American College of Radiology ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Staging of Colorectal Cancer

Variant: 1 Rectal cancer. Locoregional staging. Initial imaging.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
US pelvis transrectal	Usually Appropriate	0
MRI pelvis without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0
MRI pelvis without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0
CT abdomen and pelvis with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	૽
CT colonography	May Be Appropriate	૽
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	May Be Appropriate	⊗ ���
CT abdomen and pelvis without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	૽
CT abdomen and pelvis without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⊗ ���

Variant: 2 Rectal cancer. Locoregional staging. Postneoadjuvant therapy.

<u></u>			
Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level	
MRI pelvis without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0	
MRI pelvis without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0	
US pelvis transrectal	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	0	
CT abdomen and pelvis with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	૽ ૽	
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	May Be Appropriate	⊗⊗⊗	
CT abdomen and pelvis without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	૽ ૽	
CT colonography	Usually Not Appropriate	૽ ૽	
CT abdomen and pelvis without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⊗⊗⊗	

Variant: 3 Colorectal cancer. Staging for distant metastases. Initial imaging.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
CT chest with IV contrast and MRI abdomen with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⊗ ⊗ ⊗
CT chest abdomen pelvis with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	
CT chest with IV contrast and MRI abdomen without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	⊗ ⊗
CT chest without IV contrast and MRI abdomen with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	⊗⊗
CT chest without IV contrast and MRI abdomen without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	※ ※
CT chest abdomen pelvis without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	※ ※ ※
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	May Be Appropriate	⊗ ⊗ ⊗ ⊗
CT chest without and with IV contrast and MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	∵
CT chest abdomen pelvis without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	※※※

Panel Members

Elena K. Korngold, MD^a; Courtney Moreno, MD^b; David H. Kim, MD^c; Kathryn J. Fowler, MD^d; Brooks D. Cash,

MD^e; Kevin J. Chang, MD^f; Kenneth L. Gage, MD, PhD^g; Aakash H. Gajjar, MD^h; Evelyn M. Garcia, MDⁱ; Avinash R. Kambadakone, MD^j; Peter S. Liu, MD^k; Meghan Macomber, MD^l; Daniele Marin, MD^m; Jason A. Pietryga, MDⁿ; Cynthia S. Santillan, MD^o; Stefanie Weinstein, MD^p; Jennifer Zreloff, MD^q; Laura R. Carucci, MD.^r

Summary of Literature Review

Introduction/Background

Rectal Cancer Pre- and Postneoadjuvant Therapy

Surgical options for rectal carcinoma are varied and depend on the relationship of tumor to the anal sphincter, circumferential resection margins, and the peritoneal reflection. Primary total mesorectal surgical resection remains the standard of care for most early stage (T1–T2) rectal cancers. Several studies have evaluated the efficacy of transanal excision as an alternative to radical resection, with results suggesting this may be appropriate in carefully selected T1-stage patients [1]. Close observation and accurate preoperative staging is essential to avoid high recurrence rates in these patients, likely related to involvement of local mesorectal nodes not detected by preoperative imaging [2].

Neoadjuvant chemotherapy and radiation added to primary resection in patients with radiologically determined high-risk/locally advanced (T3–T4 or locoregional node-positive disease [N+]) rectal cancer has been shown to decrease local recurrence and improve survival [3-6]. Thus, preoperative imaging for local staging of rectal cancer is important for determining the need for neoadjuvant therapy and surgical strategy [2,3,7,8].

In patients with locally advanced rectal cancer (LARC), established risk factors for poorer outcomes include circumferential resection margin involvement, extramural depth of spread >5 mm, extramural vascular invasion (EMVI), mucinous phenotype, and poor response to chemoradiotherapy (CRT) [9,10]. Multiple studies have demonstrated relatively poor compliance with adjuvant (postoperative) chemotherapy compared with neoadjuvant treatment, with decreased survival in the adjuvant (versus neoadjuvant) cohort [11]. Prospective studies have demonstrated that preoperative or neoadjuvant radiation with or without sensitizing chemotherapy reduced local recurrence risk and may increase the proportion of patients who benefit from a sphincter-saving procedure.

More recently, postneoadjuvant "restaging" has become important to re-evaluate surgical approach, assess response to selected chemotherapy/radiation therapy, or to consider organsparing "conservative" nonoperative surveillance in carefully selected patients who may demonstrate complete or near-complete response to neoadjuvant therapy. Organ-preserving treatment strategies are increasingly used as alternatives to surgical resection in patients responding well to CRT [12,13], recognizing that between 8% to 34% of patients will demonstrate pathological complete response postneoadjuvant CRT. Follow-up imaging assessment after CRT is essential in management of LARC, and restaging MRI in combination with endoscopy has become the standard of care in posttreatment surveillance [14].

There is an ongoing effort to assess for complete response to neoadjuvant therapy in an effort to determine which patients could potentially benefit from an organ-preservation approach without

total mesorectal excision or lateral nodal dissection.

Colon Cancer

The local treatment of colon cancer relies primarily on the section of involved colon (right versus left hemicolectomy), with removal of the associated mesentery and regional nodes. Use of selective adjuvant chemotherapy is dictated by lymph node positivity and extramural lymphovascular invasion on pathologic specimen. The role of preoperative imaging to predict T stage and N stage is an area of ongoing investigation, given that neoadjuvant therapy has not yet been shown to significantly improve survival over surgery alone (with postoperative adjuvant treatment) and the standard surgical approach is radical resection. Current ongoing trials including the large randomized controlled FOxTROT trial suggest that neoadjuvant treatment can preoperatively downstage colorectal cancer with better tolerated and more complete administration of chemotherapy before surgery rather than postoperative [15]. However, preoperative imaging of colon cancer appears to be of most benefit in identifying distant metastases, regardless of its ability to predict T stage and N stage. Given the limited role of locoregional staging, the imaging variant discussion for colon cancer will be limited to evaluation of distant metastases only.

Special Imaging Considerations

In rectal tumors, because of the need for high-resolution anatomic detail in determining local tumor extension, the local staging of the tumor is often considered separately from the evaluation of distant metastatic disease, resulting in the need for a combination of modalities to fully stage the patient. In contrast, locoregional staging by imaging is not an issue for colon (nonrectal) cancers, and thus only the evaluation of distant metastatic disease is required.

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 where each procedure provides unique clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care).

Discussion of Procedures by Variant

Variant 1: Rectal cancer. Locoregional staging. Initial imaging.

In this clinical scenario, a patient has been recently diagnosed with rectal cancer and presents for evaluation of local regional extent of the rectal cancer to determine if the person would benefit from neoadjuvant therapy before possible surgical resection. This variant excludes (nonrectal) colon cancers.

Variant 1: Rectal cancer. Locoregional staging. Initial imaging.

A. CT Abdomen and Pelvis

CT was the first "locoregional staging" modality evaluated. Early enthusiastic reports of accuracy ranged between 85% to 90% [16], and it was reported to be an excellent preoperative staging method, with the ability to depict both the primary tumor and metastases. Larger, more carefully controlled studies, however, have shown that the overall accuracy of contrast-enhanced CT is in the 50% to 70% range, varying directly with the stage of the lesion. A limitation of CT is its inability to resolve the layers of the bowel wall; consequently, high T3 and T4 lesions are more accurately assessed than T2 or early T3 lesions [17,18]. A recent study using thin-section multidetector CT (MDCT) demonstrated a higher accuracy of 86% in T staging [19]. The accuracy of staging with CT may be improved with multiplanar reformats, allowing for true axial images through the rectum [20]. An evaluation of 168 consecutive patients with rectal cancer who underwent MDCT with multiplanar reformations found an accuracy of 85.7% for T stage [21]. Overstaging, predominately because of desmoplastic peritumoral inflammation, remains a challenge on CT, as with the other modalities (transrectal ultrasound [TRUS] and MRI) [22].

For lymph node involvement, CT remains relatively nonspecific for N-stage determination. There is little agreement on the critical cut-off diameter to determine if lymph nodes are involved in the disease process. One study suggests 4.5 mm; however, nodal size is not seen as a predictor of nodal status at surgery [8,23]. Because detection of nodes involved with tumor remains a difficult problem, if a colonic resection is planned, local node groups should be encompassed in a properly performed cancer operation. Accuracies for CT detection of lymph node stage range from 56% to 84% [19,20,24-26]. Locoregional staging is not routinely performed for colon cancer; however, CT is still useful in the initial evaluation of all patients scheduled for colorectal carcinoma surgery because of its ability to obtain a rapid global evaluation and demonstrate potential complications of the tumor (eg, perforation, obstruction) that may not be clinically apparent [18].

Variant 1: Rectal cancer. Locoregional staging. Initial imaging. B. CT Colonography

Virtual colonoscopy (or CT colonography) has proven to be a valid tool in identifying both primary and synchronous colonic lesions. Limited information is available regarding the performance of CT colonography for rectal cancer staging. In a study of 45 patients with low rectal adenocarcinomas, CT colonography with multiplanar reformation demonstrated 89% accuracy for T stage [27].

