American College of Radiology
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®

Suspected Osteomyelitis of the Foot in Patients with Diabetes Mellitus

Variant 1: Adult. Suspected osteomyelitis of the foot in patients with diabetes mellitus. Initial imaging.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	SOE	Adults RRL	Peds RRL	Rating	Median	Final Tabulations								
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Radiography foot	Usually appropriate	Moderate	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢ <0.03 mSv [ped]	9	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

References	Study Quality
18 (21636263)	4
19 (20567730)	4
17 (28366223)	4
16 (32862106)	Good

CT foot with IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	1	1	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT foot without IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	1	1	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
CT foot without and with IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	1	1	11	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
MRI foot without IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	1	1	11	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
MRI foot without and with IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	1	1	10	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0
3-phase bone scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☢☢☢ 1-10 mSv		1	1	10	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0

FDG-PET/CT whole body	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv	☢☢☢☢ 3-10 mSv [ped]	1	1	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
US foot	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	1	1	9	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
3-phase bone scan and WBC scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT foot	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv	☢☢☢☢ 3-10 mSv [ped]	1	1	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
3-phase bone scan and WBC scan and sulfur colloid scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		1	1	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
3-phase bone scan and WBC scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		1	1	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
WBC scan and sulfur colloid scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		1	1	10	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
WBC scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Expert Consensus	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		1	1	10	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0

Variant 2: Adult. Suspected osteomyelitis of the foot in patients with diabetes mellitus. Initial radiographs negative or indeterminate for osteomyelitis. Next imaging study.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	SOE	Adults RRL	Peds RRL	Rating	Median	Final Tabulations								
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
MRI foot without IV contrast	Usually appropriate	Strong	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	9	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	8

References	Study Quality
64 (31463805)	2
62 (10421237)	3
59 (19098186)	3
61 (18036160)	2
58 (34145466)	4
60 (37123500)	3
2 (28497161)	3

57 (16037509)	3
52 (15863990)	3
53 (18956147)	3
6 (18611152)	M
55 (17242312)	M
56 (9169715)	3
54 (32130445)	3

MRI foot without and with IV contrast	Usually appropriate	Strong	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	9	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	11

References	Study Quality
63 (8518119)	3
62 (10421237)	3
59 (19098186)	3
61 (18036160)	2
58 (34145466)	4
60 (37123500)	3
2 (28497161)	3
57 (16037509)	3
52 (15863990)	3
53 (18956147)	3
6 (18611152)	M
55 (17242312)	M
56 (9169715)	3
54 (32130445)	3

CT foot with IV contrast	May be appropriate	Limited	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	6	6	0	1	0	1	2	4	5	0	1

References	Study Quality
41 (18025514)	4
40 (27587513)	4
39 (24764120)	4
38 (29058098)	4

CT foot without IV contrast	May be appropriate	Limited	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	5	5	2	0	1	0	10	1	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
40 (27587513)	4
39 (24764120)	4
38 (29058098)	4

3-phase bone scan foot	May be appropriate (Disagreement)	Expert Opinion	☢☢☢ 1-10 mSv		5	5	3	3	4	0	1	3	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
6 (18611152)	M
37 (10395336)	3
34 (1872240)	3
35 (1727365)	4
36 (2646871)	2

FDG-PET/CT whole body	May be appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv	☢☢☢☢ 3-10 mSv [ped]	4	4	6	0	0	5	2	0	1	0	0

References	Study Quality
46 (32486304)	2
45 (23906976)	Good
42 (22801731)	1
43 (15750157)	3
29 (16264122)	Inadequate
44 (28733376)	Good

US foot	Usually not appropriate	Limited	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	3	3	2	4	7	1	0	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
65 (37950713)	2

3-phase bone scan and WBC scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT foot	Usually not appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv	☢☢☢☢ 3-10 mSv [ped]	3	3	3	2	4	2	1	2	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
22 (20851003)	2
33 (27560470)	3
30 (17138732)	2
31 (14523585)	3
32 (17146681)	3

3-phase bone scan and WBC scan and sulfur colloid scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		3	3	3	3	3	2	3	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
24 (1572113)	3
23 (27390160)	4
22 (20851003)	2
20 (9476948)	3
21 (26706230)	3

3-phase bone scan and WBC scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		3	3	5	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
29 (16264122)	Inadequate
28 (8821280)	3
27 (9473260)	2
25 (3171695)	3
26 (2341891)	3

WBC scan and sulfur colloid scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Limited	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		2	2	7	1	3	0	3	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
66 (17127204)	4
24 (1572113)	3
20 (9476948)	3
21 (26706230)	3
23 (27390160)	4

