

Staging and Follow-up of Anal Cancer

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	SOE	Adults RRL	Peds RRL	Rating	Median	Final Tabulations								
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
MRI pelvis without and with IV contrast	Usually appropriate	Limited	○ 0 mSv	○ 0 mSv [ped]	7	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	0	1
		References		Study Quality											
		18 (19365694)		3											
		19 (36932225)		4											
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually appropriate	Strong	⊕⊕⊕⊕ 10-30 mSv	⊕⊕⊕⊕ 3-10 mSv [ped]	7	7	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	5	2
		References		Study Quality											
		16 (24672298)		Good											
		13 (25652048)		Good											
		14 (28972796)		Good											
		15 (29759568)		Good											
		17 (37592085)		Good											
MRI pelvis without IV contrast	May be appropriate	Limited	○ 0 mSv	○ 0 mSv [ped]	6	6	0	0	1	2	3	3	4	2	0
		References		Study Quality											
		21 (32540336)		3											
		23 (28874205)		3											
		22 (29134349)		3											
		20 (22294527)		3											

		19 (36932225)			4											
CT pelvis with IV contrast	May be appropriate	Strong	☹☹☹ 1-10 mSv	☹☹☹☹ 3-10 mSv [ped]	5	5	0	0	0	2	9	1	3	0	0	
		References			Study Quality											
		12 (22592047)			3											
		13 (25652048)			Good											
		11 (20832181)			3											
		14 (28972796)			Good											
FDG-PET/MRI whole body	May be appropriate	Expert Consensus	☹☹☹ 1-10 mSv	☹☹☹☹ 3-10 mSv [ped]	5	5	1	0	1	4	7	1	1	0	0	
US pelvis transrectal	Usually not appropriate	Limited	0 0 mSv	0 0 mSv [ped]	3	3	2	5	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	
		References			Study Quality											
		18 (19365694)			3											
		24 (28152518)			3											
		19 (36932225)			4											
CT pelvis without IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☹☹☹ 1-10 mSv	☹☹☹☹ 3-10 mSv [ped]	2	2	6	3	3	1	1	0	0	1	0	
CT pelvis without and with IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☹☹☹☹ 10-30 mSv	☹☹☹☹☹ 3-10 mSv [ped]	2	2	5	4	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	

Variant 2: Adult. Squamous cell anal cancer. Assessment for metastatic disease at initial staging or surveillance.

		13 (25652048)		Good													
		10 (31753232)		4													
CT chest with IV contrast	Usually appropriate	Limited	☹☹☹ 1-10 mSv	☹☹☹☹ 3-10 mSv [ped]	7	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	2		
		References		Study Quality													
		10 (31753232)		4													
CT chest without IV contrast	Usually appropriate	Limited	☹☹☹ 1-10 mSv	☹☹☹☹ 3-10 mSv [ped]	7	7	0	0	1	1	3	1	6	3	0		
		References		Study Quality													
		10 (31753232)		4													
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually appropriate	Strong	☹☹☹☹ 10-30 mSv	☹☹☹☹☹ 3-10 mSv [ped]	7	7	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	7	0		
		References		Study Quality													
		13 (25652048)		Good													
		14 (28972796)		Good													
		26 (22208962)		3													
		17 (37592085)		Good													
MRI abdomen and pelvis without and with IV contrast	May be appropriate	Limited	○ ○ mSv	○ ○ mSv [ped]	5	5	0	0	0	0	8	6	1	0	0		
		References		Study Quality													
		27 (33153555)		4													
CT abdomen and pelvis without IV contrast	May be appropriate	Moderate	☹☹☹ 1-10 mSv	☹☹☹☹ 3-10 mSv [ped]	4	4	2	1	3	4	3	2	0	0	0		
		References		Study Quality													
		13 (25652048)		Good													
CT abdomen and pelvis without and with IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Moderate	☹☹☹☹ 10-30 mSv	☹☹☹☹☹ 10-30 mSv [ped]	3	3	2	5	7	1	0	0	0	0	0		
		References		Study Quality													