Variant 1: Rectal cancer. Locoregional staging. Initial imaging. C. FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

Limited recent information is available regarding the performance of fluorine-18-2-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose (FDG)-PET/CT for local rectal cancer staging. In a study of 59 patients with rectal cancer, conventional FDG-PET/CT was found to be 73.5% accurate for T stage and to have a 64.3% sensitivity and 96.7% specificity for N stage [28]. In an evaluation of 44 pathologic and 19 control lymph nodes, the standardized uptake value (SUV)_{max} and SUV_{mean} were significantly higher in pathological lymph nodes than in control lymph nodes [29].

Variant 1: Rectal cancer. Locoregional staging. Initial imaging. D. MRI Pelvis

MRI can depict the separate layers of the rectal wall with high-resolution. In addition, the mesorectal fascia can be visualized at MRI, and the relationship of the tumor to this anatomic structure can be assessed. High-resolution imaging using phased-array MRI coils, as is used in multicenter trials (MERCURY), has performed well when done at either 1.5 T or 3 T [30,31].

Additionally, when going from 1.5 T to 3 T, there may be only small incremental improvements in diagnostic accuracy [32,33]. In a meta-analysis of 21 studies, phased-array coil MRI demonstrated a specificity of 94% (95% confidence interval [CI], 88–97) for determining circumferential resection margin involvement and a specificity of 75% (95% CI, 68–80) for determining T stage [34]. However, MRI technique and image quality play a critical role in the attainment of these objectives; accuracy is dependent on obtaining high-resolution images (0.5–0.6 cm in-plane voxel size) that are perpendicular to the plane of the tumor.

Agreement between high-resolution MRI and TRUS in determining early (<T3 stage) versus advanced tumors (≥T3 stage) was found to be high (kappa value = 0.93) in a study of 86 consecutive patients in which detailed subclassification and distance of tumor extension beyond the wall were compared [35]. In a study by Fernandez-Esparrach et al [36], there was similar agreement between high-resolution MRI and endorectal US (TRUS). In another study comparing MRI and TRUS for measurement of the closest radial tumor-mesorectal margin, there was substantial agreement; however, the correlation between observers and modalities was modest, suggesting significant influence of reader performance on the diagnostic accuracy/reproducibility of TRUS [37]. This may be especially true for accuracy in lymph node detection with TRUS [38].

When used as a preoperative tool in advanced tumors, MRI has shown high diagnostic accuracy for both initial staging to determine surgical plan and determining resectability following neoadjuvant treatment [39-43]. Studies have shown MRI sensitivities ranging from 94% to 100% and specificities from 85% to 88% in assessment of the circumferential resection margin [44,45]. Hence, MRI is valuable in predicting complete resection with negative margins. In a multicenter cohort trial evaluating the use of high-resolution MRI with a phased-array coil in determining resectability, a total of 228 patients underwent curative-intent treatment based on the MRI characterization of tumor extent, with 95.6% of patients achieving margin-negative results [40]. High-risk MRI features (EMVI, extramural tumor depth >5 mm, T4 stage, involved circumferential resection margin) may correlate with a higher risk for distant metastases [46,47]. In addition to initial staging prognostic features, MRI response to neoadjuvant treatment has been shown to be an indicator of long-term outcomes, including recurrence and survival [48-51]. Reduced field of view diffusion-weighted images (DWI) may demonstrate better image quality than full field of view DWIs [52].

For lymph node involvement, the differentiation of benign from metastatic locoregional nodes remains challenging. MRI is sensitive for detecting enlarged lymph nodes but remains nonspecific for differentiating benign from malignant nodes with accuracies ranging from 59% to 83% [32,36,53,54]. However, studies have shown high negative predictive value in the setting of nodenegative determination by MRI, with negative predictive value ranging from 78% to 87% [32,36,53,54]. In a study of 60 patients with rectal cancer, 68.3% of patients with nodal metastasis were correctly identified using a size threshold of 7.2 mm, and accuracy was not improved by morphologic criteria [55]. However, in a study of 52 patients with rectal cancer, prediction of N stage was improved by considering dimension, morphology, and signal characteristics [56]. Standardized reporting systems and templates have been shown to result in more complete MRI reports [57].

Variant 1: Rectal cancer. Locoregional staging. Initial imaging. E. US Pelvis Transrectal

TRUS has been considered the reference standard for T-stage evaluation of rectal carcinoma with rich historical evidence to support its use. TRUS is able to differentiate the layers of the rectal wall

and provides high accuracy in detecting and characterizing tumors within the superficial layers of the rectal wall. Reported accuracies range between 80% and 97% for T-stage determination [58]. The T-stage accuracy for TRUS (84.6%) is far superior to that of CT (70.5%) [23]. Evaluation of the extent of the tumor infiltration into the mesorectum (differentiating minimal from advanced T3 tumors and minimal T3 from T2 tumors) is of clinical interest in determining the need for neoadjuvant treatment but remains a challenge for TRUS [59,60]. Although TRUS performs better than MRI for T1 tumors, similar for T2 and T3, it may be less accurate in characterizing locally advanced T4 tumors with a tendency to understage [36]. The use of TRUS in assigning patients to transanal endoscopic microsurgery versus traditional surgery remains controversial. Despite some authors reporting good accuracy for some T stages, a retrospective evaluation of the use of TRUS in patients selected to undergo transanal endoscopic microsurgery for presumed early-stage disease showed disappointing results with inaccurate staging seen in 44.8% of the 165 patients who underwent TRUS preoperatively (32.7% were understaged and 12.1% were overstaged) [61]. In a 2019 study of 500 patients, neither TRUS or MRI distinguished between T1 and T2 disease [62].

A significant limitation of TRUS is the limited field of view that compromises assessment of the relationship of the tumor, mesorectal tumor implants, tumor invasion in extramural vessels, and malignant nodes to the mesorectal fascia. MRI may better evaluate these findings because it offers a larger field of view. TRUS is also limited in its assessment of high rectal tumors.

Detection of lymph node involvement with TRUS is limited to mesorectal nodes in the immediate vicinity of the tumor, which limits sensitivity. The sensitivity ranges from 45% to 74% [63,64], and overall accuracy ranges from 62% to 83% [22]. Although TRUS can frequently be used to detect regional lymph nodes, it has not been shown to be predictive of the histology of the visualized lymph nodes. Many lymph nodes measuring <5 mm in diameter have associated micrometastases, and some early-stage T1 and T2 tumors are likely to have lymph node micrometastases missed on TRUS. This may be responsible for the high rate of pelvic recurrence within this patient group [65]. Lymph nodes along the superior rectal vessels and outside the mesorectal fascia along the internal iliac and obturator nodal stations (ie, lateral pelvic side wall) also cannot be assessed with TRUS. This can also be clinically important; 1 series showed that 27% of the rectal cancer study cohort (Dukes class C; T2–T4 tumors) demonstrated positive lateral lymph node involvement, with a small percentage with lateral lymph node involvement only (4%) [66]. TRUS similarly is limited in evaluating lateral lymph nodes.

Variant 2: Rectal cancer. Locoregional staging. Postneoadjuvant therapy.

In this clinical scenario, a patient who has a known diagnosis of LARC as defined by T3 or T4 primary tumor or suspected locoregional metastatic nodal disease (on initial imaging) has been treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy, external beam radiation, or a combination of the two, historically in preparation for surgical resection of the primary tumor, and more recently as part of a definitive "organ-sparing" approach in carefully selected patients. This neoadjuvant treatment is given to reduce the size and extent of the primary tumor, improve surgical options, and often to assess response and location of locoregional nodal disease. After neoadjuvant treatment, and before surgery, local tumor and regional lymph nodes are re-evaluated.

Variant 2: Rectal cancer. Locoregional staging. Postneoadjuvant therapy. A. CT Abdomen and Pelvis

Much of the literature on CT restaging was generated more than 5 years ago, demonstrating low accuracy for T-stage re-evaluation or assessment of complete response. CT may remain helpful in

limited situations to assess for resection margin, overall decrease in tumor, or interval change in node size, and may be of benefit to assess for overall tumor susceptibility to CRT, or in rare cases to detect distant metastatic disease that has developed during the course of neoadjuvant CRT. In early studies, accuracy of CT in predicting pathological T stage after radiotherapy was low (37%) but more accurate in the identification of involved circumferential resection margin (71%) [67].

Other studies demonstrated higher accuracy of T stage, up to 61% and CT correlation with pathologic tumor regression, with frequent overstaging due to residual fibrotic change that could not be distinguished from tumor on CT [68]. Nodal involvement was difficult to assess by CT, although change in nodal size could be appreciated, with one early study demonstrating a sensitivity of 56% and a specificity of 74% for nodal involvement [69].

More recent studies have supported these earlier conclusions, noting that CT restaging was able to document overall response versus nonresponse to neoadjuvant CRT with limited ability to predict pathologic T and N stage at surgical resection; for example, a study of 270 patients receiving CT, MRI, and US restaging revealed 45% accuracy for CT in predicting specific pT stage and 66% accuracy for pN stage [70]. Two surgical cohorts concluded that local restaging CT prompted 0% to 4% change in surgical management of LARC postneoadjuvant CRT and was mostly helpful in the setting of metastatic disease [71,72].

