

**American College of Radiology
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®
Liver Lesion-Initial Characterization**

Variant 1: Indeterminate, greater than 1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with US. Normal liver. No suspicion or evidence of extrahepatic malignancy or underlying liver disease.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
US abdomen with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase	Usually Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
MRI abdomen without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
Image-guided biopsy liver	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
CT abdomen without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
Liver spleen scan	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
RBC scan abdomen and pelvis	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
CT abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
DOTATATE PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
Octreotide scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT chest and abdomen	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕

Variant 2: Indeterminate, greater than 1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with CT (noncontrast or single-phase) or noncontrast MRI. Normal liver. No suspicion or evidence of extrahepatic malignancy or underlying liver disease.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase	Usually Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
US abdomen	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	○
US abdomen with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
Image-guided biopsy liver	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
Liver spleen scan	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
RBC scan abdomen and pelvis	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
CT abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
DOTATATE PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
Octreotide scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT chest and abdomen	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕

Variant 3:**Indeterminate, greater than 1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with US. Known history of an extrahepatic malignancy.**

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase	Usually Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
US abdomen with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
Image-guided biopsy liver	May Be Appropriate	Varies
MRI abdomen without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
CT abdomen without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
DOTATATE PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	May Be Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	May Be Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
Octreotide scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT chest and abdomen	May Be Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
CT abdomen without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
Liver spleen scan	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
RBC scan abdomen and pelvis	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕

Variant 4:**Indeterminate, greater than 1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with CT (noncontrast or single-phase) or noncontrast MRI. Known history of an extrahepatic malignancy.**

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase	Usually Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
US abdomen	May Be Appropriate	○
US abdomen with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
Image-guided biopsy liver	May Be Appropriate	Varies
CT abdomen without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
DOTATATE PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	May Be Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
Octreotide scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT chest and abdomen	May Be Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
Liver spleen scan	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
RBC scan abdomen and pelvis	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕

Variant 5:**Incidental liver lesion, greater than 1 cm on US, noncontrast or single-phase CT, or noncontrast MRI. Known chronic liver disease.**

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
US abdomen with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase	Usually Appropriate	☼☼☼
Image-guided biopsy liver	May Be Appropriate	Varies
Liver spleen scan	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼
RBC scan abdomen and pelvis	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼
CT abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼☼
DOTATATE PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼☼
Octreotide scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT chest and abdomen	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼☼

Variant 6:**Indeterminate, less than 1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with US. Known history of an extrahepatic malignancy.**

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
US abdomen with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
MRI abdomen without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase	May Be Appropriate	☼☼☼
Image-guided biopsy liver	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
CT abdomen without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼
Liver spleen scan	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼
RBC scan abdomen and pelvis	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼
CT abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼☼
DOTATATE PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼☼
Octreotide scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT chest and abdomen	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼☼

Variant 7:**Indeterminate, less than 1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with CT (noncontrast or single-phase) or noncontrast MRI. Known history of an extrahepatic malignancy.**

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase	Usually Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
US abdomen with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
Image-guided biopsy liver	May Be Appropriate	Varies
US abdomen	Usually Not Appropriate	○
Liver spleen scan	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
RBC scan abdomen and pelvis	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
CT abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
DOTATATE PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
Octreotide scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT chest and abdomen	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕

Variant 8:**Incidental liver lesion, less than 1 cm on US, noncontrast or single-phase CT, or noncontrast MRI. Known chronic liver disease.**

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase	Usually Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
US abdomen with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
Image-guided biopsy liver	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
Liver spleen scan	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
RBC scan abdomen and pelvis	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
CT abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
DOTATATE PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
Octreotide scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT chest and abdomen	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕

LIVER LESION-INITIAL CHARACTERIZATION

Expert Panel on Gastrointestinal Imaging: Victoria Chernyak, MD, MS^a; Jeanne M. Horowitz, MD^b; Ihab R. Kamel, MD, PhD^c; Hina Arif-Tiwari, MD^d; Mustafa R. Bashir, MD^e; Brooks D. Cash, MD^f; James Farrell, MD^g; Alan Goldstein, MD^h; Joseph R. Grajo, MDⁱ; Samir Gupta, MD^j; Nicole M. Hindman, MD^k; Aya Kamaya, MD^l; Michelle M. McNamara, MD^m; Kristin K. Porter, MD, PhDⁿ; Lilja Bjork. Solnes, MD, MBA^o; Pavan K. Srivastava, MD^p; Atif Zaheer, MD^q; Laura R. Carucci, MD.^r

Summary of Literature Review

Introduction/Background

Incidental liver masses are commonly discovered on imaging performed for other indications. Because the prevalence of benign focal liver lesions in adults is high, with at least one lesion seen in up to 15% of patients, accurate characterization of incidentally detected lesions is an important objective of diagnostic imaging [1].

Benign lesions are very common in the liver, and even in patients with primary malignancy, benign lesions unrelated to the known malignancy can be found in nearly 30% of patients [2]. Common benign liver masses include cysts, hemangiomas, and focal nodular hyperplasia (FNH). Common malignant tumors include metastases and hepatocellular carcinomas (HCCs). Less common liver masses include hepatocellular adenoma, intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma, fibrolamellar HCC, biliary cystadenoma and cystadenocarcinoma, lymphoma, stromal tumors, and a variety of sarcomas. On occasion, benign lesions and pseudolesions may mimic liver tumors. These mimics include focal fat deposition or sparing, intrahepatic vascular shunts, transient hepatic attenuation/intensity difference, abscess, hematoma, and peliosis hepatis. Patients with cirrhosis are a special patient population in whom certain benign (regenerating nodules), premalignant (dysplastic nodules), malignant (HCC), and nontumorous (confluent hepatic fibrosis) masses as well as pseudolesions (vascular shunts) are more prevalent than in the general population [3].

For each of the variants in this document, it is assumed that an imaging study has identified a lesion that was not fully characterized by the study that detected it. Prior imaging studies may include ultrasonography (US) with color-flow evaluation, noncontrast or contrast-enhanced multidetector helical CT, or noncontrast or contrast-enhanced MRI.

Management recommendations of incidental liver lesions were addressed in a recent white paper by the ACR Incidental Findings Committee ([Management of Incidental Liver Lesions on CT: A White Paper of the ACR Incidental Findings Committee](#)) [4]. The document addressed management guidance for incidental liver lesions detected on CT only. In contrast, this document addresses approaches to characterization of hepatic lesions detected with various modalities and in various clinical scenarios.

For purposes of increased clarity in this document, we combined the low-risk and average-risk individual into one category using the definitions as stated in the white paper (any age with no known malignancies, hepatic dysfunction, risk factors for HCC, or symptoms attributable to the liver). The definition of a high-risk individual in this document differs from that in the white paper in that we separate those individuals with pre-existing liver disease (cirrhosis and chronic hepatitis B without cirrhosis) from those with a known primary malignancy.

Special Imaging Considerations

When considering a definitive diagnosis of liver lesions, the dynamic pattern of lesion enhancement can guide the final diagnosis. Therefore, at least two dynamic imaging phases (ie, dual-phase) are required for characterization of most liver lesions. These phases include hepatic arterial phase and portal venous phase and are applicable to CT,

^aMontefiore Medical Center, Bronx, New York. ^bPanel Vice-Chair, Northwestern University, Chicago, Illinois. ^cPanel Chair, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland. ^dUniversity of Arizona, Banner University Medical Center, Tucson, Arizona. ^eDuke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina. ^fUniversity of Texas Health Science Center at Houston and McGovern Medical School, Houston, Texas; American Gastroenterological Association. ^gInterventional Endoscopy and Pancreatic Diseases, New Haven, Connecticut; American Gastroenterological Association. ^hUMass Medical School, Worcester, Massachusetts. ⁱUniversity of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, Florida. ^jRush University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois; American College of Surgeons. ^kNew York University Medical Center, New York, New York. ^lStanford University Medical Center, Stanford, California. ^mUniversity of Alabama Medical Center, Birmingham, Alabama. ⁿUniversity of Alabama Medical Center, Birmingham, Alabama. ^oJohns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center, Baltimore, Maryland. ^pUniversity of Illinois College of Medicine, Chicago, Illinois; American College of Physicians. ^qJohns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Maryland. ^rSpecialty Chair, Virginia Commonwealth University Medical Center, Richmond, Virginia.

