### Variant 1: Acute onset myelopathy. Initial imaging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Appropriateness Category</th>
<th>Relative Radiation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRI spine area of interest without and with IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Appropriate</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI spine area of interest without IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Appropriate</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT myelography spine area of interest</td>
<td>May Be Appropriate</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT spine area of interest with IV contrast</td>
<td>May Be Appropriate</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT spine area of interest without IV contrast</td>
<td>May Be Appropriate</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arteriography spine area of interest</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiography spine area of interest</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRA spine area of interest with IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRA spine area of interest without IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI spine area of interest with IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT spine area of interest without and with IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA spine area of interest with IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variant 2: Chronic or progressive myelopathy. Initial imaging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Appropriateness Category</th>
<th>Relative Radiation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRI spine area of interest without and with IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Appropriate</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI spine area of interest without IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Appropriate</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT myelography spine area of interest</td>
<td>May Be Appropriate</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT spine area of interest with IV contrast</td>
<td>May Be Appropriate</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT spine area of interest without IV contrast</td>
<td>May Be Appropriate</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arteriography spine area of interest</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiography spine area of interest</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRA spine area of interest with IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRA spine area of interest without IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI spine area of interest with IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT spine area of interest without and with IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA spine area of interest with IV contrast</td>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary of Literature Review

Introduction/Background
Myelopathy refers to any pathologic process affecting the spinal cord. It is a clinical diagnosis based on signs and symptoms of spinal cord dysfunction [1]. Myelopathy can be due to primary intrinsic disorders of the spinal cord and include neoplastic, infectious, inflammatory, neurodegenerative, vascular, nutritional, and idiopathic disorders [2]. More commonly, however, myelopathy is due to secondary conditions, which result in extrinsic compression of the spinal cord. The most frequently encountered cause of extrinsic compression of the spinal cord in adults is degenerative disease of the cervical and thoracic spine [3]. Other causes of myelopathy from external spinal cord compression include bone metastases and blunt or penetrating trauma. A variety of cysts and benign neoplasms can also compress the cord; they tend to arise within the intradural compartment. The most common of these are nerve sheath tumors, meningiomas, and arachnoid adhesions/cysts [4-10].

Clinically, the diagnosis of myelopathy depends on the localization of the neurological finding to the spinal cord, rather than the brain or peripheral nervous system, and then to a particular segment of the spinal cord [11]. Although the causes of myelopathy may be many, the acuity of presentation and symptom onset provides the clinical team with a practical approach to the differential diagnosis [1,12]. Myelopathy is considered acute if symptoms begin abruptly or have an onset of days to weeks. Myelopathy with a time course of months to years is considered chronic or progressive.

Imaging plays a crucial role in refining the differential diagnosis. Historically, radiological evaluation of myelopathic patients consisted of positive contrast myelography. Later, this evaluation was supplemented by CT and CT myelography. MRI is now the mainstay in the evaluation of myelopathy because of its superb contrast resolution of the spinal cord [10,13-15].

For the purposes of this discussion, myelopathy secondary to trauma is excluded (see the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® topic on “Suspected Spine Trauma” [16]).

Special Imaging Considerations
Although history and physical examination can help localize the myelopathic level, it may be beneficial to study the entire spine, even in the setting of a localized myelopathic level. In certain cases, brain MRI may be a useful adjunct diagnostic test [17]. Newer imaging techniques, such as spinal cord diffusion tensor imaging, appear promising to further interrogate spinal cord injury at a microstructural level [18-21].

CT myelography is performed in conjunction with fluoroscopic myelography. For this document, the procedure term “CT myelography” is used to guide the referral to the radiologist. The ultimate judgment regarding the propriety of any specific procedure, lumbar versus cervical puncture route, amount of contrast, and the extent and modality of imaging coverage must be made by the radiologist, with appropriate documentation and coding [22].
Initial Imaging Definition

Initial imaging is defined as imaging at the beginning of the care episode for the medical condition defined by the variant. More than one procedure can be considered usually appropriate in the initial imaging evaluation when:

- There are procedures that are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient’s care)

  OR

- There are complementary procedures (ie, more than one procedure is ordered as a set or simultaneously in which each procedure provides unique clinical information to effectively manage the patient’s care).

Discussion of Procedures by Variant

Variant 1: Acute onset myelopathy. Initial imaging.

The body regions covered in this clinical scenario are cervical, thoracic, and lumbar spine. These body regions might be evaluated separately or in combination as guided by physical examination findings, patient history, and other available information, including prior imaging.