For lymph node involvement, like all modalities that rely primarily on size as determinant of involvement (eg, TRUS and MRI), CT remains relatively nonspecific for N-stage determination. There is little agreement on the critical cut-off diameter to determine if lymph nodes are involved in the disease process before or after neoadjuvant treatment. Nodal size is not seen as a predictor of nodal status at surgery [8,23]. Accuracies for CT detection of lymph node stage range from 56% to 84% [19,20,24-26].

Variant 2: Rectal cancer. Locoregional staging. Postneoadjuvant therapy. B. CT Colonography

There is no relevant literature regarding the use of CT colonography in the restaging evaluation rectal cancer postneoadjuvant CRT.

Variant 2: Rectal cancer. Locoregional staging. Postneoadjuvant therapy. C. FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

FDG-PET/CT has traditionally been used in initial staging of rectal cancer to further evaluate equivocal findings on CT/MRI, to definitively exclude extrahepatic metastatic disease before surgical resection/liver directed therapy, and to identify occult disease in patients with rising carcinoembryonic antigen [73,74]. It is widely considered a specific but not sensitive examination for evaluating distant rather than local disease [75].

More recently, particularly in the era of neoadjuvant CRT for LARC, FDG-PET/CT has been evaluated for its role in risk stratification, potential to inform surgical decision making postneoadjuvant treatment, to give prognostic information about the likelihood of local recurrence, and to help select patients who may benefit from an organ-sparing approach [76,77]. Post-CRT PET/CT has demonstrated more benefit in identifying residual disease rather than complete responders; patients maintaining a threshold post-CRT SUV of >4.3 are highly correlated with lack of complete response presurgery. Conversely, patients who had a pathologic complete response had lower median post-CRT SUV_{max} [78], with negative predictive values up to 94%,

supporting a role in ruling out pathologic complete response and therefore excluding patients from an organ-sparing approach [72,79]. FDG-PET/CT is therefore sometimes helpful to more definitively suggest residual local or nodal disease in patient's post-CRT (excluding organ preservation approach) but does not significantly add benefit or suggest complete response in patients who have been identified as complete or near-complete responders by the more conventional combination of post-CRT MRI and endoscopy.

Variant 2: Rectal cancer. Locoregional staging. Postneoadjuvant therapy. D. MRI Pelvis

The vast majority of postneoadjuvant imaging evaluation of rectal cancer is performed using MRI pelvis most commonly with and without intravenous (IV) contrast, in conjunction with direct mucosal visualization via endoscopy, and accordingly the most research has been done in this area to attempt to accurately restage tumor, modify surgical interventions, and identify patients who may benefit from an organ-sparing approach. Standard posttreatment MRI sequences include thin cut (3–4 mm) T2-weighted nonfat-saturated images, pre- and postcontrast images, and diffusion-weighted sequence with b values up to 800 to 1,000, sometimes higher. In contrast to PET/CT, MRI tends to overestimate residual viable tumor and underestimate pathological complete response of the primary, and research into specific imaging findings/sequences to optimize this modality and identify "complete responders" are ongoing [80-82].

When used as a preoperative tool in locally advanced tumors, MRI has shown high diagnostic accuracy for both initial staging to determine the surgical plan and determining resectability following neoadjuvant treatment. At initial staging, high-risk MRI features (EMVI, extramural tumor depth >5 mm, T4 stage, involved circumferential resection margin) correlate with a higher risk for distant metastases [46,47]. In addition to the initial staging of prognostic features, MRI response to neoadjuvant treatment as determined by a decreased size of the tumor, development of T2 dark "scar," and resolution of restricted diffusion has been shown to be an indicator of long-term outcomes, including recurrence and survival rates [42,48-51,83]. MRI can also be used to evaluate posttreatment morphologic components within the tumors, including fibrosis and mucinous changes that have been shown to correlate with the response to treatment.

A meta-analysis of a combined 1,262 patients with LARC in 19 studies assessed the accuracy of both local tumor restaging as well as regional nodal restaging as determined by restaging MRI compared to surgical pathology of the resected tumor. For tumor (T stage) restaging, global sensitivity was 81%, and the global specificity was 67%. For regional nodal (N stage) restaging, global sensitivity was 77%, and the global specificity was 77%. The global positive likelihood ratio was 3.40 (95% CI, 2.07–5.59); therefore, MRI increased by 3.40-fold the odds of an accurate diagnosis of N staging [84].

For T stage, restaging MRI has been evaluated based on its ability to demonstrate downstaging of high-risk features, as well as to evaluate features that are unique in the post-CRT setting and to predict pathologic treatment response. The 2016 ESGAR consensus evaluated available literature and determined that T2 dark (fibrotic scar) appearance post-CRT or normal appearing rectal wall post-CRT, in conjunction with resolution of abnormal DWI signal, was highly predictive of complete or near-complete tumor response [85]. In a separate study, complete T2 hypointensity on MRI demonstrated an accuracy of only 70% for pathologic complete response, with negative predictive value of only 66.7%, suggesting a lack of sensitivity for pathologic complete response and artificial MRI "overstaging" [86]. On the same study, DWI assessment had a high specificity and a high

negative predictive value for the detection of complete response (eg, it was helpful to identify residual tumor when none was seen by T2 MRI or endoscopy), which is a rarer scenario. The addition of DWI sequence's qualitative assessment to conventional high-resolution T2-weighted sequences improves the diagnostic performance of MRI in the evaluation of pathologic complete response (sensitivity 80%, specificity 100%) and adds benefit over T2 or PET/CT for detecting viable tumor postneoadjuvant treatment [87,88].

Circumferential resection margin (involvement or close approximation of the tumor to the mesorectal fascia) assessment may be slightly less predictive at post-CRT MRI compared with pretreatment MRI, again likely due to overstaging by post-CRT imaging [89]. Tumor height on preand post-CRT MRI has shown excellent correlation with endoscopic findings, however, and sphincter involvement/distance, with IV contrast MRI, is more helpful in defining the relationship to the sphincter [90,91].

EMVI, a poor prognostic factor for distant metastatic disease, has been evaluated pre- and post-CRT and compared with surgical pathology, with restaging MRI demonstrating 76% to 92% sensitivity and 64% to 80% specificity in determining persistent posttreatment EMVI [92-94]. Post-CRT detected-EMVI was the only significant MRI factor in disease-free survival. The mean disease-free survival for EMVI (+) patients was significantly less than for yMR-EMVI (–) patients: 57.56 months versus 72.46 months [92]. As with other MRI findings, MRI did detect more EMVI post-CRT than was confirmed with surgical pathology [95].

Lymph node size, limited as a predictor for malignant involvement pretreatment, is a slightly more reliable predictor of malignancy post-CRT, with a small minority (6%–14%) of nodes ≤5mm containing metastases, particularly if complete response is predicted based on T-stage findings [8,96]. In the 2016 ESGAR consensus panel, lymph nodes <5 mm post-CRT were considered treated/benign; although, as demonstrated elsewhere, prediction of pathologic nodal status was limited [85].

Additional studies confirming that N+ patients had significantly larger nodes than N0 patients both pre- and post-CRT used size cutoff for post-CRT ypN-stage prediction of <2.5 mm and >5mm at MRI [97-99]. Conversely, with luminal tumor apparent complete response, lymph nodes over 7 mm to 8 mm have been more strongly correlated with locoregional node positive (N+) [100,101]. MRI has demonstrated 75% sensitivity and 71% specificity in determining node positive disease [93].

More recently, change in nodal size or DWI signal on restaging MRI has shown more promise in assessment of nodal disease. Lack of a lymph node signal on DWI high b value 1,000 was associated with a sensitivity of 100% and a specificity of 14% [102]; the positive predictive value was 24%, and the negative predictive value was 100%. Although the absence of nodes at DWI is not a frequent finding, it appears to be a reliable predictor of yN0 status after CRT and may support the decision to consider organ-preservation treatment. Decreased lymph node size posttreatment is significantly associated with disease-free survival [103].

Variant 2: Rectal cancer. Locoregional staging. Postneoadjuvant therapy. E. US Pelvis Transrectal

A significant limitation of TRUS is the limited field of view that compromises assessment of relationship of the tumor, mesorectal tumor implants, tumor invasion in extramural vessels, and

malignant nodes to the mesorectal fascia. In addition, TRUS is limited in its assessment of high rectal tumors and can only be used in nonstenotic patients.

Local tumor staging in a direct comparison of TRUS to MRI in 34 patients, TRUS was accurate in tumor restaging after neoadjuvant CRT in 60% to 62% and high-resolution MRI in 68% [104,105], with a meta-analysis demonstrating lower diagnostic accuracy than MRI post-CRT, and a statistically significant decline in T-stage accuracy compared with pre-CRT [106]. Sensitivity for complete response on TRUS is as low as 25% with a specificity of 94% [107]. Contrast-enhanced TRUS plus elastography was shown in one study to improve post-CRT local staging to 85% [108].

Detection of lymph node involvement with TRUS is limited to mesorectal nodes in the immediate vicinity of the tumor, which limits sensitivity. The sensitivity pretreatment ranges from 45% to 74% [63,64], and overall accuracy ranges from 62% to 83% [22], and this appears to be similar and even more variable posttreatment [105]. Post-CRT TRUS presents the same limitations of distance from the tumor as at baseline [104].

Although TRUS can frequently be used to detect regional lymph nodes, it has not been shown to be predictive of the histology of the visualized lymph nodes. Accuracy in restaging lymph nodal involvement is quite variable (39%–83%) with similar rates of overstaging and understaging [109].