The American College of Radiology seeks and encourages collaboration with other organizations on the development of the ACR Appropriateness Criteria through society representation on expert panels. Participation by representatives from collaborating societies on the expert panel does not necessarily imply individual or society endorsement of the final document.

Reprint requests to: publications@acr.org

MRI, and contrast-enhanced US (CEUS). For CT and MRI, late arterial phase is preferred over the early arterial phase, as maximal lesion enhancement compared with precontrast occurs more frequently during the late arterial phase [5]. It is important to note that these phases are required for assessment of liver lesions in patients with chronic liver disease, as stated in the *Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System (LI-RADS®)* [6].

For MRI, extracellular gadolinium-based contrast agents are commonly used in a variety of clinical settings. However, hepatobiliary contrast agents were developed to assist with detection and characterization of liver lesions. Two such agents are available: gadoxetate disodium and gadobenate dimeglumine. Hepatobiliary agents have the advantage of hepatobiliary phase (HBP) in addition to the dynamic postcontrast phases. In the HBP, parenchymal uptake of the contrast agent provides avid enhancement of the liver and therefore the ability to detect nonhepatocellular lesions. Of the two agents, gadoxetate is used more widely for HBP imaging as its HBP occurs approximately 20 minutes after injection as compared with 1 to 2 hours when using gadobenate.

CEUS has been recently approved for use in the United States, and has been used in Europe and Asia for >10 years [7]. Contrast agents used for CEUS are gas-filled microbubbles, stabilized by the shell of albumin, surfactants, or phospholipids [7]. Microbubbles are exclusively intravascular, and because of their small diameter (>7µm) are able to circulate in the capillary beds [7].

A positron-emitting radioisotope-labeled somatostatin analogue called Ga-68-DOTATATE utilized in PET/CT is designed to image neuroendocrine tumors (NETs). It offers a higher spatial resolution and considerably shorter imaging times compared with In-111 somatostatin receptor or metaiodobenzylguanidine scintigraphy [8].

Discussion of Procedures by Variant

Variant 1: Indeterminate, greater than 1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with US. Normal liver. No suspicion or evidence of extrahepatic malignancy or underlying liver disease.

CT Abdomen

In some cases, establishing the benign nature of the lesion, rather than a definitive diagnosis is sufficient. In differentiation between malignant and benign lesions, contrast-enhanced CT is accurate in 74% to 95% of cases [9,10]. Definitive diagnosis can be established on contrast-enhanced CT in 71% of patients, with additional imaging recommended in 10% of patients [11]. For patients with incidental liver lesions, multiphase contrast-enhanced CT has 91% to 95% accuracy for diagnosis of hemangioma, 85% to 93% accuracy for the diagnosis of FNH, and 96% to 99% accuracy for diagnosis of HCC [10,12]. For lesions detected on grayscale US, contrast-enhanced CT has sensitivity of 72% to 91%, specificity of 38% to 82%, positive predictive value (PPV) of 92%, negative predictive value (NPV) of 80%, and accuracy of 80% to 88% for establishing a definitive diagnosis [9,13]. CT of the abdomen with and without IV contrast is not recommended for this clinical scenario because there is no added value for unenhanced images.

FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

There is no relevant literature to support the use of fluorine-18-2-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose (FDG)-PET/CT in this clinical scenario.

DOTATATE PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

There is no relevant literature to support the use of Ga-68-DOTATATE PET/CT in this clinical scenario.

Octreotide Scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT Chest and Abdomen

There is no relevant literature to support the use of In-111 somatostatin receptor scan with single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) or SPECT/CT in this clinical scenario.

MRI Abdomen

In lesions detected on grayscale US, one study of MRI with and without intravenous (IV) contrast has sensitivity of 82% and specificity of 43% for establishing an exact diagnosis [14]. In another series, MRI with and without IV contrast is able to establish a definitive diagnosis in 95% of liver lesions, which is significantly higher than contrast-enhanced CT [11]. Furthermore, only 1.5% of patients with MRIs require recommendation for further imaging as opposed to 10% with CT [11]. Performance characteristics of MRI depend on the sequences and type of contrast, as well as the lesion itself. A combination of diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) and HBP allows correct classification of lesions as benign or malignant in 91% of cases and exact characterization in 85% of cases [15]. Gadoxetate-enhanced MRI has an accuracy of 95% to 99% for diagnosis of hemangioma, accuracy of 88% to 99% for the diagnosis of FNH, and accuracy of 97% for diagnosis of HCC in patients with incidentally discovered liver lesions [10,12]. For differentiation between adenoma and FNH, low signal on HBP is 100% specific, 92% sensitive,

and 97% accurate for hepatocellular adenoma [16]. However, it should be noted that inflammatory adenoma can mimic FNH on MRI [17]. For the diagnosis of a hemangioma, MRI with extracellular gadolinium contrast has sensitivity of 93%, specificity of 99%, accuracy of 98%, PPV of 96%, and NPV of 99% [18]. Although apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) values of solid benign lesions are higher than those of the solid malignant lesions, there is a considerable overlap of the ADC values between the two groups [19]. Therefore, in patients without a history of malignancy, the value of DWI for differentiating solid liver masses may be limited.

There is no relevant literature that has assessed the performance of MRI without IV contrast specifically for this clinical scenario. Therefore, the committee recommendations on the use of MRI without IV contrast are based primarily on expert opinion. In some cases, MRI without IV contrast may be appropriate, particularly if the initial US has a high index of suspicion for the diagnosis of a cyst.

Image-Guided Biopsy Liver

An indeterminate liver lesion detected on US is often further evaluated with a diagnostic CT or MRI prior to biopsy, in order to avoid biopsy of solid benign liver lesions such as hemangiomas or areas of FNH [4].

Percutaneous image-guided biopsy may be necessary to establish the diagnosis, particularly when the imaging features on a CT or MRI examination indicate possibility of malignancy. In some liver lesions, such as lymphoma, histopathologic analysis is the only technique that can make a definitive diagnosis [20]. Various techniques exist for guidance of the biopsy, and US and CT are the most commonly utilized modalities for biopsy guidance. When a biopsy is performed to diagnose or rule out malignancy in indeterminate lesions, the overall technical success rate under grayscale US guidance is 74%, which can be increased to 100% under CEUS guidance [21,22].

The percentage of tumor cells in the biopsy sample is greater with a higher number of collected biopsy samples [23]. Furthermore, for lesions not seen on grayscale US, the success rate for CEUS-guided biopsy can be as high as 88% to 96% [24,25]. US fusion with CT or MRI, can be used for percutaneous biopsy of lesions with poor sonographic conspicuity, with a 96% technical success rate [25]. Lesions that are isointense on CT can also present a challenge for CT-guided biopsy; however, use of anatomic landmarks or IV contrast can achieve accuracy of 96% to 98% [26].

Image-guided biopsies carry a risk of postbiopsy bleeding, which may be as high as 9% to 12%, particularly with hypervascular lesions [27,28]. In addition, a very small risk of needle-track seeding exists.

RBC Scan Abdomen and Pelvis

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m red blood cell (RBC) scan in this clinical scenario.

Liver Spleen Scan

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m sulfur colloid scan in this clinical scenario.

US Abdomen with Contrast

For patients with a lesion on grayscale US, addition of CEUS reduces the number of indeterminate diagnoses from 57% to 6%, and the sensitivity and specificity improve from 49% and 25% at baseline US to 93% and 75% with CEUS, respectively [29]. Furthermore, CEUS can reach a specific diagnosis in 77% to 93% and distinguish benign versus malignant lesions in 89% to 97% of indeterminate liver lesions discovered on grayscale US [9,30-32]. Of the complex cystic lesions found on grayscale US, CEUS correctly categorizes 95% of the malignant cases [33]. CEUS is comparable to CT for establishing a diagnosis for lesions detected on grayscale US, with sensitivity of 94% to 96%, specificity of 75% to 83%, PPV of 92%, NPV of 88%, and accuracy of 88% to 90% [13,14,29]. CEUS can definitively characterize an additional 41% of hemangiomas that are deemed indeterminate on a grayscale US [34].

