in the assessment of central thoracic veins. Certain MR protocols, such as TR-MRI, might eventually be used as a fast, noninvasive, and relatively safe imaging tool for screening and serial follow-up of patients with poor renal function, but further study is required [60].

The advantages of MRV are primarily for central venous evaluation, as the central veins cannot be imaged directly by US. For imaging the distal upper extremity vessels, US or even x-ray venography is preferred. MRV of the arm is rendered more difficult by its placement at the periphery of the magnetic field or the requirement to maintain the arm motionless over the head. MRI is capable of producing very high-resolution images of the soft

tissues, so it can help identify mimics of DVT and potential sources of extrinsic venous compression. To exploit this diagnostic potential, MRV protocols often include standard MRI sequences such as T1-weighted (spin echo, gradient return echo) and T2-weighted (fast spin echo) sequences to assess the anatomy surrounding the vessels. Studies so far specifically comparing MRV to venography have been mixed, with some work showing MRV to be as effective as venography [47,54] but other work showing its limitations [37,44,46]. A recent meta-analysis found MRV to have both a high sensitivity and a high specificity [61], although the study did not focus on the upper extremities.

Computed Tomography

CT can be used to determine the presence of centrally located thrombi or stenoses within the jugular veins [62,63], the brachiocephalic veins [64,65], and the SVC [64]. The presence of an extrinsic process causing venous obstruction can also be demonstrated [66]. CT is the main imaging modality for staging neoplastic involvement in the mediastinum and axillae, which can include vascular invasion or compression. Perivascular inflammatory changes around chronic thrombi can also be detected by CT [67]. Delayed imaging at 90 to 120 seconds can permit evaluation of the central veins. No large series of studies have looked at the diagnostic accuracy of this technique for diagnosing upper-extremity venous thrombosis, although extensive experience is accumulating with lower-extremity venous thrombosis. One small series showed that the performance of CT venography is similar to that of conventional venography in the thoracic and upper-extremity veins, and that it evaluates the central extent of obstruction more effectively [66]. Although CT is considered noninvasive, it exposes the patient to radiation.

Summary of Recommendations

- Despite the availability of noninvasive imaging techniques, contrast venography remains the best reference standard diagnostic test for suspected upper-extremity acute venous thrombosis.
- Contrast venography may be needed whenever other noninvasive strategies fail to adequately image the upper-extremity veins. In situations such as acute UEDVT, where the likelihood of percutaneous thrombectomy or thrombolysis is high, it is sensible to proceed directly to venography.
- Duplex, color-flow, and compression US have also established a clear role in evaluation of the more peripheral veins that are accessible to sonography.
- Gadolinium contrast-enhanced MRI is routinely used to evaluate the status of the central veins. Unfortunately, despite its widespread clinical use, there are few validation studies of this technique compared to the extensive literature on contrast venography. The recognition of gadolinium as a cause of nephrogenic systemic fibrosis has increased interest in noncontrast MRV, but validation of these techniques remains an issue.
- Delayed CT venography can often be used to confirm or exclude more central venous thrombi. As in the case of MRV, there are few correlative studies justifying this approach.

Summary of Evidence

Of the 67 references cited in the *ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Upper Extremity Swelling* document, 1 is categorized as a therapeutic reference. Additionally, 66 references are categorized as diagnostic references including 4 well-designed studies, 7 good quality studies, and 15 quality studies that may have design limitations. There are 41 references that may not be useful as primary evidence.

The 67 references cited in the *ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Upper Extremity Swelling* document were published between 1987–2013.

While there are references that report on studies with design limitations, 11 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