Acute myelopathy can be subdivided into noninflammatory and inflammatory causes. Noninflammatory conditions include extrinsic compression of the spinal cord, vascular pathologies, and trauma. Inflammatory conditions include demyelinating diseases (ie, multiple sclerosis), systemic inflammatory diseases, and infection.

For the purposes of this discussion, myelopathy secondary to trauma is excluded (see the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® topic on “Suspected Spine Trauma” [16]). Vertebral fracture in the setting of weakened bone (eg, osteoporotic or pathologic fracture) with retropulsion can lead to myelopathy, even in minor trauma or no obvious history of trauma (see the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® topic on “Management of Vertebral Compression Fractures” [23]).

All patients with acute onset myelopathy require evaluation for extrinsic compression of the spinal cord [3]. In the acute setting, extrinsic compression of the spinal cord is most commonly caused by degenerative disease (spondylotic myelopathy) and is more prevalent in the cervical spine. Factors contributing to spondylotic myelopathy include spinal degenerative changes, disc herniations, and malalignment. These findings may be accentuated in the presence of congenitally short pedicles. Other causes of extrinsic compression of the spinal cord include pathology involving the epidural compartment (abscess or hematoma) [24]. In patients who have undergone spinal surgery, extrinsic compression of the spinal cord can develop throughout the postoperative course and may be secondary to seromas, pseudomeningoceles, hematomas, and/or epidural abscesses [25]. Primary or metastatic tumors of the extradural and intradural extramedullary spaces encroaching upon the spinal canal can cause extrinsic compression of the spinal cord, resulting in not only acute but also progressive myelopathy (see Variant 2). Please see the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® topic on “Follow-up of Malignant or Aggressive Musculoskeletal Tumors” [26] for further details on extradural tumors.

Although infrequent, spinal cord ischemia can result in acute onset myelopathy and in adults is most commonly the result of atheromatous disease or as a complication of aortic surgery [3]. Other pathologies that may predispose patients to developing spinal cord ischemia include systemic hypotension, thoracoabdominal aneurysms or dissection, sickle cell disease, and spinal arteriovenous malformations (AVMs) [27,28]. Very rarely, patients may develop hematomyelia and subsequently acute myelopathy because of an intramedullary AVM or spinal artery aneurysm rupture [29,30]. Acute ischemic myelopathy can also develop in the setting of fibrocartilaginous embolic disease [31]. Depending on the level(s) of the spinal cord involved, patients will typically develop acute paraparesis or quadriplegia. Inflammatory conditions that can result in acute myelopathy include demyelinating diseases such as multiple sclerosis (MS), neuromyelitis optica (NMO), and acute disseminated encephalomyelitis (ADEM); systemic inflammatory conditions such as systemic lupus erythematosus, Sjogren syndrome, mixed connective tissue disorder, Behcet disease, and sarcoidosis; and infectious diseases [8].

MRI Spine

MRI is useful for evaluation of the spinal cord when investigating the etiology of acute myelopathy [32]. MRI has superior soft-tissue resolution and multiplanar capability, making it ideal for evaluation of the spinal canal and its contents as well as the surrounding osseous and soft-tissue structures [13-15,33-36].
Intramedullary cord signal changes on MRI in patients with spondylotic myelopathy represent prognostic factors for neurosurgical outcome [21,37-41]. Intravenous (IV) contrast is typically not required for the diagnosis of spondylotic myelopathy, but characteristic patterns of enhancement can be seen immediately at and below a level of stenosis [42,43].

In patients who have undergone spinal surgery, complications in the early postoperative setting (eg, hematoma) can result in extrinsic compression of the spinal cord and are best evaluated using MRI without and with IV contrast [44].

In cases in which spinal cord ischemia is suspected as the cause for acute myelopathy, MRI without and with IV contrast is useful in cases where spinal cord ischemic is suspected as the cause for acute myelopathy [27,28,45-47]. Contrast enhancement is typically not seen in the early phase of acute ischemia and, if present, may suggest an alternative inflammatory or infectious etiology [48]. Diffusion-weighted imaging can show signal alteration in the spinal cord earlier after patient symptom onset compared with T2-weighted images [49,50]. As such, diffusion-weighted imaging should be included anytime there is concern for spinal cord ischemia [51].

When considering inflammatory or infections etiologies of myelopathy, visualization of the osseous spinal column as well as the spinal cord is useful and best accomplished noninvasively by MRI [4,7,45,52-60].