For specific diagnoses, CEUS correctly characterizes 89% of areas of focal fat, 80% to 90% of hemangiomas, 87% of complex cysts, 78% of hepatic adenomas, 84% to 94% of FNHs, 86% of abscesses, and 60% of hematomas [14,30,35]. Typical pattern of enhancement on CEUS (eg, centripetal fill in during the arterial phase, hyper-enhanced lesion during venous and late phases) has 88% to 90% sensitivity, 99% specificity, 94% to 95% PPV, 97% to 98% NPV, and 97% accuracy for the diagnosis of hemangiomas [18,36]. In noncirrhotic patients, the hypoechoic pattern in portal and sinusoidal phase (rapid wash-out) or the markedly hypoechoic or anechoic pattern in sinusoidal phase (marked late wash-out) showed a sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy of 97%, 100% and 98%, respectively, for the diagnosis of malignancy [37].

Variant 2: Indeterminate, greater than 1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with CT (noncontrast or single-phase) or noncontrast MRI. Normal liver. No suspicion or evidence of extrahepatic malignancy or underlying liver disease.

CT Abdomen

Contrast-enhanced CT correctly differentiates between malignant and benign lesions in 74% to 95% of lesions [9,10]. For patients with incidental liver lesions, multiphase contrast-enhanced CT has 91% to 95% accuracy for diagnosis of hemangioma, 85% to 93% accuracy for the diagnosis of FNH, and 96% to 99% accuracy for diagnosis of HCC [10,12]. CT of the abdomen with and without IV contrast is not recommended for this clinical scenario because there is no added value for unenhanced images.

FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

There is no relevant literature to support the use of FDG-PET/CT in this clinical scenario.

DOTATATE PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

There is no relevant literature to support the use of Ga-68-DOTATATE PET/CT in this clinical scenario.

Octreotide Scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT Chest and Abdomen

There is no relevant literature to support the use of In-111 somatostatin receptor scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT in this clinical scenario.

MRI Abdomen

For small (≤ 2 cm) lesions deemed indeterminate on CT with and without IV contrast, MRI with and without IV contrast has sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV of 68%, 94%, 76%, and 91%, respectively, for the correct classification of the lesion as benign or malignant [38]. Combination of DWI and HBP allows correct classification of lesions as benign or malignant in 91% of cases, and exact characterization in 85% of cases [15]. Compared with noncontrast MRI, gadoxetate-enhanced MRI allows for improved characterization of FNH with an accuracy of 68% versus 88%, respectively [12]. For patients with incidental liver lesions, gadoxetate-enhanced MRI has 95% to 99% accuracy for diagnosis of hemangioma, 95% to 99% accuracy for the diagnosis of FNH, and 97% accuracy for diagnosis of HCC [10]. Although ADC values of solid benign lesions are higher than that of the solid malignant lesions, there is a considerable overlap of the ADC values between the two groups [19]. Therefore, in patients without a history of malignancy, the value of DWI for differentiating solid liver masses may be limited.

Image-Guided Biopsy Liver

Percutaneous image-guided biopsy may be necessary to establish the diagnosis, particularly when the imaging features on a CT or MRI examination indicate possibility of malignancy. In some liver lesions, such as lymphoma, histopathologic analysis is the only technique that can make a definitive diagnosis [20]. Various techniques exist for guidance of the biopsy, and US and CT are the most commonly utilized modalities for biopsy guidance. When a biopsy is performed to diagnose or rule out malignancy in indeterminate lesions, the overall technical success rate under grayscale US guidance is 74%, which can be increased to 100% under CEUS guidance [21,22].

The percentage of tumor cells in the biopsy sample is greater with a higher number of collected biopsy samples [23]. Furthermore, for lesions not seen on grayscale US, the success rate for CEUS-guided biopsy can be as high as 88% to 96% [24,25]. US fusion with CT or MRI, can be used for percutaneous biopsy of lesions with poor sonographic conspicuity, with a 96% technical success rate [25]. Lesions that are isointense on CT can also present a challenge for CT-guided biopsy; however, use of anatomic landmarks or IV contrast can achieve accuracy of 96% to 98% [26].

Image-guided biopsies carry a risk of postbiopsy bleeding, which may be as high as 9% to 12%, particularly with hypervascular lesions [27,28]. In addition, a very small risk of needle-track seeding exists.

RBC Scan Abdomen and Pelvis

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m RBC scan in this clinical scenario.

Liver Spleen Scan

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m sulfur colloid scan in this clinical scenario.

US Abdomen

Diagnostic accuracy of grayscale US is 41% to 68% for specific diagnosis and 86% for differentiation between malignant and benign lesions [9,29]. US can be helpful in some cases due to its ability to characterize a lesion as a

cyst. Doppler evaluation of flow is an integral part of the clinical grayscale US examination. However, none of the reviewed studies specifically compared performance of US examinations with and without the addition of Doppler.

US Abdomen with Contrast

In a small retrospective study of solid indeterminate lesions detected on contrast-enhanced CT in patients without parenchymal liver disease, addition of CEUS improves diagnostic accuracy from 43% to 49% to 89% to 92% [39]. CEUS is able to provide correct diagnosis in 89% of cases and can distinguish between benign and malignant lesions in 97% of cases [9]. In noncirrhotic patients, the hypoechoic pattern in portal and sinusoidal phase (rapid wash-out) or the markedly hypoechoic or anechoic pattern in sinusoidal phase (marked late wash-out) showed a sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy of 97%, 100%, and 98%, respectively, for the diagnosis of malignancy [37].

Variant 3: Indeterminate, greater than 1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with US. Known history of an extrahepatic malignancy.

CT Abdomen

In patients with a history of primary malignancy, contrast-enhanced CT can differentiate between metastases and benign lesions with 74% accuracy [40]. Specifically, in patients with a history of colon cancer, lesion characterization on contrast-enhanced CT is correct in 77% of cases [41]. When metastases are suspected based on US, the sensitivity and specificity of contrast-enhanced CT for detection of metastases are 88% and 17%, respectively [42].

In patients with hypervascular liver metastases, addition of noncontrast CT can improve the confidence level for lesion characterization by 4% to 15%; however, it does not change the diagnostic accuracy [43]. The addition of noncontrast CT can increase sensitivity for breast cancer metastases by 5% to 23% but does not improve sensitivity for melanoma metastases [44]. Sensitivity of noncontrast CT alone is 61% to 100% for breast cancer metastases, 62% to 100% for melanoma metastases, and 17% to 88% for NET metastases [44]. In comparison, contrast-enhanced CT has sensitivity of 77% to 95% for breast cancer metastases, 86% to 100% for melanoma metastases, and 44% to 77% for NET metastases [44,45].

FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

In patients with a history of primary malignancy, FDG-PET/CT can differentiate between malignant and benign lesions with an accuracy of 75% [40]. When metastases are suspected based on US, the sensitivity and specificity of PET/CT in the detection of hepatic metastases is 97% and 75%, respectively, which is higher, compared with contrast-enhanced CT alone with sensitivity and specificity of 88% and 17%, respectively [42].

DOTATATE PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

In patients with primary NET, Ga-68-DOTATATE PET/CT demonstrates sensitivity of 80% to 100% and of specificity 82% to 100% [8]. Specifically, Ga-68-DOTATATE PET/CT is more sensitive than FDG-PET/CT, with sensitivities of 72% to 100% versus 54% to 78%, respectively [8]. Ga-68-DOTATATE PET/CT is not used in assessment metastases from primary cancers other than NET.

Octreotide Scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT Chest and Abdomen

Sensitivity of In-111 somatostatin receptor scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT varies depending on the specific histologic type of the primary NET. For example, detection rates are >75% in small-cell-lung cancer and carcinoid metastases and 40% to 75% in insulinoma and medullary thyroid cancers [46].

MRI Abdomen

In patients with a history of primary malignancy, noncontrast MRI can differentiate between malignant and benign lesions with an accuracy of 71% [47]. The accuracy increases to between 83% and 91% with the addition of dynamic postcontrast sequences and further increases to 94% with the addition of HBP [47,48]. In patients with a history of colon cancer, the lesion characterization on contrast-enhanced MRI is correct in 89% of cases [41]. In patients with suspected colorectal liver metastases, the combination of gadoxetate-enhanced MRI and DWI shows significantly higher accuracy (90%–93%) for the preoperative detection of small colorectal liver metastases than DWI alone [49]. In patients with known primary cancer, ADC values can help to distinguish between metastasis and benign solid hepatic lesions [50].