- Joffe HV, Kucher N, Tapson VF, Goldhaber SZ. Upper-extremity deep vein thrombosis: a prospective registry of 592 patients. *Circulation*. 2004;110(12):1605-1611.
- Kucher N. Clinical practice. Deep-vein thrombosis of the upper extremities. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;364(9):861-869.
- Abdullah BJ, Mohammad N, Sangkar JV, et al. Incidence of upper limb venous thrombosis associated with peripherally inserted central catheters (PICC). *Br J Radiol*. 2005;78(931):596-600.
- Knudson GJ, Wiedmeyer DA, Erickson SJ, et al. Color Doppler sonographic imaging in the assessment of upper-extremity deep venous thrombosis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1990;154(2):399-403.
- Mustafa S, Stein PD, Patel KC, Otten TR, Holmes R, Silbergleit A. Upper extremity deep venous thrombosis. *Chest*. 2003;123(6):1953-1956.
- Patel MC, Berman LH, Moss HA, McPherson SJ. Subclavian and internal jugular veins at Doppler US: abnormal cardiac pulsatility and respiratory phasicity as a predictor of complete central occlusion. *Radiology*. 1999;211(2):579-583.
- Schmittling ZC, McLafferty RB, Bohannon WT, Ramsey DE, Hodgson KJ. Characterization and probability of upper extremity deep venous thrombosis. *Ann Vasc Surg*. 2004;18(5):552-557.
- Spencer FA, Emery C, Lessard D, Goldberg RJ. Upper extremity deep vein thrombosis: a community-based perspective. *Am J Med*. 2007;120(8):678-684.
- Lee AY, Levine MN, Butler G, et al. Incidence, risk factors, and outcomes of catheter-related thrombosis in adult patients with cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2006;24(9):1404-1408.
- Baarslag HJ, Koopman MM, Reekers JA, van Beek EJ. Diagnosis and management of deep vein thrombosis of the upper extremity: a review. *Eur Radiol*. 2004;14(7):1263-1274.
- Baarslag HJ, van Beek EJ, Koopman MM, Reekers JA. Prospective study of color duplex ultrasonography compared with contrast venography in patients suspected of having deep venous thrombosis of the upper extremities. *Ann Intern Med*. 2002;136(12):865-872.
- Ong B, Gibbs H, Catchpole I, Hetherington R, Harper J. Peripherally inserted central catheters and upper extremity deep vein thrombosis. *Australas Radiol*. 2006;50(5):451-454.
- Prandoni P, Polistena P, Bernardi E, et al. Upper-extremity deep vein thrombosis. Risk factors, diagnosis, and complications. *Arch Intern Med*. 1997;157(1):57-62.
- Flinterman LE, van Hylckama Vlieg A, Rosendaal FR, Doggen CJ. Venous thrombosis of the upper extremity: effect of blood group and coagulation factor levels on risk. *Br J Haematol*. 2010;149(1):118-123.