Variant 3: Colorectal cancer. Staging for distant metastases. Initial imaging.

In this clinical scenario, a patient has been recently diagnosed with colon or rectal cancer and presents for evaluation of metastatic disease in the chest, abdomen, and pelvis.

Variant 3: Colorectal cancer. Staging for distant metastases. Initial imaging. A. CT Chest, Abdomen, and Pelvis

Most studies show comparable or improved sensitivity for detection of colorectal liver metastases with IV conventional extracellular gadolinium agent-enhanced MRI compared with CT [110,111]. Abdominal/pelvic CT with IV contrast has a high negative predictive value of 90% [112].

The false positive rate of CT in a prospective study by Valls et al [113] was 3.9% (10 of 257 findings: 95% CI, 1.9–7.1), with intraoperative US and histopathology serving as the reference standard. Although CT may have diminished sensitivity compared with MRI in detection of liver lesions, an important determinant of its accuracy is CT technique. The use of MDCT, multiphase imaging, appropriate IV contrast bolus and timing, and optimal imaging parameters significantly narrows the differential between CT and MRI [114,115]. In studies evaluating IV contrast-enhanced optimized CT technique, detection rates for liver metastases range from 85% to 91% [113,116]. CT may show more limited sensitivity in detecting metastases in the setting of fatty liver and following neoadjuvant therapy compared with MRI [110,111]. Particularly in this setting of serial imaging, MDCT has proven to be an effective tool in the assessment of the extent of liver disease in addition to providing a comprehensive assessment of extrahepatic disease. Recent studies have also noted CT morphologic criteria of responses in liver metastasis that have proven to be excellent predictors of overall survival and disease-free survival [117,118].

Detection of possible lung metastases is also an important part of the initial imaging evaluation of patients with colorectal carcinoma. The National Comprehensive Cancer Network recommends that patients with newly diagnosed colorectal cancer undergo staging chest CT, because staging chest CT has been shown to detect more lung metastases than chest radiography [119]. In a series

of 74 patients with newly diagnosed rectal cancer who underwent both chest CT and chest radiography, 37% of patients with a normal chest radiograph had a lesion visible only on the chest CT, and 17% of these patients were found to have at least one pulmonary metastasis [119]. Among patients with potentially resectable liver metastases and a negative initial chest PET, additional imaging with a chest CT revealed pulmonary metastases in 5% of patients [120]. A potential pitfall of chest CT is the detection of small indeterminate pulmonary nodules that are not metastases [121]. In another study, approximately one-fourth of the indeterminate lesions on preoperative CT ultimately developed into metastases and 1 in 10 into other lung malignancies [122]. Chest CT examinations performed to evaluate for pulmonary metastases were typically performed with IV contrast material [121,123,124].

Variant 3: Colorectal cancer. Staging for distant metastases. Initial imaging. B. FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

Although there is some evidence to support the use of PET/CT in the local staging of patients with rectal carcinoma, the more common clinical application of PET/CT is in identifying nodal and distant metastases [125-127]. PET/CT is useful for determining overall stage and identifying patients with metastatic disease (sensitivity of 89% and specificity of 64%); however, the accuracy on a lesion-by-lesion basis is relatively low compared with contrast-enhanced CT and MRI for liver metastases (55% versus 89% in a study comparing PET/CT to MDCT) [128,129]. PET/CT may help to exclude other sites of disease beyond the liver or, in complex cases, to improve staging accuracy in which it has been shown to result in a change in management in up to 8% to 11% of patients [128,130-132]. Caution should be exercised, however, as the findings of PET/CT may be nonspecific and could result in a negative impact on patient care in up to 9% of patients [128]. Additionally, PET/CT has further reduced sensitivity for lesions in the setting of neoadjuvant therapy and should be used in conjunction with IV contrast CT or MRI for presurgical planning of liver metastases [133]. PET/CT may add influence in the positive predictive value of avid lymph nodes because it has a higher specificity than other modalities. The sensitivity of detecting nodal metastases is only 43% with a specificity of 80%, and again size is not a helpful characteristic.

There is also a potential role for PET/CT in restaging colorectal cancer after CRT by measuring the pretreatment and posttreatment SUV and assessing response by decreasing SUV [134]. Limitations of PET include decreased sensitivity in detecting small colonic lesions ≤10 mm in diameter and decreased FDG uptake by mucinous tumors [129].

Variant 3: Colorectal cancer. Staging for distant metastases. Initial imaging. C. CT Chest

Most studies show comparable or improved sensitivity for detection of colorectal liver metastases with IV conventional extracellular gadolinium agent-enhanced MRI compared with CT [110,111]. MRI is more accurate than CT in detecting liver metastases in the setting of fatty liver and following neoadjuvant therapy [110,111,135]. Many recent studies focus on the benefit of hepatobiliary contrast agent-enhanced MRI and DWI [136-143]. In a retrospective study of 242 patients undergoing surgical resection for colorectal liver metastases (n = 92 with prechemotherapy and presurgical MRI with a hepatobiliary IV contrast agent and n = 150 without both prechemotherapy and presurgical hepatobiliary IV contrast agent-enhanced MRI), patients who underwent hepatobiliary MRI both prechemotherapy and presurgically had significantly lower rates of intrahepatic recurrence (48% versus 65%, P = .04) and fewer repeat hepatectomies (13% versus 25%, P = .03) [138]. On the basis of the results of this study, the authors suggested that a hepatobiliary IV contrast agent-enhanced MRI may improve outcomes in the era of highly active

neoadjuvant chemotherapy and disappearing lesions. In a study of 28 patients with pathologically proven metastatic cancer who underwent Gd-EOB (gadolinium-ethoxybenzyl) MRI and MDCT imaging, per lesion sensitivity in the detection of liver metastases was higher with Gd-EOB MRI (90%–96%) compared to MDCT (72%–75%) [144]. DWI-MRI is also more accurate than MDCT for detection of liver metastases with 100% sensitivity and specificity for DWI-MRI and 87.5% sensitivity and 95.5% specificity for MDCT [145].

Because of limited sensitivity of MRI for lung nodules, a chest CT can be utilized in addition to abdominal MRI for complete staging. The National Comprehensive Cancer Network recommends that patients with newly diagnosed colorectal cancer undergo staging chest CT, because staging chest CT has been shown to detect more lung metastases than chest radiography [119]. In a series of 74 patients with newly diagnosed rectal cancer who underwent both chest CT and chest radiography, 37% of patients with a normal chest radiograph had a lesion visible only on the chest CT, and 17% of these patients were found to have at least one pulmonary metastasis [119]. Among patients with potentially resectable liver metastases and a negative initial chest PET, additional imaging with a chest CT revealed pulmonary metastases in 5% of patients [120]. A potential pitfall of chest CT is the detection of small indeterminate pulmonary nodules that are not metastases [121]. In another study, approximately one-fourth of the indeterminate lesions on preoperative CT ultimately developed into metastases and 1 in 10 into other lung malignancies [122]. Chest CT examinations performed to evaluate for pulmonary metastases were typically performed with IV contrast material [121,123,124].

Summary of Recommendations

- **Variant 1**: US pelvis transrectal or MRI pelvis without and with IV contrast or MRI pelvis without IV contrast is usually appropriate as initial imaging of rectal cancer for locoregional staging. These procedures may both be ordered in conjunction to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care.
- Variant 2: MRI pelvis without and with IV contrast or MRI pelvis without IV contrast is usually appropriate for the locoregional staging of rectal cancer postneoadjuvant therapy. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care). The panel did not agree on recommending US pelvis transrectal for this clinical scenario. There is insufficient medical literature to conclude whether or not these patients would benefit from these procedures. Imaging with this procedure is controversial in this patient population but may be appropriate.
- **Variant 3**: CT chest with IV contrast and MRI abdomen with IV contrast or CT chest abdomen pelvis with IV contrast is usually appropriate for the initial imaging of colorectal cancer when staging for distant metastases. 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. 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, please go to the ACR website at https://www.acr.org/Clinical-Resources/Clinical-Tools-and-Reference/Appropriateness-Criteria.

Appropriateness Category Names and Definitions

Appropriateness Category Name	Appropriateness Rating	Appropriateness Category Definition
Usually Appropriate	7, 8, or 9	The imaging procedure or treatment is indicated in the specified clinical scenarios at a favorable riskbenefit ratio for patients.
May Be Appropriate	4, 5, or 6	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.
May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	5	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.
Usually Not Appropriate	1, 2, or 3	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.

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 [146].

Relative Radiation Level Designations		
Relative Radiation Level*	Adult Effective Dose Estimate Range	Pediatric Effective Dose Estimate Range

0	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."