Image-Guided Biopsy Liver

Percutaneous image-guided biopsy may be necessary to establish the diagnosis, particularly when the imaging features on a CT or MRI examination indicate a possibility of malignancy. In some liver lesions, such as lymphoma, histopathologic analysis is the only technique that can make a definitive diagnosis [20]. Various techniques exist

for guidance of the biopsy, where US and CT are the most commonly utilized modalities for biopsy guidance. When a biopsy is performed to diagnose or rule out malignancy in indeterminate lesions, the overall technical success rate under grayscale US guidance is 74%, which can be increased to 100% under CEUS guidance [21,22].

The percentage of tumor cells in the biopsy sample is greater with a higher number of collected biopsy samples [23]. Furthermore, for lesions not seen on grayscale US, the success rate for CEUS-guided biopsy can be as high as 88% to 96% [24,25]. US fusion with CT or MRI can be used for percutaneous biopsy of lesions with poor sonographic conspicuity with a 96% technical success rate [25]. Lesions which are isointense on CT can also present a challenge for CT-guided biopsy; however, use of anatomic landmarks or IV contrast can achieve accuracy of 96% to 98% [26].

Image-guided biopsies carry a risk of postbiopsy bleeding, which may be as high as 9% to 12%, particularly with hypervascular lesions [27,28]. In addition, a very small risk of needle-track seeding exists.

RBC Scan Abdomen and Pelvis

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m RBC scan in this clinical scenario.

Liver Spleen Scan

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m sulfur colloid scan in this clinical scenario.

US Abdomen with Contrast

Depending on the appearance of the lesion on the initial US, CEUS may be performed for lesion characterization. CEUS can differentiate between malignant and benign lesions in 90% of lesions [48]. Diagnostic accuracy of CEUS for metastases is 83% compared with 76% for MRI with extracellular contrast agent [35]. In noncirrhotic patients, the hypoechoic pattern in portal and sinusoidal phase (rapid wash-out) or the markedly hypoechoic or anechoic pattern in sinusoidal phase (marked late wash-out) showed a sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy of 97%, 100%, and 98%, respectively, for the diagnosis of malignancy [37].

Variant 4: Indeterminate, greater than 1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with CT (noncontrast or single-phase) or noncontrast MRI. Known history of an extrahepatic malignancy.

CT Abdomen

In patients with a history of primary malignancy, contrast-enhanced CT can differentiate between metastases and benign lesions with 74% accuracy [40]. Specifically, in patients with a history of colon cancer, lesion characterization on contrast-enhanced CT is correct in 77% of cases [41].

In patients with hypervascular liver metastases, adding a noncontrast CT phase to a contrast-enhanced CT examination can improve the confidence level for lesion characterization by 4% to 15%; however, it does not change the diagnostic accuracy [43]. The addition of noncontrast CT can increase sensitivity for breast cancer metastases by 5% to 23% but does not improve sensitivity for melanoma metastases [44]. Sensitivity of noncontrast CT alone is 61% to 100% for breast cancer metastases, 62% to 100% for melanoma metastases, and 17% to 88% for NET metastases [44]. In comparison, contrast-enhanced CT has a sensitivity of 77% to 95% for breast cancer metastases, 86% to 100% for melanoma metastases, and 44% to 82% for NET metastases [44,45].

FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

In patients with a history of primary malignancy, FDG-PET/CT can differentiate between malignant and benign lesions with an accuracy of 75% [40]. In patients with a history of primary cancer and indeterminate lesions found by either CT or MRI, FDG-PET/CT has an accuracy of 75% with a high sensitivity of 96% and a limited specificity of 33% [40].

The sensitivity and specificity of FDG-PET/CT in the detection of hepatic metastases is 97% and 75%, respectively, which is higher compared with contrast-enhanced CT alone (which has a sensitivity and specificity of 88% and 17%, respectively) [42].

DOTATATE PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

In patients with primary NET, Ga-68-DOTATATE PET/CT demonstrates sensitivity of 80% to 100% and specificity of 82% to 100% [8]. Specifically, Ga-68-DOTATATE PET/CT is more sensitive than FDG-PET/CT, with sensitivities of 72% to 100% versus 54% to 78%, respectively [8].

Octreotide Scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT Chest and Abdomen

Sensitivity of a In-111 somatostatin receptor scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT varies depending on the specific histologic type of the primary NET. For example, detection rates are >75% in small-cell-lung cancer and carcinoid metastases and 40% to 75% in insulinoma and medullary thyroid cancers [46].

MRI Abdomen

In patients with a history of primary malignancy, noncontrast MRI can differentiate between malignant and benign lesions with accuracy of 71% [47]. The accuracy increases by between 83% and 91% with the addition of dynamic postcontrast sequences and further increases to 94% with addition of HBP [47,48]. In patients with a history of colon cancer, the lesion characterization on contrast-enhanced MRI is correct in 89% of cases [41]. In patients with suspected colorectal liver metastases, the combination of gadoxetate-enhanced MRI and DWI shows significantly higher accuracy (90% to 93%) for the preoperative detection of small colorectal liver metastases than DWI alone [49]. In patients with known primary cancer, ADC values can help to distinguish between metastasis and benign solid hepatic lesions [50].

Image-Guided Biopsy Liver

Percutaneous image-guided biopsy may be necessary to establish the diagnosis, particularly when the imaging features on a CT or MRI examination indicate possibility of malignancy. In patients with a history of primary malignancy, 91% of biopsies are positive for malignancy, 5% of which can be different from the primary cancer [51]. Up to 6% of biopsies in patients with primary malignancy are nondiagnostic [51].

In some liver lesions, such as lymphoma, histopathologic analysis is the only technique that can make a definitive diagnosis [20]. Various techniques exist for guidance of the biopsy, and US and CT are the most commonly utilized modalities for biopsy guidance. When a biopsy is performed to diagnose or rule out malignancy in indeterminate lesions, the overall technical success rate under grayscale US guidance is 74%, which can be increased to 100% under CEUS guidance [21,22].

The percentage of tumor cells in the biopsy sample is greater with a higher number of collected biopsy samples [23]. Furthermore, for lesions not seen on grayscale US, the success rate for CEUS-guided biopsy can be as high as 88% to 96% [24,25]. US fusion with CT or MRI, can be used for percutaneous biopsy of lesions with poor sonographic conspicuity, with a 96% technical success rate [25]. Lesions that are iso-intense on CT can also present a challenge for CT-guided biopsy; however, use of anatomic landmarks or IV contrast can achieve an accuracy of 96% to 98% [26].

The image-guided biopsies carry a risk of postbiopsy bleeding that may be as high as 9% to 12%, particularly with hypervascular lesions [27,28]. In addition, a small risk of needle-track seeding exists. In patients with HCC, the rate of seeding is 0.1% to 0.7% [52-54].

RBC Scan Abdomen and Pelvis

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m RBC scan in this clinical scenario.

Liver Spleen Scan

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m sulfur colloid scan in this clinical scenario.

US Abdomen

Grayscale US is able to provide correct diagnosis in 68% of liver lesions [9]. For differentiation between malignant and benign lesions, US is correct in 86% of cases [9].

US Abdomen with Contrast

In noncirrhotic patients, the hypoechoic pattern in portal and sinusoidal phase (rapid wash-out) or the markedly hypoechoic or anechoic pattern in sinusoidal phase (marked late wash-out) showed a sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy of 97%, 100%, and 98%, respectively, for the diagnosis of malignancy [37].

In a small retrospective study of patients with primary pancreatic adenocarcinoma, CT and CEUS have similar sensitivities for detection of metastases (73% versus 80%, respectively) [2]. However, CEUS is able to more accurately differentiate between an incidental benign lesion (eg, cysts, vascular shunts) from metastases, resulting in fewer false-positive diagnoses and therefore higher PPV (60% versus 92%) [2]. The accuracy of CEUS for diagnosis of metastases is 76% [35].

Variant 5: Incidental liver lesion, greater than 1 cm on US, noncontrast or single-phase CT, or noncontrast MRI. Known chronic liver disease.

Evaluation of liver lesions detected in a patient with chronic liver disease should be performed based on the algorithm set forth by the most recent version of LI-RADS [6,55].

