

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|-----|-----|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percutaneous lung biopsy | Usually appropriate | | N/A | N/A | 8 | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Surgical lung biopsy/resection | May be appropriate | | N/A | N/A | 5 | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Follow-up imaging only | Usually not appropriate | | N/A | N/A | 2 | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Conservative management (do nothing) | Usually not appropriate | | N/A | N/A | 1 | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Variant 3: Middle-aged patient (35–60 years old) with a newly diagnosed colon carcinoma. Three pulmonary nodules, ranging up to 2 cm in diameter, noted on staging CT of the chest. At least 1 of the lesions demonstrates a lobulated appearance.

| Procedure | Appropriateness Category | SOE | Adults RRL | Peds RRL | Rating | Median | Final Tabulations | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----|----------------|----------|--------|--------|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| FDG-PET/CT whole body | Usually appropriate | | ⊕⊕⊕⊕ 10-30 mSv | | 8 | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percutaneous lung biopsy | Usually appropriate | | N/A | N/A | 8 | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Follow-up imaging only | Usually not appropriate | | N/A | N/A | 3 | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Surgical lung biopsy/resection | Usually not appropriate | | N/A | N/A | 3 | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Conservative management (do nothing) | Usually not appropriate | | N/A | N/A | 1 | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Variant 4: Young adult patient (20–35 years old) with 1.0-cm smooth-walled noncalcified lung nodule seen on CT after minor motor vehicle trauma. No known risk factors for lung cancer.

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.