References

- **1.** Middleton PF, Sutherland LM, Maddern GJ. Transanal endoscopic microsurgery: a systematic review. Dis Colon Rectum. 2005;48(2):270-284.
- 2. Pricolo VE. Rectal cancer: the good, the bad, and the ugly. Arch Surg 2011;146:544.
- 3. Nogue M, Salud A, Vicente P, et al. Addition of bevacizumab to XELOX induction therapy plus concomitant capecitabine-based chemoradiotherapy in magnetic resonance imaging-defined poor-prognosis locally advanced rectal cancer: the AVACROSS study. Oncologist. 2011;16(5):614-620.
- **4.** Velenik V, Ocvirk J, Music M, et al. Neoadjuvant capecitabine, radiotherapy, and bevacizumab (CRAB) in locally advanced rectal cancer: results of an open-label phase II study. Radiat Oncol. 2011;6:105.
- **5.** Boland PM, Fakih M. The emerging role of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for rectal cancer. J Gastrointest Oncol. 2014;5(5):362-373.
- **6.** Glynne-Jones R, Tan D, Goh V. Pelvic MRI for guiding treatment decisions in rectal cancer. Oncology (Williston Park). 2014;28(8):667-677.
- **7.** Barbaro B, Fiorucci C, Tebala C, et al. Locally advanced rectal cancer: MR imaging in prediction of response after preoperative chemotherapy and radiation therapy. Radiology. 2009;250(3):730-739.
- **8.** Perez RO, Pereira DD, Proscurshim I, et al. Lymph node size in rectal cancer following neoadjuvant chemoradiation--can we rely on radiologic nodal staging after chemoradiation? Dis Colon Rectum. 2009;52(7):1278-1284.
- **9.** Yu SK, Chand M, Tait DM, Brown G. Magnetic resonance imaging defined mucinous rectal carcinoma is an independent imaging biomarker for poor prognosis and poor response to preoperative chemoradiotherapy. Eur J Cancer. 50(5):920-7, 2014 Mar.
- **10.** Brown G, Radcliffe AG, Newcombe RG, Dallimore NS, Bourne MW, Williams GT. Preoperative assessment of prognostic factors in rectal cancer using high-resolution magnetic resonance imaging. Br J Surg. 90(3):355-64, 2003 Mar.
- **11.** Akgun E, Ozkok S, Tekin M, et al. The effects of chemoradiotherapy on recurrence and survival in locally advanced rectal cancers with curative total mesorectal excision: a prospective, nonrandomized study. World J Surg Oncol. 15(1):205, 2017 Nov 22.

- **12.** Appelt AL, Pløen J, Harling H, et al. High-dose chemoradiotherapy and watchful waiting for distal rectal cancer: a prospective observational study. The Lancet Oncology 2015;16:919-27.
- **13.** Martens MH, Maas M, Heijnen LA, et al. Long-term Outcome of an Organ Preservation Program After Neoadjuvant Treatment for Rectal Cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 2016;108.
- **14.** Maas M, Lambregts DM, Nelemans PJ, et al. Assessment of Clinical Complete Response After Chemoradiation for Rectal Cancer with Digital Rectal Examination, Endoscopy, and MRI: Selection for Organ-Saving Treatment. Ann Surg Oncol 2015;22:3873-80.
- **15.** Seymour MT, Morton D, Investigators obotIFT. FOxTROT: an international randomised controlled trial in 1052 patients (pts) evaluating neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NAC) for colon cancer. Journal of Clinical Oncology 2019;37:3504-04.
- **16.** Bernini A, Deen KI, Madoff RD, Wong WD. Preoperative adjuvant radiation with chemotherapy for rectal cancer: its impact on stage of disease and the role of endorectal ultrasound. Annals of Surgical Oncology. 3(2):131-5, 1996 Mar.
- **17.** Bhattacharjya S, Bhattacharjya T, Baber S, Tibballs JM, Watkinson AF, Davidson BR. Prospective study of contrast-enhanced computed tomography, computed tomography during arterioportography, and magnetic resonance imaging for staging colorectal liver metastases for liver resection. Br J Surg 2004;91:1361-9.
- **18.** Farouk R, Nelson H, Radice E, Mercill S, Gunderson L. Accuracy of computed tomography in determining resectability for locally advanced primary or recurrent colorectal cancers. Am J Surg 1998;175:283-7.
- **19.** Ahmetoglu A, Cansu A, Baki D, et al. MDCT with multiplanar reconstruction in the preoperative local staging of rectal tumor. Abdom Imaging 2011;36:31-7.
- **20.** Anderson EM, Betts M, Slater A. The value of true axial imaging for CT staging of colonic cancer. Eur Radiol. 21(6):1286-92, 2011 Jun.
- **21.** Zhou XC, Chen QL, Huang CQ, Liao HL, Ren CY, He QS. The clinical application value of multi-slice spiral CT enhanced scans combined with multiplanar reformations images in preoperative T staging of rectal cancer. Medicine (Baltimore). 98(28):e16374, 2019 Jul.
- **22.** Low G, Tho LM, Leen E, et al. The role of imaging in the pre-operative staging and post-operative follow-up of rectal cancer. Surgeon 2008;6:222-31.
- **23.** Ju H, Xu D, Li D, Chen G, Shao G. Comparison between endoluminal ultrasonography and spiral computerized tomography for the preoperative local staging of rectal carcinoma. Biosci Trends 2009;3:73-6.
- **24.** da Fonte AC, Chojniak R, de Oliveira Ferreira F, Pinto PN, dos Santos Neto PJ, Bitencourt AG. Inclusion of computed tomographic colonography on pre-operative CT for patients with colorectal cancer. Eur J Radiol. 81(3):e298-303, 2012 Mar.
- **25.** Duman M, Tas S, Mecit EA, et al. Preoperative local staging of colorectal cancer patients with MDCT. Hepatogastroenterology 2012;59:1108-12.
- **26.** Stabile Ianora AA, Moschetta M, Pedote P, Scardapane A, Angelelli G. Preoperative local staging of colosigmoideal cancer: air versus water multidetector-row CT colonography. Radiol Med (Torino). 117(2):254-67, 2012 Mar.
- 27. Shida D, Iinuma G, Komono A, et al. Preoperative T staging using CT colonography with

- multiplanar reconstruction for very low rectal cancer. BMC Cancer. 17(1):764, 2017 Nov 14.
- **28.** Hotta M, Minamimoto R, Yano H, Gohda Y, Shuno Y. Diagnostic performance of 18F-FDG PET/CT using point spread function reconstruction on initial staging of rectal cancer: a comparison study with conventional PET/CT and pelvic MRI. Cancer Imaging. 18(1):4, 2018 Jan 30.
- **29.** Cerny M, Dunet V, Prior JO, et al. Initial Staging of Locally Advanced Rectal Cancer and Regional Lymph Nodes: Comparison of Diffusion-Weighted MRI With 18F-FDG-PET/CT. Clin Nucl Med. 41(4):289-95, 2016 Apr.
- **30.** Sani F, Foresti M, Parmiggiani A, et al. 3-T MRI with phased-array surface coil in the local staging of rectal cancer. Radiol Med 2011;116:375-88.
- **31.** Wong EM, Leung JL, Cheng CS, Lee JC, Li MK, Chung CC. Effect of endorectal coils on staging of rectal cancers by magnetic resonance imaging. Hong Kong Med J 2010;16:421-6.
- **32.** Karatag O, Karatag GY, Ozkurt H, et al. The ability of phased-array MRI in preoperative staging of primary rectal cancer: correlation with histopathological results. Diagn Interv Radiol 2012;18:20-6.
- **33.** Maas M, Lambregts DM, Lahaye MJ, et al. T-staging of rectal cancer: accuracy of 3.0 Tesla MRI compared with 1.5 Tesla. Abdom Imaging 2012;37:475-81.
- **34.** Al-Sukhni E, Milot L, Fruitman M, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of MRI for assessment of T category, lymph node metastases, and circumferential resection margin involvement in patients with rectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ann Surg Oncol. 2012;19(7):2212-2223.
- **35.** Rafaelsen SR, Vagn-Hansen C, Sorensen T, Ploen J, Jakobsen A. Transrectal ultrasound and magnetic resonance imaging measurement of extramural tumor spread in rectal cancer. World J Gastroenterol 2012;18:5021-6.
- **36.** Fernandez-Esparrach G, Ayuso-Colella JR, Sendino O, et al. EUS and magnetic resonance imaging in the staging of rectal cancer: a prospective and comparative study. Gastrointest Endosc. 2011;74(2):347-354.
- **37.** Phang PT, Gollub MJ, Loh BD, et al. Accuracy of endorectal ultrasound for measurement of the closest predicted radial mesorectal margin for rectal cancer. Dis Colon Rectum 2012;55:59-64.
- **38.** Li JC, Liu SY, Lo AW, et al. The learning curve for endorectal ultrasonography in rectal cancer staging. Surg Endosc 2010;24:3054-9.
- **39.** Del Vescovo R, Trodella LE, Sansoni I, et al. MR imaging of rectal cancer before and after chemoradiation therapy. Radiol Med 2012;117:1125-38.
- **40.** Engelen SM, Maas M, Lahaye MJ, et al. Modern multidisciplinary treatment of rectal cancer based on staging with magnetic resonance imaging leads to excellent local control, but distant control remains a challenge. Eur J Cancer 2013;49:2311-20.
- **41.** Mercury Study Group. Extramural depth of tumor invasion at thin-section MR in patients with rectal cancer: results of the MERCURY study. Radiology 2007;243:132-9.
- **42.** Kim SH, Lee JM, Park HS, Eun HW, Han JK, Choi BI. Accuracy of MRI for predicting the circumferential resection margin, mesorectal fascia invasion, and tumor response to

- neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for locally advanced rectal cancer. J Magn Reson Imaging 2009;29:1093-101.
- **43.** Wieder HA, Rosenberg R, Lordick F, et al. Rectal cancer: MR imaging before neoadjuvant chemotherapy and radiation therapy for prediction of tumor-free circumferential resection margins and long-term survival. Radiology 2007;243:744-51.
- **44.** Purkayastha S, Tekkis PP, Athanasiou T, Tilney HS, Darzi AW, Heriot AG. Diagnostic precision of magnetic resonance imaging for preoperative prediction of the circumferential margin involvement in patients with rectal cancer. Colorectal Dis 2007;9:402-11.
- **45.** Videhult P, Smedh K, Lundin P, Kraaz W. Magnetic resonance imaging for preoperative staging of rectal cancer in clinical practice: high accuracy in predicting circumferential margin with clinical benefit. Colorectal Dis 2007;9:412-9.
- **46.** Chang GJ, You YN, Park IJ, et al. Pretreatment high-resolution rectal MRI and treatment response to neoadjuvant chemoradiation. Dis Colon Rectum 2012;55:371-7.
- **47.** Hunter CJ, Garant A, Vuong T, et al. Adverse features on rectal MRI identify a high-risk group that may benefit from more intensive preoperative staging and treatment. Ann Surg Oncol 2012;19:1199-205.
- **48.** Patel UB, Taylor F, Blomqvist L, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging-detected tumor response for locally advanced rectal cancer predicts survival outcomes: MERCURY experience. J Clin Oncol 2011;29:3753-60.
- **49.** Shihab OC, Taylor F, Salerno G, et al. MRI predictive factors for long-term outcomes of low rectal tumours. Ann Surg Oncol 2011;18:3278-84.
- **50.** Strassburg J, Ruppert R, Ptok H, et al. MRI-based indications for neoadjuvant radiochemotherapy in rectal carcinoma: interim results of a prospective multicenter observational study. Ann Surg Oncol 2011;18:2790-9.
- **51.** Taylor FG, Quirke P, Heald RJ, et al. Preoperative high-resolution magnetic resonance imaging can identify good prognosis stage I, II, and III rectal cancer best managed by surgery alone: a prospective, multicenter, European study. Ann Surg 2011;253:711-9.
- **52.** Peng Y, Li Z, Tang H, et al. Comparison of reduced field-of-view diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) and conventional DWI techniques in the assessment of rectal carcinoma at 3.0T: Image quality and histological T staging. J Magn Reson Imaging. 47(4):967-975, 2018 04.
- **53.** Kim DJ, Kim JH, Ryu YH, Jeon TJ, Yu JS, Chung JJ. Nodal staging of rectal cancer: high-resolution pelvic MRI versus (1)(8)F-FDGPET/CT. J Comput Assist Tomogr. 2011;35(5):531-534.
- **54.** Mizukami Y, Ueda S, Mizumoto A, et al. Diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging for detecting lymph node metastasis of rectal cancer. World J Surg 2011;35:895-9.
- **55.** Grone J, Loch FN, Taupitz M, Schmidt C, Kreis ME. Accuracy of Various Lymph Node Staging Criteria in Rectal Cancer with Magnetic Resonance Imaging. J Gastrointest Surg. 22(1):146-153, 2018 01.
- **56.** Faletti R, Gatti M, Arezzo A, et al. Preoperative staging of rectal cancer using magnetic resonance imaging: comparison with pathological staging. Minerva Chir. 73(1):13-19, 2018 Feb.

- **57.** Tersteeg JJC, Gobardhan PD, Crolla RMPH, et al. Improving the Quality of MRI Reports of Preoperative Patients With Rectal Cancer: Effect of National Guidelines and Structured Reporting. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 210(6):1240-1244, 2018 Jun.
- **58.** Yimei J, Ren Z, Lu X, Huan Z. A comparison between the reference values of MRI and EUS and their usefulness to surgeons in rectal cancer. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci 2012;16:2069-77.
- **59.** Jurgensen C, Teubner A, Habeck JO, Diener F, Scherubl H, Stolzel U. Staging of rectal cancer by EUS: depth of infiltration in T3 cancers is important. Gastrointest Endosc 2011;73:325-8.
- **60.** Badger SA, Devlin PB, Neilly PJ, Gilliland R. Preoperative staging of rectal carcinoma by endorectal ultrasound: is there a learning curve? Int J Colorectal Dis 2007;22:1261-8.
- **61.** Ashraf S, Hompes R, Slater A, et al. A critical appraisal of endorectal ultrasound and transanal endoscopic microsurgery and decision-making in early rectal cancer. Colorectal Dis 2012;14:821-6.
- **62.** Oien K, Forsmo HM, Rosler C, Nylund K, Waage JE, Pfeffer F. Endorectal ultrasound and magnetic resonance imaging for staging of early rectal cancers: how well does it work in practice?. Acta Oncol. 58(sup1):S49-S54, 2019.
- **63.** Lin S, Luo G, Gao X, et al. Application of endoscopic sonography in preoperative staging of rectal cancer: six-year experience. J Ultrasound Med 2011;30:1051-7.
- **64.** Ravizza D, Tamayo D, Fiori G, et al. Linear array ultrasonography to stage rectal neoplasias suitable for local treatment. Dig Liver Dis 2011;43:636-41.
- **65.** Landmann RG, Wong WD, Hoepfl J, et al. Limitations of early rectal cancer nodal staging may explain failure after local excision. Dis Colon Rectum 2007;50:1520-5.
- **66.** Moriya Y, Sugihara K, Akasu T, Fujita S. Importance of extended lymphadenectomy with lateral node dissection for advanced lower rectal cancer. World J Surg 1997;21:728-32.
- **67.** Pomerri F, Pucciarelli S, Maretto I, et al. Prospective assessment of imaging after preoperative chemoradiotherapy for rectal cancer. Surgery. 149(1):56-64, 2011 Jan.
- **68.** Lee CT, Chow NH, Liu YS, et al. Computed tomography with histological correlation for evaluating tumor regression of rectal carcinoma after preoperative chemoradiation therapy. Hepatogastroenterology. 59(120):2484-9, 2012 Nov-Dec.
- **69.** Huh JW, Park YA, Jung EJ, Lee KY, Sohn SK. Accuracy of endorectal ultrasonography and computed tomography for restaging rectal cancer after preoperative chemoradiation. J Am Coll Surg. 207(1):7-12, 2008 Jul.
- **70.** Yoo C, Ryu MH, Jo J, Park I, Ryoo BY, Kang YK. Efficacy of Imatinib in Patients with Platelet-Derived Growth Factor Receptor Alpha-Mutated Gastrointestinal Stromal Tumors. Cancer Res. Treat.. 48(2):546-52, 2016 Apr.
- **71.** Davids JS, Alavi K, Andres Cervera-Servin J, et al. Routine preoperative restaging CTs after neoadjuvant chemoradiation for locally advanced rectal cancer are low yield: A retrospective case study. International Journal of Surgery 2014;12:1295-99.
- **72.** Schneider DA, Akhurst TJ, Ngan SY, et al. Relative Value of Restaging MRI, CT, and FDG-PET Scan After Preoperative Chemoradiation for Rectal Cancer. Dis Colon Rectum. 59(3):179-86, 2016 Mar.

- **73.** Sanli Y, Kuyumcu S, Ozkan ZG, et al. The utility of FDG-PET/CT as an effective tool for detecting recurrent colorectal cancer regardless of serum CEA levels. Ann Nucl Med. 26(7):551-8, 2012 Aug.
- **74.** Nishimura J, Hasegawa J, Ogawa Y, et al. (18)F-Fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography ((18)F-FDG PET) for the early detection of response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy for locally advanced rectal cancer. SURG. TODAY. 46(10):1152-8, 2016 Oct.
- **75.** Tsunoda Y, Ito M, Fujii H, Kuwano H, Saito N. Preoperative diagnosis of lymph node metastases of colorectal cancer by FDG-PET/CT. Jpn J Clin Oncol. 38(5):347-53, 2008 May.
- **76.** Thomas A.. 125 years of radiological research-BJR's history is radiology's history. Br J Radiol. 93(1105):20209002, 2020 Jan 01.
- **77.** Okitsu T, Nakazawa D, Nakagawa K, Okano T, Wada A. Synthesis and biological evaluation of 9Z-retinoic acid analogs having 2-substituted benzo[b]furan. Chem Pharm Bull (Tokyo). 58(3):418-22, 2010 Mar.
- **78.** Sorenson E, Lambreton F, Yu JQ, et al. Impact of PET/CT for Restaging Patients With Locally Advanced Rectal Cancer After Neoadjuvant Chemoradiation. J Surg Res. 243:242-248, 2019 11.
- **79.** Huh JW, Kwon SY, Lee JH, Kim HR. Comparison of restaging accuracy of repeat FDG-PET/CT with pelvic MRI after preoperative chemoradiation in patients with rectal cancer. J Cancer Res Clin Oncol. 141(2):353-9, 2015 Feb.
- **80.** van den Broek JJ, van der Wolf FS, Lahaye MJ, et al. Accuracy of MRI in Restaging Locally Advanced Rectal Cancer After Preoperative Chemoradiation. Dis Colon Rectum. 60(3):274-283, 2017 Mar.
- **81.** Kim H, Kim HM, Koom WS, et al. Profiling of rectal cancers MRI in pathological complete remission states after neoadjuvant concurrent chemoradiation therapy. Clin Radiol. 71(3):250-7, 2016 Mar.
- **82.** Nahas SC, Rizkallah Nahas CS, Sparapan Marques CF, et al. Pathologic Complete Response in Rectal Cancer: Can We Detect It? Lessons Learned From a Proposed Randomized Trial of Watch-and-Wait Treatment of Rectal Cancer. Dis Colon Rectum. 59(4):255-63, 2016 Apr.
- **83.** Fowler KJ, Kaur H, Cash BD, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria((R)) Pretreatment Staging of Colorectal Cancer. J Am Coll Radiol 2017;14:S234-S44.
- **84.** Wei MZ, Zhao ZH, Wang JY. The Diagnostic Accuracy of Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Restaging of Rectal Cancer After Preoperative Chemoradiotherapy: A Meta-Analysis and Systematic Review. [Review]. J Comput Assist Tomogr. 44(1):102-110, 2020 Jan/Feb.
- **85.** Beets-Tan RGH, Lambregts DMJ, Maas M, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging for clinical management of rectal cancer: Updated recommendations from the 2016 European Society of Gastrointestinal and Abdominal Radiology (ESGAR) consensus meeting. [Review]. Eur Radiol. 28(4):1465-1475, 2018 Apr.
- **86.** Blazic IM, Campbell NM, Gollub MJ. MRI for evaluation of treatment response in rectal cancer. Br J Radiol. 89(1064):20150964, 2016 Aug.
- **87.** Foti PV, Privitera G, Piana S, et al. Locally advanced rectal cancer: Qualitative and quantitative evaluation of diffusion-weighted MR imaging in the response assessment after neoadjuvant chemo-radiotherapy. Eur J Radiol Open. 3:145-52, 2016.