Demyelinating diseases such as MS and NMO can present as acute myelopathy. MS is the classic demyelinating disease and is characterized by lesions affecting the spinal cord (and brain) and clinical defects disseminated in space and time [61]. Spinal cord involvement is seen in 80% to 90% of patients with MS, most commonly affecting the cervical cord [62]. Patients with primary progressive MS tend to have more spinal cord involvement than patients with relapsing-remitting MS [12]. When myelopathy due to MS is suspected, MRI detection of spinal cord lesion(s) fulfills part of the 2016 Magnetic Resonance Imaging in MS (MAGNIMS) criteria [63]. NMO is a demyelinating condition characterized by optic neuritis and spinal cord lesions. Brain lesions are not as commonly encountered in NMO as in MS, so, when present, tend to predominate in regions around the third and fourth ventricles [64-66]. ADEM is a demyelinating condition that typically manifests as encephalopathy. Spinal cord involvement is present in approximately 25% of cases of ADEM. MRI of the spine is generally considered the reference standard for imaging of the spinal cord in cases of suspected demyelinating disease [63,67,68] in addition to excluding alternative etiologies. Contrast-enhanced imaging is recommended for initial diagnostic evaluation [69,70].

**MRA Spine**

There is no relevant literature regarding the use of MR angiography (MRA) in the initial imaging evaluation of acute onset myelopathy. In cases of spinal cord ischemia, MRA can be used to identify the artery of Adamkiewicz or vertebral artery dissection/occlusion and should be considered as a follow-up to MRI [12]. Although MRA can be performed for suspected spinal vascular malformations in patients with hematomyelia, conventional angiography remains necessary for complete lesion characterization [71].

**CT Myelography Spine**

CT myelography may be useful in this clinical setting to answer specific questions before surgical intervention [72,73]. In spondylotic myelopathy, conventional myelography can be used to diagnose severe canal stenosis [74]. MRI, however, is best for evaluation of the marrow and the spinal canal/spinal cord [13-15].

**CT Spine**

CT can depict bony encroachment on the spinal canal in cases of disc-osteophyte complexes as well as subluxation and compression of neural structures by herniated disc material with better resolution than with radiographs. For inflammatory or infectious processes, CT can be beneficial to evaluate the osseous structures and adjacent soft-tissue involvement [75]. Although CT demonstrates osseous integrity with excellent assessment of bone destruction, MRI provides better visualization of the marrow and the spinal cord [13-15]. CT of the spine is not useful in the initial evaluation of spinal cord ischemia [76].

**CTA Spine**

There is no relevant literature regarding the use of CT angiography (CTA) in the initial imaging evaluation of acute onset myelopathy. In cases of spinal cord ischemia, CTA can be used to identify the artery of Adamkiewicz or vertebral artery dissection/occlusion and should be considered as a follow-up to MRI [12].
**Radiography Spine**

There is no relevant literature supporting the use of radiographs as the initial imaging evaluation of acute onset myelopathy. Although radiographs may demonstrate bone destruction, CT provides better visualization of the osseous spine [13-15]. In spondylotic myelopathy, radiographs may depict osteophytic narrowing of the spinal canal, whereas conventional myelography can be used to diagnose severe canal stenosis [74]. MRI, however, is best for evaluation of the marrow and the spinal canal/spinal cord [13-15]. Lateral radiographs can be obtained as an adjunct to cross-sectional imaging to help assess alignment parameters and dynamic instability [77].

**Arteriography**

There is no relevant literature regarding the use of conventional arteriography in the initial imaging evaluation of acute onset myelopathy. Even in cases of spinal cord ischemia and suspected spinal vascular malformations, conventional arteriography of the spine is not useful for initial evaluation [71,76].

**Variant 2: Chronic or progressive myelopathy. Initial imaging.**

The body regions covered in this clinical scenario are cervical, thoracic, and lumbar spine. These body regions might be evaluated separately or in combination as guided by physical examination findings, patient history, and other available information, including prior imaging.

As with acute myelopathy, all patients with chronic or progressive myelopathy require evaluation for extrinsic compression of the spinal cord [3]. In the chronic or progressive setting, extrinsic compression of the spinal cord is most commonly due to degenerative disease (spondylotic myelopathy) and is more prevalent in the cervical spine. Factors contributing to spondylotic myelopathy include spinal degenerative changes, disc herniations, epidural lipomatosis, and malalignment. These findings may be accentuated in the presence of congenitally short pedicles. In patients who have undergone spinal surgery, extrinsic compression of the spinal cord can develop throughout the postoperative course and may be secondary to seromas, pseudomeningoceles, hematomas, and/or epidural abscesses [25]. Primary or metastatic tumors of the extradural and intradural extramedullary spaces encroaching upon the spinal canal can cause extrinsic compression of the spinal cord, resulting in progressive myelopathy as well as acute myelopathy (see Variant 1). Please see the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® topic on “Follow-up of Malignant or Aggressive Musculoskeletal Tumors” [26] for further details on extradural tumors. Infrequently, other rare conditions such as Hirayama disease (cervical flexion myelopathy), dorsal arachnoid webs, and ventral cord herniation can result in progressive myelopathy [78-80].