15. Mai C, Hunt D. Upper-extremity deep venous thrombosis: a review. *Am J Med.* 2011;124(5):402-407.
16. Lam EY, Giswold ME, Moneta GL. Venous and Lymphatic Disease. In: Brunicaardi FC, Andersen DK, Billiar TR, et al., eds. *Schwartz's Principles of Surgery.* 8th ed: McGraw-Hill; 2005.
17. Agarwal AK, Patel BM, Haddad NJ. Central vein stenosis: a nephrologist's perspective. *Semin Dial.* 2007;20(1):53-62.
18. Hingorani AP, Ascher E, Markevich N, et al. Prospective evaluation of combined upper and lower extremity DVT. *Vasc Endovascular Surg.* 2006;40(2):131-134.
19. Constans J, Salmi LR, Sevestre-Pietri MA, et al. A clinical prediction score for upper extremity deep venous thrombosis. *Thromb Haemost.* 2008;99(1):202-207.
20. Merminod T, Pellicciotta S, Bounameaux H. Limited usefulness of D-dimer in suspected deep vein thrombosis of the upper extremities. *Blood Coagul Fibrinolysis.* 2006;17(3):225-226.
21. Di Nisio M, Van Sluis GL, Bossuyt PM, Buller HR, Porreca E, Rutjes AW. Accuracy of diagnostic tests for clinically suspected upper extremity deep vein thrombosis: a systematic review. *J Thromb Haemost.* 2010;8(4):684-692.
22. Rondina MT, Lam UT, Pendleton RC, et al. (18)F-FDG PET in the evaluation of acuity of deep vein thrombosis. *Clin Nucl Med.* 2012;37(12):1139-1145.
23. Do B, Mari C, Biswal S, Kalinyak J, Quon A, Gambhir SS. Diagnosis of aseptic deep venous thrombosis of the upper extremity in a cancer patient using fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography/computerized tomography (FDG PET/CT). *Ann Nucl Med.* 2006;20(2):151-155.
24. Gloviczki P, Calcagno D, Schirger A, et al. Noninvasive evaluation of the swollen extremity: experiences with 190 lymphoscintigraphic examinations. *J Vasc Surg.* 1989;9(5):683-689; discussion 690.
25. Sharif-Kashani B, Behzadnia N, Shahabi P, Sadr M. Screening for deep vein thrombosis in asymptomatic high-risk patients: a comparison between digital photoplethysmography and venous ultrasonography. *Angiology.* 2009;60(3):301-307.
26. Wang YF, Cherng SC, Chiu JS, Su YC, Sheu YT. Application of upper extremity radionuclide venography as a diagnostic approach for Port-A catheter thrombosis. *J Chin Med Assoc.* 2006;69(8):358-363.
27. Akita S, Mitsukawa N, Kazama T, et al. Comparison of lymphoscintigraphy and indocyanine green lymphography for the diagnosis of extremity lymphoedema. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg.* 2013;66(6):792-798.
28. Infante JR, Garcia L, Laguna P, et al. Lymphoscintigraphy for differential diagnosis of peripheral edema: diagnostic yield of different scintigraphic patterns. *Rev Esp Med Nucl Imagen Mol.* 2012;31(5):237-242.
29. Raju S, Furrh JBT, Neglen P. Diagnosis and treatment of venous lymphedema. *J Vasc Surg.* 2012;55(1):141-149.
30. Liu NF, Yan ZX, Wu XF. Classification of lymphatic-system malformations in primary lymphoedema based on MR lymphangiography. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* 2012;44(3):345-349.
31. Notohamiprodjo M, Weiss M, Baumeister RG, et al. MR lymphangiography at 3.0 T: correlation with lymphoscintigraphy. *Radiology.* 2012;264(1):78-87.
32. Baxter GM, Kincaid W, Jeffrey RF, Millar GM, Porteous C, Morley P. Comparison of colour Doppler ultrasound with venography in the diagnosis of axillary and subclavian vein thrombosis. *Br J Radiol.* 1991;64(765):777-781.
33. Koksoy C, Kuzu A, Kutlay J, Erden I, Ozcan H, Ergin K. The diagnostic value of colour Doppler ultrasound in central venous catheter related thrombosis. *Clin Radiol.* 1995;50(10):687-689.
34. Weissleder R, Elizondo G, Stark DD. Sonographic diagnosis of subclavian and internal jugular vein thrombosis. *J Ultrasound Med.* 1987;6(10):577-587.
35. Pacheco H, Yesenko SL, Gornik HL, Abizer S, Bartholomew JR. Venous Thoracic Outlet Syndrome Diagnosed Using Duplex Ultrasound. *Journal for Vascular Ultrasound.* 2009;33(4):184-187.
36. Chin EE, Zimmerman PT, Grant EG. Sonographic evaluation of upper extremity deep venous thrombosis. *J Ultrasound Med.* 2005;24(6):829-838; quiz 839-840.
37. Haire WD, Lynch TG, Lund GB, Lieberman RP, Edney JA. Limitations of magnetic resonance imaging and ultrasound-directed (duplex) scanning in the diagnosis of subclavian vein thrombosis. *J Vasc Surg.* 1991;13(3):391-397.
38. Svensson WE, Mortimer PS, Tohno E, Cosgrove DO. Colour Doppler demonstrates venous flow abnormalities in breast cancer patients with chronic arm swelling. *Eur J Cancer.* 1994;30A(5):657-660.
39. Weber TM, Lockhart ME, Robbin ML. Upper extremity venous Doppler ultrasound. *Radiol Clin North Am.* 2007;45(3):513-524, viii-ix.