WBC scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		2	2	7	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
68 (16702459)	4
67 (3157204)	3
44 (28733376)	Good
34 (1872240)	3
24 (1572113)	3

CT foot without and with IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Limited	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	1	1	9	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
41 (18025514)	4
40 (27587513)	4
39 (24764120)	4
38 (29058098)	4

Image-guided biopsy foot	Usually not appropriate	Strong	Varies	Varies	1	1	9	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
51 (33739950)	2
50 (33134407)	Good
49 (30778640)	4
48 (31322951)	4
47 (36905125)	4

Variant 3: Adult. Radiographs positive for osteomyelitis of the foot in patients with diabetes mellitus. Next imaging study for pretreatment planning.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	SOE	Adults RRL	Peds RRL	Rating	Median	Final Tabulations								
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
MRI foot without and with IV contrast	Usually appropriate	Strong	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	9	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	10

References	Study Quality
71 (11756124)	2
70 (30136224)	4
61 (18036160)	2
62 (10421237)	3
63 (8518119)	3
60 (37123500)	3
57 (16037509)	3
59 (19098186)	3
52 (15863990)	3
53 (18956147)	3
55 (17242312)	M
56 (9169715)	3
58 (34145466)	4
54 (32130445)	3
2 (28497161)	3
6 (18611152)	M

MRI foot without IV contrast	Usually appropriate	Strong	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	8	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	6

References	Study Quality
70 (30136224)	4
62 (10421237)	3
59 (19098186)	3
61 (18036160)	2
58 (34145466)	4
60 (37123500)	3
2 (28497161)	3
57 (16037509)	3
52 (15863990)	3
53 (18956147)	3
6 (18611152)	M

		55 (17242312)		M												
		56 (9169715)		3												
		54 (32130445)		3												
CT foot with IV contrast	May be appropriate	Limited	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	6	6	0	1	0	2	1	5	4	0	1	
		References		Study Quality												
		41 (18025514)		4												
		40 (27587513)		4												
		39 (24764120)		4												
		38 (29058098)		4												
CT foot without IV contrast	May be appropriate	Limited	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	5	5	1	0	1	5	7	0	0	0	0	
		References		Study Quality												
		40 (27587513)		4												
		39 (24764120)		4												
		38 (29058098)		4												
		14 (36820925)		2												
3-phase bone scan and WBC scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT foot	May be appropriate (Disagreement)	Expert Opinion	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv	☢☢☢☢ 3-10 mSv [ped]	5	5	5	3	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	
		References		Study Quality												
		69 (38649465)		2												
		33 (27560470)		3												
		22 (20851003)		2												
		30 (17138732)		2												
		31 (14523585)		3												
		32 (17146681)		3												
WBC scan foot	May be appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		5	5	1	1	2	3	5	1	1	0	0	
		References		Study Quality												
		68 (16702459)		4												

Image-guided biopsy foot	May be appropriate	Strong	Varies	Varies	5	5	0	0	0	4	7	2	1	0	0
US foot	Usually not appropriate	Limited	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	3	3	3	2	4	3	1	1	0	0	0
WBC scan and sulfur colloid scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Limited	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		3	3	3	3	4	1	3	0	0	0	0
CT foot without and with IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Limited	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	2	2	6	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
67 (3157204)	3
44 (28733376)	Good
34 (1872240)	3
24 (1572113)	3

References	Study Quality
51 (33739950)	2
50 (33134407)	Good
49 (30778640)	4
48 (31322951)	4
47 (36905125)	4

References	Study Quality
65 (37950713)	2

References	Study Quality
66 (17127204)	4
24 (1572113)	3
20 (9476948)	3
21 (26706230)	3
23 (27390160)	4

References	Study Quality
41 (18025514)	4
40 (27587513)	4
39 (24764120)	4

References	Study Quality
38 (29058098)	4
14 (36820925)	2

3-phase bone scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Limited	☢☢☢ 1-10 mSv		2	2	5	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
37 (10395336)	3
36 (2646871)	2
6 (18611152)	M
34 (1872240)	3
35 (1727365)	4

FDG-PET/CT whole body	Usually not appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv	☢☢☢☢ 3-10 mSv [ped]	2	2	7	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
46 (32486304)	2
45 (23906976)	Good
42 (22801731)	1
43 (15750157)	3
29 (16264122)	Inadequate
44 (28733376)	Good

3-phase bone scan and WBC scan and sulfur colloid scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		2	2	5	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
24 (1572113)	3
23 (27390160)	4
22 (20851003)	2
20 (9476948)	3
21 (26706230)	3