Once extrinsic compression of the spinal cord has been excluded, chronic or progressive myelopathy can be subdivided into non-neoplastic and neoplastic causes. Non-neoplastic causes include demyelinating diseases such as MS, NMO, and ADEM; metabolic derangements such as Vitamin B12 (cobalamin) deficiency, copper deficiency, and nitrous oxide inhalation; chronic infections including human T cell lymphotropic virus myelitis, tuberculosis, schistosomiasis, human immunodeficiency virus vacuolar myelopathy, and tertiary syphilis; prior radiation treatment; autoimmune causes including paraneoplastic myelopathy; and vascular abnormalities such as spinal dural AVM/fistulas. Neoplastic causes include primary and metastatic tumors of the spinal cord.

**MRI Spine**

MRI is useful for evaluation of the spinal cord when investigating the etiology of chronic or progressive myelopathy [32]. MRI has superior soft-tissue resolution and multiplanar capability, making it ideal for evaluation of the spinal canal and its contents as well as the surrounding osseous and soft-tissue structures [13-15,33-36].

The imaging changes in the spinal cord due to myelomalacia and gliosis are best discerned by MRI [81,82]. Intramedullary cord signal changes on MRI in patients with spondylotic myelopathy represent prognostic factors for neurosurgical outcome [21,37-41]. IV contrast is typically not required for the diagnosis of spondylotic myelopathy, but characteristic patterns of enhancement can be seen immediately at and below a level of stenosis [42,43].

In patients who have undergone spinal surgery, late complications (eg, adjacent level degenerative disease with spinal stenosis, recurrent disc herniation) can result in extrinsic compression of the spinal cord and are best evaluated using MRI without and with IV contrast [44].

Demyelinating diseases such as MS can present as subacute/chronic myelopathy. MS is the classic demyelinating disease and is characterized by lesions affecting the spinal cord (and brain) and clinical defects disseminated in space and time [61]. Spinal cord involvement is seen in 80% to 90% of patients with MS, most commonly affecting the cervical cord [62]. Patients with primary progressive MS tend to have more spinal cord involvement than
patients with relapsing-remitting MS [12]. When myelopathy due to MS is suspected, MRI detection of spinal cord lesion(s) fulfills part of the 2016 MAGNIMS criteria [63]. Other demyelinating processes such as NMO and ADEM can present as chronic myelopathy less commonly. In patients with chronic or progressive myelopathy, MRI of the spinal cord can identify spinal cord lesions suggestive of demyelinating disease in addition to excluding alternative etiologies. Contrast-enhanced imaging is recommended for initial diagnostic evaluation [69,70].

Metabolic causes of chronic or progressive myelopathy result in changes in the spinal cord known as subacute combined degeneration and are best evaluated with MRI [11,83,84]. Chronic infections can have a similar appearance [12].

Radiation-induced myelopathy is a rare dose-dependent complication that anatomically localizes to a prior radiation port [85]. Autoimmune myelitis includes paraneoplastic myelopathy [86,87]. MRI without and with IV contrast is useful to evaluate the spinal cord in these instances.

Vascular malformations can likewise present with chronic and slowly progressive myelopathy [88]. MRI without and with IV contrast is useful to demonstrate spinal cord edema caused by venous hypertension and enlarged veins along the dorsal surface of the spinal cord. There may be patchy intramedullary enhancement due to breakdown of the blood-cord barrier. In some cases, abnormal vasculature may be identified that may be useful to guide spinal arteriography and intervention [5,89-91].

Primary and metastatic tumors of the spinal cord very rarely cause myelopathy and are best evaluated on contrast-enhanced MRI of the spine [92-96]. The distinction of syrinx from tumor, location of small tumor nodules, extent of cyst, and distinction of nodule and cyst from edema are crucial in treatment planning for intramedullary disease and best delineated with MRI [9,97].

In cases in which MRI shows findings suspicious for arachnoid cyst/arachnoid web or ventral cord herniation, CT myelography can be performed for further evaluation [79,80]. Likewise, in cases in which there is clinical concern for positional myelopathy, MRI with flexion/extension can be performed as a follow-up [78].

MRA Spine
There is no relevant literature regarding the use of MRA in the initial imaging evaluation of chronic or progressive myelopathy. If MRI demonstrates findings concerning for an underlying vascular malformations, MRA can be performed as a follow-up to demonstrate abnormal vasculature that may be useful to guide spinal arteriography and intervention [5,89-91].