40. Grassi CJ, Polak JF. Axillary and subclavian venous thrombosis: follow-up evaluation with color Doppler flow US and venography. *Radiology*. 1990;175(3):651-654.
41. Gaitini D, Beck-Razi N, Haim N, Brenner B. Prevalence of upper extremity deep venous thrombosis diagnosed by color Doppler duplex sonography in cancer patients with central venous catheters. *J Ultrasound Med*. 2006;25(10):1297-1303.
42. Haire WD, Lynch TG, Lieberman RP, Lund GB, Edney JA. Utility of duplex ultrasound in the diagnosis of asymptomatic catheter-induced subclavian vein thrombosis. *J Ultrasound Med*. 1991;10(9):493-496.
43. Ho VB, Corse WR, Hood MN, Rowedder AM. Magnetic resonance angiography of the thoracic vessels. *Magnetic Resonance Imaging Clinics of North America*. 2004;12(4):727-747.
44. Hansen ME, Spritzer CE, Sostman HD. Assessing the patency of mediastinal and thoracic inlet veins: value of MR imaging. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1990;155(6):1177-1182.
45. Blume U, Orbell J, Waltham M, Smith A, Razavi R, Schaeffter T. 3D T(1)-mapping for the characterization of deep vein thrombosis. *MAGMA*. 2009;22(6):375-383.
46. Baarslag HJ, Van Beek EJ, Reekers JA. Magnetic resonance venography in consecutive patients with suspected deep vein thrombosis of the upper extremity: initial experience. *Acta Radiol*. 2004;45(1):38-43.
47. Finn JP, Zisk JH, Edelman RR, et al. Central venous occlusion: MR angiography. *Radiology*. 1993;187(1):245-251.
48. Vogt FM, Herborn CU, Goyen M. MR venography. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am*. 2005;13(1):113-129, vi.
49. Spritzer CE. Progress in MR imaging of the venous system. *Perspect Vasc Surg Endovasc Ther*. 2009;21(2):105-116.
50. Cantwell CP, Cradock A, Bruzzi J, Fitzpatrick P, Eustace S, Murray JG. MR venography with true fast imaging with steady-state precession for suspected lower-limb deep vein thrombosis. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2006;17(11 Pt 1):1763-1769.
51. Miyazaki M, Sugiura S, Tateishi F, Wada H, Kassai Y, Abe H. Non-contrast-enhanced MR angiography using 3D ECG-synchronized half-Fourier fast spin echo. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2000;12(5):776-783.
52. Pedrosa I, Morrin M, Oleaga L, Baptista J, Rofsky NM. Is true FISP imaging reliable in the evaluation of venous thrombosis? *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2005;185(6):1632-1640.
53. Denson K, Morgan D, Cunningham R, et al. Incidence of venous thromboembolism in patients with traumatic brain injury. *Am J Surg*. 2007;193(3):380-383; discussion 383-384.
54. Tanju S, Sancak T, Dusunceli E, Yagmurlu B, Erden I, Sanlidilek U. Direct contrast-enhanced 3D MR venography evaluation of upper extremity deep venous system. *Diagn Interv Radiol*. 2006;12(2):74-79.
55. Vymazal J, Spuentrup E, Cardenas-Molina G, et al. Thrombus imaging with fibrin-specific gadolinium-based MR contrast agent EP-2104R: results of a phase II clinical study of feasibility. *Invest Radiol*. 2009;44(11):697-704.
56. Kim CY, Mirza RA, Bryant JA, et al. Central veins of the chest: evaluation with time-resolved MR angiography. *Radiology*. 2008;247(2):558-566.
57. Nael K, Moriarty JM, Finn JP. Low dose CE-MRA. *Eur J Radiol*. 2011;80(1):2-8.
58. Ruehm SG, Kroeger K, Bosk S, Massing S, Mteiescu S, Debatin JF. Thromboembolic disease: Assessment with whole body MR venography. *Academic Radiology*. 2005;12(5):S63.
59. Nael K, Krishnam M, Ruehm SG, Michaely HJ, Laub G, Finn JP. Time-resolved MR angiography in the evaluation of central thoracic venous occlusive disease. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2009;192(6):1731-1738.
60. Pinto C, Hickey R, Carroll TJ, et al. Time-resolved MR angiography with generalized autocalibrating partially parallel acquisition and time-resolved echo-sharing angiographic technique for hemodialysis arteriovenous fistulas and grafts. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2006;17(6):1003-1009.
61. Sampson FC, Goodacre SW, Thomas SM, van Beek EJ. The accuracy of MRI in diagnosis of suspected deep vein thrombosis: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Radiol*. 2007;17(1):175-181.
62. Panzironi G, Rainaldi R, Ricci F, Casale A, De Vargas Macciucca M. Gray-scale and color Doppler findings in bilateral internal jugular vein thrombosis caused by anaplastic carcinoma of the thyroid. *J Clin Ultrasound*. 2003;31(2):111-115.
63. Stam J. Thrombosis of the cerebral veins and sinuses. *N Engl J Med*. 2005;352(17):1791-1798.
64. Kim HC, Chung JW, Yoon CJ, et al. Collateral pathways in thoracic central venous obstruction: three-dimensional display using direct spiral computed tomography venography. *J Comput Assist Tomogr*. 2004;28(1):24-33.
65. Sabharwal R, Boshell D, Vladica P. Multidetector spiral CT venography in the diagnosis of upper extremity deep venous thrombosis. *Australas Radiol*. 2007;51 Suppl:B253-256.

66. Kim H, Chung JW, Park JH, et al. Role of CT venography in the diagnosis and treatment of benign thoracic central venous obstruction. *Korean J Radiol.* 2003;4(3):146-152.
67. Arrive L, Crema MD, Lewin M, et al. Computed tomography features of acute thrombosis of central veins with perivenous inflammatory changes. *J Comput Assist Tomogr.* 2007;31(6):931-935.

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.