		13 (25652048)		Good											
MRI abdomen and pelvis without IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Limited	0 0 mSv	0 0 mSv [ped]	3	3	0	2	8	4	1	0	0	0	0
		References		Study Quality											
		27 (33153555)		4											
FDG-PET/MRI whole body	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☼☼☼ 1-10 mSv	☼☼☼☼ 3-10 mSv [ped]	3	3	4	0	5	0	4	1	1	0	0
CT chest without and with IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Limited	☼☼☼ 1-10 mSv	☼☼☼☼ 3-10 mSv [ped]	2	2	2	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
		References		Study Quality											
		10 (31753232)		4											

Variant 3: Adult. Squamous cell anal cancer. Posttreatment locoregional assessment.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	SOE	Adults RRL	Peds RRL	Rating	Median	Final Tabulations								
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
MRI pelvis without and with IV contrast	Usually appropriate	Limited	0 0 mSv	0 0 mSv [ped]	7	7	0	0	1	1	1	3	5	4	0
		References		Study Quality											
		24 (28152518)		3											
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually appropriate	Strong	☼☼☼☼ 10-30 mSv	☼☼☼☼ 3-10 mSv [ped]	7	7	0	0	1	0	1	1	7	4	1
		References		Study Quality											
		13 (25652048)		Good											
		28 (33539412)		3											
		29 (35274187)		4											
		14 (28972796)		Good											
		17 (37592085)		Good											

CT pelvis with IV contrast	May be appropriate	Expert Consensus	☼☼☼ 1-10 mSv	☼☼☼☼ 3-10 mSv [ped]	5	5	0	0	0	7	7	1	0	0	0
MRI pelvis without IV contrast	May be appropriate	Limited	○ 0 mSv	○ 0 mSv [ped]	5	5	0	0	0	2	7	6	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
29 (35274187)	4
30 (27090113)	3
24 (28152518)	3
19 (36932225)	4
31 (37462820)	3

FDG-PET/MRI whole body	May be appropriate	Expert Consensus	☼☼☼ 1-10 mSv	☼☼☼☼ 3-10 mSv [ped]	5	5	0	1	6	0	8	0	0	0	0
CT pelvis without IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☼☼☼ 1-10 mSv	☼☼☼☼ 3-10 mSv [ped]	3	3	2	5	4	3	1	0	0	0	0
US pelvis transrectal	Usually not appropriate	Limited	○ 0 mSv	○ 0 mSv [ped]	3	3	3	1	7	1	2	1	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
32 (25585077)	3
24 (28152518)	3

CT pelvis without and with IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☼☼☼☼ 10-30 mSv	☼☼☼☼ 3-10 mSv [ped]	2	2	6	3	3	0	1	1	1	0	0
--	-------------------------	------------------	----------------	---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Appendix Key

A more complete discussion of the items presented below can be found by accessing the supporting documents at the designated hyperlinks.

Appropriateness Category: The panel's recommendation for a procedure based on the assessment of the risks and benefits of performing the procedure for the specified clinical scenario.

SOE: Strength of Evidence. The assessment of the amount and quality of evidence found in the peer reviewed medical literature for an appropriateness recommendation.

- **References:** The citation number and PMID for the reference(s) associated with the recommendation.
- **Study Quality:** The assessment of the quality of an individual reference based on the number of study quality elements described in the reference.

RRL: Relative Radiation Level. A population based assessment of the amount of radiation a typical patient may be exposed to during the specified procedure.

Rating: The final rating (1-9 scale) for the procedure as determined by the panel during rating rounds.

Median: The median rating (1-9 scale) for the procedure as determined by the panel during rating rounds.

Final tabulations: A histogram showing the number of panel members who rated the procedure as noted in the column heading (ie, 1, 2, 3, etc.).

Additional supporting documents about the AC methodology and processes can be found at www.acr.org/ac.