- **88.** Song I, Kim SH, Lee SJ, Choi JY, Kim MJ, Rhim H. Value of diffusion-weighted imaging in the detection of viable tumour after neoadjuvant chemoradiation therapy in patients with locally advanced rectal cancer: comparison with T2 weighted and PET/CT imaging. Br J Radiol 2012;85:577-86.
- **89.** Son IT, Kim YH, Lee KH, et al. Oncologic relevance of magnetic resonance imaging-detected threatened mesorectal fascia for patients with mid or low rectal cancer: A longitudinal analysis before and after long-course, concurrent chemoradiotherapy. Surgery. 162(1):152-163, 2017 07.
- **90.** Chung E, Kang D, Lee HS, et al. Accuracy of pelvic MRI in measuring tumor height in rectal cancer patients with or without preoperative chemoradiotherapy. Eur J Surg Oncol. 45(3):324-330, 2019 03.
- **91.** Corines MJ, Nougaret S, Weiser MR, Khan M, Gollub MJ. Gadolinium-Based Contrast Agent During Pelvic MRI: Contribution to Patient Management in Rectal Cancer. Dis Colon Rectum. 61(2):193-201, 2018 Feb.
- **92.** Lee ES, Kim MJ, Park SC, et al. Magnetic Resonance Imaging-Detected Extramural Venous Invasion in Rectal Cancer before and after Preoperative Chemoradiotherapy: Diagnostic Performance and Prognostic Significance. Eur Radiol. 28(2):496-505, 2018 Feb.
- **93.** Kalisz KR, Enzerra MD, Paspulati RM. MRI Evaluation of the Response of Rectal Cancer to Neoadjuvant Chemoradiation Therapy. [Review]. Radiographics. 39(2):538-556, 2019 MarApr.
- **94.** Jia X, Zhang Y, Wang Y, et al. MRI for Restaging Locally Advanced Rectal Cancer: Detailed Analysis of Discrepancies With the Pathologic Reference Standard. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 213(5):1081-1090, 2019 11.
- **95.** Chand M, Evans J, Swift RI, et al. The prognostic significance of postchemoradiotherapy high-resolution MRI and histopathology detected extramural venous invasion in rectal cancer. Ann Surg. 261(3):473-9, 2015 Mar.
- **96.** Lahaye MJ, Beets GL, Engelen SM, et al. Locally advanced rectal cancer: MR imaging for restaging after neoadjuvant radiation therapy with concomitant chemotherapy. Part II. What are the criteria to predict involved lymph nodes?. Radiology. 252(1):81-91, 2009 Jul.
- **97.** Heijnen LA, Maas M, Beets-Tan RG, et al. Nodal staging in rectal cancer: why is restaging after chemoradiation more accurate than primary nodal staging?. Int J Colorectal Dis. 31(6):1157-62, 2016 Jun.
- **98.** Sprenger T, Rothe H, Homayounfar K, et al. Preoperative chemoradiotherapy does not necessarily reduce lymph node retrieval in rectal cancer specimens--results from a prospective evaluation with extensive pathological work-up. J Gastrointest Surg. 14(1):96-103, 2010 Jan.
- **99.** Malakorn S, Yang Y, Bednarski BK, et al. Who Should Get Lateral Pelvic Lymph Node Dissection After Neoadjuvant Chemoradiation?. Dis Colon Rectum. 62(10):1158-1166, 2019 10.
- **100.** Loftas P, Sturludottir M, Hallbook O, Almlov K, Arbman G, Blomqvist L. Assessment of remaining tumour involved lymph nodes with MRI in patients with complete luminal response after neoadjuvant treatment of rectal cancer. Br J Radiol. 91(1087):20170938, 2018 Jul.

- **101.** Ogura A, Konishi T, Cunningham C, et al. Neoadjuvant (Chemo)radiotherapy With Total Mesorectal Excision Only Is Not Sufficient to Prevent Lateral Local Recurrence in Enlarged Nodes: Results of the Multicenter Lateral Node Study of Patients With Low cT3/4 Rectal Cancer. J Clin Oncol. 37(1):33-43, 2019 01 01.
- **102.** van Heeswijk MM, Lambregts DM, Palm WM, et al. DWI for Assessment of Rectal Cancer Nodes After Chemoradiotherapy: Is the Absence of Nodes at DWI Proof of a Negative Nodal Status?. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 208(3):W79-W84, 2017 Mar.
- **103.** Gollub MJ, Blazic I, Bates DDB, et al. Pelvic MRI after induction chemotherapy and before long-course chemoradiation therapy for rectal cancer: What are the imaging findings?. Eur Radiol. 29(4):1733-1742, 2019 Apr.
- **104.** Cote A, Florin FG, Mois E, et al. The accuracy of endorectal ultrasonography and high-resolution magnetic resonance imaging for restaging rectal cancer after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy. Ann Ital Chir. 89:168-176, 2018.
- **105.** Kye BH, Kim HJ, Kim G, Kim JG, Cho HM. Multimodal Assessments Are Needed for Restaging after Neoadjunvant Chemoradiation Therapy in Rectal Cancer Patients. Cancer Res. Treat.. 48(2):561-6, 2016 Apr.
- **106.** Li XT, Zhang XY, Sun YS, Tang L, Cao K. Evaluating rectal tumor staging with magnetic resonance imaging, computed tomography, and endoluminal ultrasound: A meta-analysis. Medicine (Baltimore). 95(44):e5333, 2016 Nov.
- **107.** Liu S, Zhong GX, Zhou WX, et al. Can Endorectal Ultrasound, MRI, and Mucosa Integrity Accurately Predict the Complete Response for Mid-Low Rectal Cancer After Preoperative Chemoradiation? A Prospective Observational Study from a Single Medical Center. Dis Colon Rectum. 61(8):903-910, 2018 08.
- **108.** Xiao Y, Xu D, Ju H, et al. Application value of biplane transrectal ultrasonography plus ultrasonic elastosonography and contrast-enhanced ultrasonography in preoperative T staging after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for rectal cancer. Eur J Radiol. 104:20-25, 2018 Jul.
- **109.** Gavioli M, Bagni A, Piccagli I, Fundaro S, Natalini G. Usefulness of endorectal ultrasound after preoperative radiotherapy in rectal cancer: comparison between sonographic and histopathologic changes. Dis Colon Rectum. 43(8):1075-83, 2000 Aug.
- **110.** Kulemann V, Schima W, Tamandl D, et al. Preoperative detection of colorectal liver metastases in fatty liver: MDCT or MRI? Eur J Radiol 2011;79:e1-6.
- **111.** van Kessel CS, van Leeuwen MS, van den Bosch MA, et al. Accuracy of multislice liver CT and MRI for preoperative assessment of colorectal liver metastases after neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Dig Surg. 2011; 28(1):36-43.
- **112.** Cance WG, Cohen AM, Enker WE, Sigurdson ER. Predictive value of a negative computed tomographic scan in 100 patients with rectal carcinoma. Dis Colon Rectum. 1991;34(9):748-751.
- **113.** Valls C, Andia E, Sanchez A, et al. Hepatic metastases from colorectal cancer: preoperative detection and assessment of resectability with helical CT. Radiology 2001;218:55-60.
- **114.** Numminen K, Isoniemi H, Halavaara J, et al. Preoperative assessment of focal liver lesions: multidetector computed tomography challenges magnetic resonance imaging. Acta Radiol