CT Myelography Spine
CT myelography may be useful in this setting to answer specific questions before surgical intervention [72,73]. In cases in which MRI shows findings suspicious for arachnoid cyst/arachnoid web or ventral cord herniation, CT myelography can be performed for further evaluation [79,80]. Likewise, in cases in which there is clinical concern for positional myelopathy, extension/flexion positional CT myelography can be performed as a follow-up [98]. In spondylotic myelopathy, conventional myelography can be used to diagnose severe canal stenosis [74]. MRI, however, is best for evaluation of the marrow and the spinal canal/spinal cord [13-15].

CT Spine
CT can depict bony encroachment on the spinal canal in cases of disc-osteophyte complexes as well as subluxation and compression of neural structures by herniated disc material with better resolution than with radiographs. Although CT demonstrates osseous integrity with excellent assessment of bone destruction, MRI provides better visualization of the marrow and the spinal cord [13-15]. It is therefore not useful in the initial evaluation of noncompressive etiologies of chronic or progressive myelopathy.

CTA Spine
There is no relevant literature regarding the use of CTA in the initial imaging evaluation of chronic or progressive myelopathy. CTA continues to make progress as a preangiographic tool for localization of spinal vascular malformations [99-102].

Radiography Spine
There is no relevant literature supporting the use of radiographs as the initial imaging evaluation of chronic or progressive myelopathy. Although radiographs may demonstrate bone destruction, CT provides better visualization of the osseous spine [13-15]. In spondylotic myelopathy, radiographs may depict osteophytic narrowing of the spinal canal, whereas conventional myelography can be used to diagnose severe canal stenosis [74]. MRI, however,
is best for evaluation of the marrow and the spinal canal/spinal cord [13-15]. Lateral radiographs can be obtained as an adjunct to cross-sectional imaging to help assess alignment parameters and dynamic instability [77].

**Arteriography**
There is no relevant literature regarding the use of conventional arteriography in the initial imaging evaluation of chronic or progressive myelopathy.

**Summary of Recommendations**
- **Variant 1:** MRI spine area of interest without and with IV contrast or MRI spine area of interest without IV contrast is usually appropriate for the initial imaging of patients with acute onset myelopathy. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient’s care).
- **Variant 2:** MRI spine area of interest without and with IV contrast or MRI spine area of interest without IV contrast is usually appropriate for the initial imaging of patients with chronic or progressive myelopathy. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient’s care).

**Supporting Documents**
The evidence table, literature search, and appendix for this topic are available at [https://acsearch.acr.org/list](https://acsearch.acr.org/list). The appendix includes the strength of evidence assessment and the final rating round tabulations for each recommendation.

For additional information on the Appropriateness Criteria methodology and other supporting documents go to [www.acr.org/ac](http://www.acr.org/ac).

### Appropriateness Category Names and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriateness Category Name</th>
<th>Appropriateness Rating</th>
<th>Appropriateness Category Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usually Appropriate</td>
<td>7, 8, or 9</td>
<td>The imaging procedure or treatment is indicated in the specified clinical scenarios at a favorable risk-benefit ratio for patients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Be Appropriate</td>
<td>4, 5, or 6</td>
<td>The imaging procedure or treatment may be indicated in the specified clinical scenarios as an alternative to imaging procedures or treatments with a more favorable risk-benefit ratio, or the risk-benefit ratio for patients is equivocal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The individual ratings are too dispersed from the panel median. The different label provides transparency regarding the panel’s recommendation. “May be appropriate” is the rating category and a rating of 5 is assigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually Not Appropriate</td>
<td>1, 2, or 3</td>
<td>The imaging procedure or treatment is unlikely to be indicated in the specified clinical scenarios, or the risk-benefit ratio for patients is likely to be unfavorable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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, because of both 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 with 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 [103].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Radiation Level*</th>
<th>Adult Effective Dose Estimate Range</th>
<th>Pediatric Effective Dose Estimate Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☀</td>
<td>0 mSv</td>
<td>0 mSv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☀ ☀</td>
<td>&lt;0.1 mSv</td>
<td>&lt;0.03 mSv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☀ ☀ ☀</td>
<td>0.1-1 mSv</td>
<td>0.03-0.3 mSv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☀ ☀ ☀ ☀</td>
<td>1-10 mSv</td>
<td>0.3-3 mSv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☀ ☀ ☀ ☀ ☀</td>
<td>10-30 mSv</td>
<td>3-10 mSv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☀ ☀ ☀ ☀ ☀ ☀</td>
<td>30-100 mSv</td>
<td>10-30 mSv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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.”
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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.