CT Abdomen

The sensitivity of a dual-phase contrast-enhanced CT for diagnosing a small HCC (<2 cm) is 53% [56]. In patients with chronic liver disease, triple-phase contrast-enhanced CT correctly characterizes lesions in 49% to 68% of cases and has a sensitivity of 61% to 73% for lesion detection [57]. Delayed phase wash-out on CT is important in HCC diagnosis [58]. For 1- to 2-cm lesions in patients with cirrhosis detected on screening US, the addition of noncontrast CT to dynamic postcontrast phases (CT without and with IV contrast) does not increase sensitivity or accuracy for HCC [59].

FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

FDG-PET/CT has a limited role in characterization of liver lesions in patients with parenchymal liver disease [6]. Once the diagnosis of HCC is established, tumor FDG activity may predict microvascular invasion [60].

DOTATATE PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

There is no relevant literature to support the use of Ga-68-DOTATATE PET/CT in this clinical scenario.

Octreotide Scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT Chest and Abdomen

There is no relevant literature to support the use of In-111 somatostatin receptor scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT in this clinical scenario.

MRI Abdomen

In patients with chronic liver disease, noncontrast MRI has a sensitivity of 46% to 59% for lesion detection; addition of postcontrast phases with gadoxetate increases sensitivity to 68% to 80% [57]. Gadoxetate-enhanced MRI demonstrates a higher proportion of correctly characterized lesions (50%–72%) than noncontrast MRI (30%–50%) [57].

MRI with extracellular agents has a sensitivity of 78% to 83% and specificity of 100% [35,61]. Addition of HBP improves sensitivity and accuracy for nodules <2 cm [62]. The sensitivity of MRI with gadoxetate for diagnosing a small HCC (<2 cm) is 76% to 97% [56,63]. Addition of HBP improves detection of HCC and differentiation between HCC and dysplastic nodules [64,65]. Furthermore, addition of HBP improves sensitivity and accuracy for diagnosis of HCC, compared with the dynamic images alone [66,67]. Gadoxetate-enhanced MRI allows for correct characterization of liver lesions in 87% to 91% of cases [63]. However, the HBP on gadoxetate-enhanced MRI can be limited in the setting of poor liver function, and transient hepatic enhancement differences can cause artifacts in the HBP in cirrhotic patients [68,69].

In patients with chronic liver disease, the mean ADC values in benign solid lesions are higher than those in malignant lesions [70]. In small (<3 cm) lesions, presence of high signal intensity on both T2-weighted imaging and DWI helps differentiate atypical HCCs from dysplastic nodules, with the resultant sensitivity of 80%, specificity of 100%, PPV of 100%, and NPV of 78.3% [71]. For lesions <3 cm in patients with cirrhosis, the sensitivity and accuracy to differentiate the dysplastic nodule from HCC are 46% to 82% and 57% to 75%, respectively [72,73]. The addition of DWI to dynamic sequences improved its ability to distinguish between HCC and dysplastic nodules compared with dynamic sequences alone, with a resultant accuracy of 93% and sensitivity of 97% [73].

Image-Guided Biopsy Liver

Biopsy plays a minor role in establishing the diagnosis of HCC because the imaging criteria of LI-RADS category 5 (definite HCC) can establish such diagnosis with nearly 100% specificity and PPV [6,74]. Biopsy may be necessary if the imaging features of the lesion do not meet the criteria for LI-RADS 5 (definite HCC) category or for molecular analysis to determine clinical trial eligibility or to guide treatment [74]. Overall risk of bleeding for image-guided biopsy can be as high as 12% [27]. An additional risk in biopsy of HCC is a risk of needle-tract seeding, with track seeding incidence being 2.7% overall and 0.1% to 0.9% per year [52-54,75].

RBC Scan Abdomen and Pelvis

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m RBC scan in this clinical scenario.

Liver Spleen Scan

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m sulfur colloid scan in this clinical scenario.

US Abdomen with Contrast

For indeterminate liver lesions detected on US, CEUS can provide definitive diagnosis in 77% to 93% of cases and can distinguish between benign and malignant lesions in 89% to 96% of cases [31,32]. The sensitivity of CEUS for diagnosing a small HCC (<2 cm) is 68% compared with 53% for contrast-enhanced CT and 77% for gadolinium-ethoxybenzyl-diethylenetriamine pentaacetic acid MRI in the same study [56]. Diagnostic accuracy of CEUS for HCC is 79% [35].

Assessment of nodule vascularity on CEUS can help determine the progression from regenerative nodules, dysplastic nodules and HCC in lesions measuring 1 to 3.5 cm [76]. For lesions <3 cm in patients with cirrhosis, the sensitivity and accuracy to differentiate the dysplastic nodule from HCC on CEUS are 59% and 67%, respectively [72]. For small nodules (1–2 cm) in cirrhosis, the sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy of CEUS for diagnosing HCC are 87%, 100%, and 93%, respectively [77].

On CEUS, HCC typically shows a global arterial hyperenhancement and a delayed contrast wash-out, whereas intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma shows an initial contrast enhancement primarily at the tumor periphery followed by an early portal-venous contrast wash-out in the tumor center [78]. CEUS can accurately differentiate between intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma and HCC [79].

Variant 6: Indeterminate, less than 1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with US. Known history of an extrahepatic malignancy.

CT Abdomen

Typically, resolution of CT does not allow for definitive characterization of lesions <1 cm. For instance, small hypervascular metastases may be difficult to distinguish from flash-filling hemangiomas [80]. However, between 78% and 84% of small (lesions ≤1 cm in diameter are deemed too small to characterize by the interpreting radiologist) hypodense lesions in patients with primary malignancy are benign [81-83].

CT of the abdomen with and without IV contrast is not recommended for this clinical scenario because there is no added value for unenhanced images.

FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

In patients with a history of primary malignancy, FDG-PET/CT may be indicated to evaluate for presence of metastases beyond the liver. Current literature does not support the use of FDG-PET/CT specifically to characterize subcentimeter liver lesions due to its limited sensitivity for lesions <1 cm.

DOTATATE PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

Ga-68-DOTATATE PET/CT is sensitive for detection of metastases in patients with primary NET; however, there is no relevant literature on assessment of subcentimeter liver lesions.

Octreotide Scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT Chest and Abdomen

In patients with a history of primary NET, In-111 somatostatin receptor scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT can detect liver metastases; however, there is no relevant literature to support the use of this procedure in characterization of subcentimeter liver lesions.

MRI Abdomen

On MRI with gadoxetate, the combination of HBP and DWI has the highest accuracy for detection of subcentimeter liver lesions [15]. ADC values can help differentiate benign versus malignant subcentimeter liver lesions with 92% to 93% accuracy [84].

There is no relevant literature that has assessed the performance of MRI without IV contrast specifically for this clinical scenario. Therefore, the committee recommendations on the use of MRI without IV contrast are based primarily on expert opinion. In some cases, MRI without IV contrast may be appropriate as it can differentiate between small cysts and solid lesions.

Image-Guided Biopsy Liver

Tissue sampling may be necessary to establish the definitive diagnosis in patients with a history of primary malignancy and indeterminate subcentimeter liver lesions. However, the role of percutaneous biopsy is limited in the evaluation of subcentimeter liver lesions because such lesions are typically difficult to target under image guidance. Furthermore, there is no relevant literature to assess performance of percutaneous biopsy techniques for subcentimeter liver lesions.

RBC Scan Abdomen and Pelvis

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m RBC scan in this clinical scenario.

Liver Spleen Scan

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m sulfur colloid scan in this clinical scenario.

US Abdomen with Contrast

Compared with a baseline grayscale US, CEUS can detect 6.5 times more subcentimeter metastases [9]. For indeterminate liver lesions discovered on grayscale US, CEUS reached a specific diagnosis in 83% of cases and distinguished benign versus malignant in 90% of cases [30]. For the benign diagnoses, CEUS correctly characterized 89% of areas of focal fat, 90% of hemangiomas, 87% of complex cysts, 78% of hepatic adenomas, 90% of FNHs, 86% of abscesses, and 60% of hematomas [30]. CEUS correctly characterized 86% of metastases [30].

Variant 7: Indeterminate, less than 1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with CT (noncontrast or single-phase) or noncontrast MRI. Known history of an extrahepatic malignancy.