- **115.** Onishi H, Murakami T, Kim T, et al. Hepatic metastases: detection with multi-detector row CT, SPIO-enhanced MR imaging, and both techniques combined. Radiology 2006;239:131-8.
- **116.** Soyer P, Poccard M, Boudiaf M, et al. Detection of hypovascular hepatic metastases at triple-phase helical CT: sensitivity of phases and comparison with surgical and histopathologic findings. Radiology 2004;231:413-20.
- **117.** Brouquet A, Abdalla EK, Kopetz S, et al. High survival rate after two-stage resection of advanced colorectal liver metastases: response-based selection and complete resection define outcome. J Clin Oncol. 2011;29(8):1083-1090.
- **118.** Shindoh J, Loyer EM, Kopetz S, et al. Optimal morphologic response to preoperative chemotherapy: an alternate outcome end point before resection of hepatic colorectal metastases. J Clin Oncol 2012;30:4566-72.
- **119.** O'Leary MP, Parrish AB, Tom CM, MacLaughlin BW, Petrie BA. Staging Rectal Cancer: The Utility of Chest Radiograph and Chest Computed Tomography. Am Surg. 82(10):1005-1008, 2016 Oct.
- **120.** Kronawitter U, Kemeny NE, Heelan R, Fata F, Fong Y. Evaluation of chest computed tomography in the staging of patients with potentially resectable liver metastases from colorectal carcinoma. Cancer 1999;86:229-35.
- **121.** Grossmann I, Avenarius JK, Mastboom WJ, Klaase JM. Preoperative staging with chest CT in patients with colorectal carcinoma: not as a routine procedure. Ann Surg Oncol 2010;17:2045-50.
- **122.** Christoffersen MW, Bulut O, Jess P. The diagnostic value of indeterminate lung lesions on staging chest computed tomographies in patients with colorectal cancer. Dan Med Bull 2010;57:A4093.
- **123.** Choi DJ, Kwak JM, Kim J, Woo SU, Kim SH. Preoperative chest computerized tomography in patients with locally advanced mid or lower rectal cancer: its role in staging and impact on treatment strategy. J Surg Oncol 2010;102:588-92.
- **124.** McQueen AS, Scott J. CT staging of colorectal cancer: what do you find in the chest? Clin Radiol 2012;67:352-8.
- **125.** Mainenti PP, Iodice D, Segreto S, et al. Colorectal cancer and 18FDG-PET/CT: what about adding the T to the N parameter in loco-regional staging? World J Gastroenterol. 2011;17(11):1427-1433.
- **126.** Kinner S, Antoch G, Bockisch A, Veit-Haibach P. Whole-body PET/CT-colonography: a possible new concept for colorectal cancer staging. Abdom Imaging. 32(5):606-12, 2007 Sep-Oct.
- **127.** Veit-Haibach P, Kuehle CA, Beyer T, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of colorectal cancer staging with whole-body PET/CT colonography. JAMA. 296(21):2590-600, 2006 Dec 06.
- **128.** Ramos E, Valls C, Martinez L, et al. Preoperative staging of patients with liver metastases of colorectal carcinoma. Does PET/CT really add something to multidetector CT? Ann Surg Oncol 2011;18:2654-61.
- 129. Shin SS, Jeong YY, Min JJ, Kim HR, Chung TW, Kang HK. Preoperative staging of colorectal

- cancer: CT vs. integrated FDG PET/CT. [Review] [41 refs]. Abdom Imaging. 33(3):270-7, 2008 May-Jun.
- **130.** Briggs RH, Chowdhury FU, Lodge JP, Scarsbrook AF. Clinical impact of FDG PET-CT in patients with potentially operable metastatic colorectal cancer. Clin Radiol. 66(12):1167-74, 2011 Dec.
- **131.** Eglinton T, Luck A, Bartholomeusz D, Varghese R, Lawrence M. Positron-emission tomography/computed tomography (PET/CT) in the initial staging of primary rectal cancer. Colorectal Dis 2010;12:667-73.
- **132.** Llamas-Elvira JM, Rodriguez-Fernandez A, Gutierrez-Sainz J, et al. Fluorine-18 fluorodeoxyglucose PET in the preoperative staging of colorectal cancer. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 2007;34:859-67.
- **133.** Spatz J, Holl G, Sciuk J, Anthuber M, Arnholdt HM, Markl B. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy affects staging of colorectal liver metastasis--a comparison of PET, CT and intraoperative ultrasound. Int J Colorectal Dis 2011;26:165-71.
- **134.** Capirci C, Rubello D, Pasini F, et al. The role of dual-time combined 18-fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography and computed tomography in the staging and restaging workup of locally advanced rectal cancer, treated with preoperative chemoradiation therapy and radical surgery. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2009;74:1461-9.
- **135.** Berger-Kulemann V, Schima W, Baroud S, et al. Gadoxetic acid-enhanced 3.0 T MR imaging versus multidetector-row CT in the detection of colorectal metastases in fatty liver using intraoperative ultrasound and histopathology as a standard of reference. Eur J Surg Oncol 2012;38:670-6.
- **136.** Hammerstingl R, Huppertz A, Breuer J, et al. Diagnostic efficacy of gadoxetic acid (Primovist)-enhanced MRI and spiral CT for a therapeutic strategy: comparison with intraoperative and histopathologic findings in focal liver lesions. Eur Radiol 2008;18:457-67.
- **137.** Kim YK, Park G, Kim CS, Yu HC, Han YM. Diagnostic efficacy of gadoxetic acid-enhanced MRI for the detection and characterisation of liver metastases: comparison with multidetector-row CT. Br J Radiol. 85(1013):539-47, 2012 May.
- **138.** Knowles B, Welsh FK, Chandrakumaran K, John TG, Rees M. Detailed liver-specific imaging prior to pre-operative chemotherapy for colorectal liver metastases reduces intra-hepatic recurrence and the need for a repeat hepatectomy. HPB (Oxford) 2012;14:298-309.
- **139.** Koh DM, Collins DJ, Wallace T, Chau I, Riddell AM. Combining diffusion-weighted MRI with Gd-EOB-DTPA-enhanced MRI improves the detection of colorectal liver metastases. Br J Radiol 2012;85:980-9.
- **140.** Macera A, Lario C, Petracchini M, et al. Staging of colorectal liver metastases after preoperative chemotherapy. Diffusion-weighted imaging in combination with Gd-EOB-DTPA MRI sequences increases sensitivity and diagnostic accuracy. Eur Radiol. 23(3):739-47, 2013 Mar.
- **141.** Kim SH, Lee JM, Hong SH, et al. Locally advanced rectal cancer: added value of diffusion-weighted MR imaging in the evaluation of tumor response to neoadjuvant chemo- and radiation therapy. Radiology 2009;253:116-25.

- **142.** Koh DM, Collins DJ. Diffusion-weighted MRI in the body: applications and challenges in oncology. AJR Am J Roentgenol 2007;188:1622-35.
- **143.** Sugita R, Ito K, Fujita N, Takahashi S. Diffusion-weighted MRI in abdominal oncology: clinical applications. World J Gastroenterol 2010;16:832-6.
- **144.** Granata V, Fusco R, de Lutio di Castelguidone E, et al. Diagnostic performance of gadoxetic acid-enhanced liver MRI versus multidetector CT in the assessment of colorectal liver metastases compared to hepatic resection. BMC Gastroenterol. 19(1):129, 2019 Jul 24.
- **145.** Koh FHX, Tan KK, Teo LLS, Ang BWL, Thian YL. Prospective comparison between magnetic resonance imaging and computed tomography in colorectal cancer staging. ANZ J Surg. 88(6):E498-E502, 2018 Jun.
- **146.** American College of Radiology. ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Radiation Dose Assessment Introduction. Available at: https://edge.sitecorecloud.io/americancoldf5f-acrorgf92a-productioncb02-3650/media/ACR/Files/Clinical/Appropriateness-Criteria/ACR-Appropriateness-Criteria-Radiation-Dose-Assessment-Introduction.pdf.

Disclaimer

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.

aOregon Health and Science University, Portland, Oregon. ^bEmory University, Atlanta, Georgia. ^cPanel Chair, University of Wisconsin Hospital & Clinics, Madison, Wisconsin. ^dPanel Vice-Chair, University of California San Diego, San Diego, California. ^eUniversity of Texas Health Science Center at Houston and McGovern Medical School, Houston, Texas; American Gastroenterological Association. ^fBoston University Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts. ^gH. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center and Research Institute, Tampa, Florida; Commission on Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging. ^hPRiSMA Proctology Surgical Medicine & Associates, Houston, Texas; American College of Surgeons. ⁱVirginia Tech Carilion School of Medicine, Roanoke, Virginia. ^jMassachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts. ^kCleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio. ^lSutter Medical Group, Sacramento, California; Commission on Radiation Oncology. ^mDuke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina. ⁿUniversity of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama. ^oUniversity of California San Diego, San Diego, California. ^pUniversity of California San Francisco, San Francisco, California. ^qEmory University, Atlanta, Georgia; Society of General Internal Medicine, Primary care physician. ^rSpecialty Chair, Virginia Commonwealth University Medical Center, Richmond, Virginia.