3-phase bone scan and WBC scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		2	2	5	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality

29 (16264122)	Inadequate
28 (8821280)	3
27 (9473260)	2
25 (3171695)	3
26 (2341891)	3

Variant 4: Adult. Suspected osteomyelitis of the foot in patients with diabetes mellitus and metal instrumentation in the foot. Initial radiographs negative or indeterminate for osteomyelitis. Next imaging study.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	SOE	Adults RRL	Peds RRL	Rating	Median	Final Tabulations								
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
MRI foot without IV contrast	Usually appropriate	Limited	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	7	7	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	2	2

References	Study Quality
77 (30660474)	3
76 (32040604)	4
57 (16037509)	3
59 (19098186)	3
58 (34145466)	4
60 (37123500)	3
52 (15863990)	3
53 (18956147)	3
54 (32130445)	3

MRI foot without and with IV contrast	Usually appropriate	Limited	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	7	7	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	2	3

References	Study Quality
77 (30660474)	3
76 (32040604)	4
59 (19098186)	3
63 (8518119)	3
58 (34145466)	4

3-phase bone scan and WBC scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT foot	Usually appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv	☢☢☢☢ 3-10 mSv [ped]	7	7	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	1	4

References	Study Quality
60 (37123500)	3
57 (16037509)	3
52 (15863990)	3
53 (18956147)	3
54 (32130445)	3

CT foot without IV contrast	May be appropriate	Limited	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	6	6	0	0	0	2	4	7	1	0	0

References	Study Quality
33 (27560470)	3
32 (17146681)	3
30 (17138732)	2
31 (14523585)	3
25 (3171695)	3
26 (2341891)	3
22 (20851003)	2

3-phase bone scan and WBC scan and sulfur colloid scan foot	May be appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		6	6	0	0	1	0	5	2	1	2	3

References	Study Quality
40 (27587513)	4
39 (24764120)	4
19 (20567730)	4
38 (29058098)	4
14 (36820925)	2

References	Study Quality
24 (1572113)	3
23 (27390160)	4
22 (20851003)	2
20 (9476948)	3

	21 (26706230)	3														
3-phase bone scan and WBC scan foot	May be appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		6	6	0	0	1	1	3	4	1	1	3
	References	Study Quality														
	29 (16264122)	Inadequate														
	28 (8821280)	3														
	27 (9473260)	2														
	25 (3171695)	3														
	26 (2341891)	3														
CT foot with IV contrast	May be appropriate	Limited	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	5	5	0	0	0	1	8	4	1	0	0
	References	Study Quality														
	41 (18025514)	4														
	40 (27587513)	4														
	39 (24764120)	4														
	19 (20567730)	4														
	38 (29058098)	4														
	14 (36820925)	2														
WBC scan and sulfur colloid scan foot	May be appropriate	Limited	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		5	5	0	0	0	2	8	1	1	1	1
	References	Study Quality														
	66 (17127204)	4														
	24 (1572113)	3														
	20 (9476948)	3														
	21 (26706230)	3														
	23 (27390160)	4														
US foot	Usually not appropriate	Limited	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	3	3	5	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0
	References	Study Quality														
	65 (37950713)	2														

CT foot without and with IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Limited	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	2	2	6	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
41 (18025514)	4
40 (27587513)	4
39 (24764120)	4
19 (20567730)	4
38 (29058098)	4
14 (36820925)	2

3-phase bone scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Limited	☢☢☢ 1-10 mSv		2	2	6	2	3	0	3	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
37 (10395336)	3
36 (2646871)	2
6 (18611152)	M
34 (1872240)	3
35 (1727365)	4

FDG-PET/CT whole body	Usually not appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv	☢☢☢☢ 3-10 mSv [ped]	2	2	7	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
75 (21934545)	M
74 (14990668)	4
45 (23906976)	Good
73 (12766596)	3
44 (28733376)	Good
46 (32486304)	2
42 (22801731)	1
43 (15750157)	3
29 (16264122)	Inadequate

WBC scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		2	2	6	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
68 (16702459)	4
67 (3157204)	3
44 (28733376)	Good
34 (1872240)	3
24 (1572113)	3

Image-guided biopsy foot	Usually not appropriate	Strong	Varies	Varies	2	2	7	0	2	1	3	1	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
51 (33739950)	2
50 (33134407)	Good
49 (30778640)	4
48 (31322951)	4
47 (36905125)	4