CT Abdomen

Subcentimeter liver lesions in patients with primary malignancy are seen on contrast-enhanced CT in 13% of patients, and of these, 12% are metastases [82]. Among patients with a history of colorectal and breast cancers, small hepatic lesions were metastatic in 14% and 22% of cases, respectively [82]. Subcentimeter liver lesions in women with breast cancer can be found in 29%, and if no obvious liver metastases are present, 93% to 97% of these subcentimeter liver lesions are benign [85].

CT of the abdomen with and without IV contrast is not recommended for this clinical scenario because there is no added value for unenhanced images.

FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

In patients with a history of primary malignancy, FDG-PET/CT may be indicated to evaluate for the presence of metastases beyond the liver. There is no relevant literature to support the use of FDG-PET/CT specifically to characterize subcentimeter liver lesions due to its limited sensitivity for lesions <1 cm.

DOTATATE PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

Ga-68-DOTATATE PET/CT is sensitive for detection of metastases in patients with primary NET; however, there is no relevant literature on assessment of subcentimeter liver lesions.

Octreotide Scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT Chest and Abdomen

In patients with a history of primary NET, In-111 somatostatin receptor scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT can detect liver metastases; however, there is no relevant literature on assessment of subcentimeter liver lesions.

MRI Abdomen

For subcentimeter liver lesions detected on CT, the sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV for differentiation of benign from malignant lesions for contrast-enhanced MRI are 83%, 98%, 92%, and 94%, respectively [86]. In patients with a history of colon cancer, MRI has a sensitivity of 60% for detection of subcentimeter metastases [87].

There is no relevant literature that has assessed the performance of MRI without IV contrast specifically for this clinical scenario. Therefore, the committee recommendations on the use of MRI without IV contrast are based primarily on expert opinion.

Image-Guided Biopsy Liver

Tissue sampling may be necessary to establish the definitive diagnosis in patients with a history of primary malignancy and indeterminate subcentimeter liver lesions. However, the role of percutaneous biopsy is limited in the evaluation of subcentimeter liver lesions because such lesions are typically difficult to target under image guidance. Furthermore, published data are not available to assess performance of percutaneous biopsy techniques for subcentimeter liver lesions.

RBC Scan Abdomen and Pelvis

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m RBC scan in this clinical scenario.

Liver Spleen Scan

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m sulfur colloid scan in this clinical scenario.

US Abdomen

In patients with a history of primary malignancy and indeterminate, subcentimeter focal liver lesions on CT, grayscale US is able to prove cystic nature of the lesion in 67% of cases [88].

US Abdomen with Contrast

In patients with a history of primary malignancy and indeterminate, subcentimeter focal liver lesions on CT that were proven to be noncystic on grayscale US, CEUS correctly characterizes 95% of lesions overall, and 98% of metastases [88]. Compared with a baseline dual-phase contrast-enhanced CT, CEUS can detect 6.5 times more subcentimeter metastases [9].

Variant 8: Incidental liver lesion, less than 1 cm on US, noncontrast or single-phase CT, or noncontrast MRI. Known chronic liver disease.

Evaluation of liver lesions detected in a patient with chronic liver disease should be performed based on the algorithm set forth by the most recent version of LI-RADS [6,55]. Please note that a size ≥ 10 mm is required for definitive diagnosis of HCC [89].

CT Abdomen

If imaging assessment is desired in this clinical scenario, multiphase CT is appropriate, per LI-RADS technical recommendations. Triple-phase contrast-enhanced CT has a sensitivity of 26% to 47% for detection of subcentimeter liver lesions in patients with chronic liver disease [57]. Contrast-enhanced CT has an accuracy of 60%, sensitivity of 56%, and specificity of 67% for diagnosing HCC ≤ 1 cm [90].

CT of the abdomen with and without IV contrast is not recommended for this clinical scenario because there is no added value for unenhanced images.

FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

There is no relevant literature to support the use of FDG-PET/CT in this clinical scenario.

DOTATATE PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

There is no relevant literature to support the use of Ga-68-DOTATATE PET/CT in this clinical scenario.

Octreotide Scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT Chest and Abdomen

There is no relevant literature to support the use of In-111 somatostatin receptor scan with SPECT or SPECT/CT in this clinical scenario.

MRI Abdomen

Dynamic MRI has an accuracy of 66%, sensitivity of 58% to 91%, and specificity of 29% for diagnosing HCC ≤ 1 cm [90,91]. Gadoxetate-enhanced MRI is superior for detection of subcentimeter liver lesions compared with triple-phase contrast-enhanced CT, with the sensitivities of 38% to 55% versus 26% to 47%, respectively [57]. Addition of HBP can improve the detection of HCCs < 1 cm from 85% to 96% [67].

There is no relevant literature that has assessed the performance of MRI without IV contrast specifically for this clinical scenario. Therefore, the committee recommendations on the use of MRI without IV contrast are based primarily on expert opinion.

Image-Guided Biopsy Liver

As with other liver lesions, percutaneous biopsy of small HCCs may be technically challenging. In small HCCs (≤ 20 mm), the initial biopsy is diagnostic in 70% of cases [92]. There is no relevant literature evaluating percutaneous biopsy for subcentimeter liver lesions. Even after a successful biopsy, the interpretation of the pathology specimen may not be straightforward, with the overwhelming diagnostic challenge for hypovascular liver nodules on pathology being the differentiation of high-grade dysplastic nodules from well-differentiated small HCC [93]. Overall risk of bleeding for image-guided biopsy is as high as 12% [27]. An additional risk in the biopsy of HCCs is the risk of needle-tract seeding, with track seeding incidence of 2.7% overall and 0.1% to 0.9% per year [52-54,75].

RBC Scan Abdomen and Pelvis

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m RBC scan in this clinical scenario.

Liver Spleen Scan

There is no relevant literature to support the use of a Tc-99m sulfur colloid scan in this clinical scenario.

US Abdomen with Contrast

For indeterminate liver lesions discovered on US, CEUS reached a specific diagnosis in 83% and distinguished benign versus malignant in 90% of cases [30]. For the benign diagnoses, CEUS correctly characterized 89% of areas of focal fat, 90% of hemangiomas, 87% of complex cysts, 78% hepatic adenomas, 90% of FNHs, 86% of abscesses, and 60% of hematomas [30]. CEUS correctly characterized 76% of HCCs and 25% of intrahepatic cholangiocarcinomas [30]. CEUS can distinguish between HCC and FNH with 82% accuracy and 87% sensitivity [94].

Summary of Recommendations

- **Variante 1:** CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase, MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast, or US abdomen with IV contrast is usually appropriate for the imaging of an indeterminate >1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with US in a normal liver with no suspicion or evidence of extrahepatic malignancy or underlying liver disease. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care).
- **Variante 2:** CT abdomen and pelvis with IV contrast multiphase or MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast is usually appropriate for the imaging of an indeterminate >1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with CT (noncontrast or single-phase) or noncontrast MRI in a normal liver with no suspicion or evidence of extrahepatic malignancy or underlying liver disease. 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 abdomen in patients in this clinical scenario. There is insufficient medical literature to conclude whether or not these patients would benefit from this procedure. This procedure is controversial but may be appropriate.
- **Variante 3:** MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast or CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase is usually appropriate for the imaging of an indeterminate >1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with US for patients with a known history of an extrahepatic malignancy. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care).
- **Variante 4:** MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast, CT abdomen with IV multiphase, or FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh is usually appropriate for the imaging of an indeterminate >1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with CT (noncontrast or single-phase) or noncontrast MRI in patients with a known history of an extrahepatic malignancy. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care).
- **Variante 5:** MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast, CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase, or US abdomen with IV contrast is usually appropriate for the imaging of an incidental liver lesion >1 cm on US, noncontrast, or single-phase CT, or noncontrast MRI in patients with known chronic liver disease. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care).
- **Variante 6:** MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast is usually appropriate for the imaging of an indeterminate <1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with US in patients with a known history of an extrahepatic malignancy.
- **Variante 7:** MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast or CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase is usually appropriate for the imaging of an indeterminate <1 cm liver lesion on initial imaging with CT (noncontrast or single-phase) or noncontrast MRI in patients with a known history of an extra hepatic malignancy. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care).
- **Variante 8:** MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast or CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase is usually appropriate for the imaging of an incidental liver lesion <1 cm on US, noncontrast or single-phase CT or noncontrast MRI in patients with known chronic liver disease. 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 go to www.acr.org/ac.