Variant 5: Adult. Radiographs positive for osteomyelitis of the foot in patients with diabetes mellitus and metal instrumentation in the foot. Next imaging study for pretreatment planning.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	SOE	Adults RRL	Peds RRL	Rating	Median	Final Tabulations								
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
MRI foot without and with IV contrast	Usually appropriate	Limited	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	8	8	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	4	4

References	Study Quality
77 (30660474)	3
76 (32040604)	4
59 (19098186)	3
63 (8518119)	3
58 (34145466)	4
60 (37123500)	3

57 (16037509)	3
52 (15863990)	3
53 (18956147)	3
54 (32130445)	3

MRI foot without IV contrast	Usually appropriate	Limited	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	7	7	0	0	1	0	1	5	2	3	2

References	Study Quality
77 (30660474)	3
76 (32040604)	4
57 (16037509)	3
59 (19098186)	3
58 (34145466)	4
60 (37123500)	3
52 (15863990)	3
53 (18956147)	3
54 (32130445)	3

3-phase bone scan and WBC scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT foot	May be appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv	☢☢☢☢ 3-10 mSv [ped]	6	6	0	0	1	1	2	5	1	1	3

References	Study Quality
69 (38649465)	2
33 (27560470)	3
22 (20851003)	2
30 (17138732)	2
31 (14523585)	3
32 (17146681)	3

3-phase bone scan and WBC scan and sulfur colloid scan foot	May be appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		6	6	0	0	1	0	5	3	0	2	3

References	Study Quality
24 (1572113)	3
23 (27390160)	4
22 (20851003)	2

20 (9476948)	3
21 (26706230)	3

3-phase bone scan and WBC scan foot	May be appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		6	6	0	0	1	1	4	4	0	1	3

References	Study Quality
29 (16264122)	Inadequate
28 (8821280)	3
27 (9473260)	2
25 (3171695)	3
26 (2341891)	3

WBC scan and sulfur colloid scan foot	May be appropriate	Limited	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		6	6	0	0	1	1	4	4	1	0	3

References	Study Quality
66 (17127204)	4
24 (1572113)	3
20 (9476948)	3
21 (26706230)	3
23 (27390160)	4

CT foot with IV contrast	May be appropriate	Limited	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	5	5	0	0	0	1	9	1	3	0	0

References	Study Quality
41 (18025514)	4
40 (27587513)	4
39 (24764120)	4
19 (20567730)	4
38 (29058098)	4
14 (36820925)	2

CT foot without IV contrast	May be appropriate	Limited	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	5	5	0	0	1	1	7	3	1	1	0

References	Study Quality

Image-guided biopsy foot	May be appropriate	Strong	Varies	Varies	5	5	0	0	0	2	7	5	0	0	0
3-phase bone scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Limited	☢☢☢ 1-10 mSv		3	3	3	2	5	1	3	0	0	0	0
US foot	Usually not appropriate	Limited	O 0 mSv	O 0 mSv [ped]	3	3	4	2	4	3	1	0	0	0	0
WBC scan foot	Usually not appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv		3	3	5	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	0

References	Study Quality
40 (27587513)	4
39 (24764120)	4
19 (20567730)	4
38 (29058098)	4
14 (36820925)	2

References	Study Quality
51 (33739950)	2
50 (33134407)	Good
49 (30778640)	4
48 (31322951)	4
47 (36905125)	4

References	Study Quality
37 (10395336)	3
36 (2646871)	2
6 (18611152)	M
34 (1872240)	3
35 (1727365)	4

References	Study Quality
65 (37950713)	2

References	Study Quality
68 (16702459)	4
67 (3157204)	3
44 (28733376)	Good

		34 (1872240)		3												
		24 (1572113)		3												
CT foot without and with IV contrast	Usually not appropriate	Limited	☢ <0.1 mSv	☢☢ 0.03-0.3 mSv [ped]	2	2	6	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		References		Study Quality												
		41 (18025514)		4												
		40 (27587513)		4												
		39 (24764120)		4												
		19 (20567730)		4												
		38 (29058098)		4												
		14 (36820925)		2												
FDG-PET/CT whole body	Usually not appropriate	Strong	☢☢☢☢ 10-30 mSv	☢☢☢☢ 3-10 mSv [ped]	2	2	7	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	
		References		Study Quality												
		75 (21934545)		M												
		74 (14990668)		4												
		45 (23906976)		Good												
		73 (12766596)		3												
		72 (15680102)		2												
		46 (32486304)		2												
		42 (22801731)		1												
		43 (15750157)		3												
		29 (16264122)		Inadequate												
		44 (28733376)		Good												

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.**