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 risk-benefit 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 [95].

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

- Kaltenbach TE, Engler P, Kratzer W, et al. Prevalence of benign focal liver lesions: ultrasound investigation of 45,319 hospital patients. *Abdom Radiol (NY)* 2016;41:25-32.
- Taimr P, Jongerijs VL, Pek CJ, et al. Liver Contrast-Enhanced Ultrasound Improves Detection of Liver Metastases in Patients with Pancreatic or Periapillary Cancer. *Ultrasound Med Biol* 2015;41:3063-9.
- Horowitz JM, Kamel IR, Arif-Tiwari H, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Chronic Liver Disease. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2017;14:S391-S405.
- Gore RM, Pickhardt PJ, Morteale KJ, et al. Management of Incidental Liver Lesions on CT: A White Paper of the ACR Incidental Findings Committee. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2017;14:1429-37.
- Hope TA, Petkovska I, Saranathan M, Hargreaves BA, Vasanaawala SS. Combined parenchymal and vascular imaging: High spatiotemporal resolution arterial evaluation of hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2016;43:859-65.
- American College of Radiology: Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System. Available at: <https://www.acr.org/Clinical-Resources/Reporting-and-Data-Systems/LI-RADS>. Accessed March 27, 2020.
- D'Onofrio M, Crosara S, De Robertis R, Canestrini S, Mucelli RP. Contrast-Enhanced Ultrasound of Focal Liver Lesions. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2015;205:W56-66.
- Mojtahedi A, Thamake S, Tworowska I, Ranganathan D, Delpassand ES. The value of (68)Ga-DOTATATE PET/CT in diagnosis and management of neuroendocrine tumors compared to current FDA approved imaging modalities: a review of literature. *Am J Nucl Med Mol Imaging* 2014;4:426-34.
- Moriyasu F, Itoh K. Efficacy of perflubutane microbubble-enhanced ultrasound in the characterization and detection of focal liver lesions: phase 3 multicenter clinical trial. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2009;193:86-95.
- Chung YE, Kim MJ, Kim YE, Park MS, Choi JY, Kim KW. Characterization of incidental liver lesions: comparison of multidetector CT versus Gd-EOB-DTPA-enhanced MR imaging. *PLoS One* 2013;8:e66141.
- Margolis NE, Shaver CM, Rosenkrantz AB. Indeterminate liver and renal lesions: comparison of computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging in providing a definitive diagnosis and impact on recommendations for additional imaging. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2013;37:882-6.
- Zech CJ, Grazioli L, Breuer J, Reiser MF, Schoenberg SO. Diagnostic performance and description of morphological features of focal nodular hyperplasia in Gd-EOB-DTPA-enhanced liver magnetic resonance imaging: results of a multicenter trial. *Invest Radiol* 2008;43:504-11.
- Seitz K, Strobel D, Bernatik T, et al. Contrast-Enhanced Ultrasound (CEUS) for the characterization of focal liver lesions - prospective comparison in clinical practice: CEUS vs. CT (DEGUM multicenter trial). Parts of this manuscript were presented at the Ultrasound Dreiländertreffen 2008, Davos. *Ultraschall Med* 2009;30:383-9.
- Trillaud H, Bruel JM, Valette PJ, et al. Characterization of focal liver lesions with SonoVue-enhanced sonography: international multicenter-study in comparison to CT and MRI. *World J Gastroenterol* 2009;15:3748-56.
- Holzapfel K, Eiber MJ, Fingerle AA, Bruegel M, Rummeny EJ, Gaa J. Detection, classification, and characterization of focal liver lesions: Value of diffusion-weighted MR imaging, gadoxetic acid-enhanced MR imaging and the combination of both methods. *Abdom Imaging* 2012;37:74-82.

16. Purysko AS, Remer EM, Coppa CP, Obuchowski NA, Schneider E, Veniero JC. Characteristics and distinguishing features of hepatocellular adenoma and focal nodular hyperplasia on gadoxetate disodium-enhanced MRI. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2012;198:115-23.
17. Agarwal S, Fuentes-Orrego JM, Arnason T, et al. Inflammatory hepatocellular adenomas can mimic focal nodular hyperplasia on gadoxetic acid-enhanced MRI. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2014;203:W408-14.
18. Fang L, Zhu Z, Huang B, et al. A comparative study of contrast enhanced ultrasound and contrast enhanced magnetic resonance imaging for the detection and characterization of hepatic hemangiomas. *Biosci Trends* 2015;9:104-10.
19. Miller FH, Hammond N, Siddiqi AJ, et al. Utility of diffusion-weighted MRI in distinguishing benign and malignant hepatic lesions. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2010;32:138-47.
20. Bai YF, Liu JM, Zhang XM, Jiang CZ, Xu X, Zheng SS. Percutaneous liver biopsy: retrospective study of primary and secondary hepatic lymphoma in twenty-one patients. *Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int* 2017;16:58-64.
21. Eso Y, Takai A, Takeda H, et al. Sonazoid-enhanced ultrasonography guidance improves the quality of pathological diagnosis in the biopsy of focal hepatic lesions. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2016;28:1462-67.
22. Sparchez Z, Radu P, Kacso G, Sparchez M, Zaharia T, Al Hajjar N. Prospective comparison between real time contrast enhanced and conventional ultrasound guidance in percutaneous biopsies of liver tumors. *Med Ultrason* 2015;17:456-63.
23. Tacher V, Le Deley MC, Hollebecque A, et al. Factors associated with success of image-guided tumour biopsies: Results from a prospective molecular triage study (MOSCATO-01). *Eur J Cancer* 2016;59:79-89.
24. Partovi S, Lu Z, Kessner R, et al. Contrast enhanced ultrasound guided biopsies of liver lesions not visualized on standard B-mode ultrasound-preliminary experience. *J Gastrointest Oncol* 2017;8:1056-64.
25. Park HJ, Lee MW, Lee MH, et al. Fusion imaging-guided percutaneous biopsy of focal hepatic lesions with poor conspicuity on conventional sonography. *J Ultrasound Med* 2013;32:1557-64.
26. Sainani NI, Schlett CL, Hahn PF, Gervais DA, Mueller PR, Arellano RS. Computed tomography-guided percutaneous biopsy of isoattenuating focal liver lesions. *Abdom Imaging* 2014;39:633-44.
27. Sandrasegaran K, Thayalan N, Thavanesan R, et al. Risk factors for bleeding after liver biopsy. *Abdom Radiol (NY)* 2016;41:643-9.
28. Kang TW, Lee MW, Choi D, et al. Safety of Percutaneous Biopsy for Hepatic Angiosarcoma: Results of a Multicenter Korean Survey. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2016;27:846-51.
29. Wang WP, Wu Y, Luo Y, et al. Clinical value of contrast-enhanced ultrasonography in the characterization of focal liver lesions: a prospective multicenter trial. *Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int* 2009;8:370-6.
30. Sporea I, Martie A, Bota S, Sirli R, Popescu A, Danila M. Characterization of focal liver lesions using contrast enhanced ultrasound as a first line method: a large monocentric experience. *J Gastrointest Liver Dis* 2014;23:57-63.
31. Sporea I, Badea R, Martie A, et al. Contrast enhanced ultrasound for the characterization of focal liver lesions. *Med Ultrason* 2011;13:38-44.
32. Sporea I, Sirli R, Martie A, Popescu A, Danila M. How useful is contrast enhanced ultrasonography for the characterization of focal liver lesions? *J Gastrointest Liver Dis* 2010;19:393-8.
33. Corvino A, Catalano O, Setola SV, Sandomenico F, Corvino F, Petrillo A. Contrast-enhanced ultrasound in the characterization of complex cystic focal liver lesions. *Ultrasound Med Biol* 2015;41:1301-10.
34. Sirli R, Sporea I, Popescu A, et al. Contrast enhanced ultrasound for the diagnosis of liver hemangiomas in clinical practice. *Med Ultrason* 2011;13:95-101.
35. Seitz K, Bernatik T, Strobel D, et al. Contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) for the characterization of focal liver lesions in clinical practice (DEGUM Multicenter Trial): CEUS vs. MRI--a prospective comparison in 269 patients. *Ultraschall Med* 2010;31:492-9.
36. Sirli R, Sporea I, Sandulescu DL, et al. Contrast enhanced ultrasound for the diagnosis of liver hemangiomas - results of a Romanian multicentre study. *Med Ultrason* 2015;17:444-50.
37. Celli N, Gaiani S, Piscaglia F, et al. Characterization of liver lesions by real-time contrast-enhanced ultrasonography. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2007;19:3-14.
38. Phongkitkarun S, Srianujata T, Jatchavala J. Supplement value of magnetic resonance imaging in small hepatic lesion (< or = 20 mm) detected on routine computed tomography. *J Med Assoc Thai* 2009;92:677-86.
39. Quaia E, De Paoli L, Angileri R, Cabibbo B, Cova MA. Indeterminate solid hepatic lesions identified on non-diagnostic contrast-enhanced computed tomography: assessment of the additional diagnostic value of contrast-enhanced ultrasound in the non-cirrhotic liver. *Eur J Radiol* 2014;83:456-62.

40. Jolepalem P, Rydberg JN, Wong CO. Improvement of hepatic lesion characterization by 18F-FDG PET/CT with the use of the lesion to background liver activity ratio. *Clin Nucl Med* 2013;38:869-73.
41. 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;28:36-43.
42. D'Souza M M, Sharma R, Mondal A, et al. Prospective evaluation of CECT and 18F-FDG-PET/CT in detection of hepatic metastases. *Nucl Med Commun* 2009;30:117-25.
43. Sadigh G, Nandwana SB, Moreno C, et al. Assessment of Added Value of Noncontrast to Contrast-Enhanced Abdominal Computed Tomography Scan for Characterization of Hypervascular Liver Metastases. *Curr Probl Diagn Radiol* 2016;45:373-79.
44. Sadigh G, Applegate KE, Baumgarten DA. Comparative accuracy of intravenous contrast-enhanced CT versus noncontrast CT plus intravenous contrast-enhanced CT in the detection and characterization of patients with hypervascular liver metastases: a critically appraised topic. *Acad Radiol* 2014;21:113-25.
45. Sundin A, Vullierme MP, Kaltsas G, Plockinger U, Mallorca Consensus Conference p, European Neuroendocrine Tumor S. ENETS Consensus Guidelines for the Standards of Care in Neuroendocrine Tumors: radiological examinations. *Neuroendocrinology* 2009;90:167-83.
46. Kwekkeboom DJ, Krenning EP, Scheidhauer K, et al. ENETS Consensus Guidelines for the Standards of Care in Neuroendocrine Tumors: somatostatin receptor imaging with (111)In-pentetreotide. *Neuroendocrinology* 2009;90:184-9.
47. Haimerl M, Wachtler M, Platzek I, et al. Added value of Gd-EOB-DTPA-enhanced Hepatobiliary phase MR imaging in evaluation of focal solid hepatic lesions. *BMC Med Imaging* 2013;13:41.
48. Huf S, Platz Batista da Silva N, Wiesinger I, et al. Analysis of Liver Tumors Using Preoperative and Intraoperative Contrast-Enhanced Ultrasound (CEUS/IOCEUS) by Radiologists in Comparison to Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Histopathology. *Rofo* 2017;189:431-40.
49. Chung WS, Kim MJ, Chung YE, et al. Comparison of gadoteric acid-enhanced dynamic imaging and diffusion-weighted imaging for the preoperative evaluation of colorectal liver metastases. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2011;34:345-53.
50. Testa ML, Chojniak R, Sene LS, et al. Is DWI/ADC a useful tool in the characterization of focal hepatic lesions suspected of malignancy? *PLoS One* 2014;9:e101944.
51. Elsayes KM, Ellis JH, Elkhoully T, et al. Diagnostic yield of percutaneous image-guided tissue biopsy of focal hepatic lesions in cancer patients: ten percent are not metastases from the primary malignancy. *Cancer* 2011;117:4041-8.
52. Szpakowski JL, Drasin TE, Lyon LL. Rate of seeding with biopsies and ablations of hepatocellular carcinoma: A retrospective cohort study. *Hepatol Commun* 2017;1:841-51.
53. Ahn DW, Shim JH, Yoon JH, et al. Treatment and clinical outcome of needle-track seeding from hepatocellular carcinoma. *Korean J Hepatol* 2011;17:106-12.
54. Chen QW, Cheng CS, Chen H, et al. Effectiveness and complications of ultrasound guided fine needle aspiration for primary liver cancer in a Chinese population with serum alpha-fetoprotein levels \leq 200 ng/ml--a study based on 4,312 patients. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e101536.
55. Chernyak V, Santillan CS, Papadatos D, Sirlin CB. LI-RADS((R)) algorithm: CT and MRI. *Abdom Radiol (NY)* 2018;43:111-26.
56. Mita K, Kim SR, Kudo M, et al. Diagnostic sensitivity of imaging modalities for hepatocellular carcinoma smaller than 2 cm. *World J Gastroenterol* 2010;16:4187-92.
57. Ichikawa T, Saito K, Yoshioka N, et al. Detection and characterization of focal liver lesions: a Japanese phase III, multicenter comparison between gadoteric acid disodium-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging and contrast-enhanced computed tomography predominantly in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma and chronic liver disease. *Invest Radiol* 2010;45:133-41.
58. Iannaccone R, Laghi A, Catalano C, et al. Hepatocellular carcinoma: role of unenhanced and delayed phase multi-detector row helical CT in patients with cirrhosis. *Radiology* 2005;234:460-7.
59. Jang HJ, Kim TK, Khalili K, et al. Characterization of 1-to 2-cm liver nodules detected on hcc surveillance ultrasound according to the criteria of the American Association for the Study of Liver Disease: is quadriphasic CT necessary? *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2013;201:314-21.
60. Kornberg A, Freesmeyer M, Barthel E, et al. 18F-FDG-uptake of hepatocellular carcinoma on PET predicts microvascular tumor invasion in liver transplant patients. *Am J Transplant* 2009;9:592-600.

61. Becker-Weidman DJ, Kalb B, Sharma P, et al. Hepatocellular carcinoma lesion characterization: single-institution clinical performance review of multiphase gadolinium-enhanced MR imaging--comparison to prior same-center results after MR systems improvements. *Radiology* 2011;261:824-33.
62. Di Martino M, Anzidei M, Zaccagna F, et al. Qualitative analysis of small (≤ 2 cm) regenerative nodules, dysplastic nodules and well-differentiated HCCs with gadoxetic acid MRI. *BMC Med Imaging* 2016;16:62.
63. Kwon S, Kim YK, Park HJ, Jeong WK, Lee WJ, Choi D. Is gadoxetic acid-enhanced MRI limited in tumor characterization for patients with chronic liver disease? *Magn Reson Imaging* 2014;32:1214-22.
64. Chou CT, Chen YL, Wu HK, Chen RC. Characterization of hyperintense nodules on precontrast T1-weighted MRI: utility of gadoxetic acid-enhanced hepatocyte-phase imaging. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2011;33:625-32.
65. Chou CT, Chen YL, Su WW, Wu HK, Chen RC. Characterization of cirrhotic nodules with gadoxetic acid-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging: the efficacy of hepatocyte-phase imaging. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2010;32:895-902.
66. Orlacchio A, Chegai F, Fabiano S, et al. Role of MRI with hepatospecific contrast agent in the identification and characterization of focal liver lesions: pathological correlation in explanted livers. *Radiol Med* 2016;121:588-96.
67. Bashir MR, Gupta RT, Davenport MS, et al. Hepatocellular carcinoma in a North American population: does hepatobiliary MR imaging with Gd-EOB-DTPA improve sensitivity and confidence for diagnosis? *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2013;37:398-406.
68. Khouri Chalouhi C, Vernuccio F, Rini F, et al. Hepatobiliary phase in cirrhotic patients with different Model for End-stage Liver Disease score: comparison of the performance of gadoxetic acid to gadobenate dimeglumine. *Eur Radiol* 2019;29:3090-99.
69. Torrisi C, Picone D, Cabibbo G, Matranga D, Midiri M, Brancatelli G. Gadoxetic acid-enhanced MRI of transient hepatic enhancement differences: Another cause of hypointense observation on hepatobiliary phase. *Eur J Radiol* 2018;107:39-45.
70. Yang D, Zhang J, Han D, Jin E, Yang Z. The role of apparent diffusion coefficient values in characterization of solid focal liver lesions: a prospective and comparative clinical study. *Sci China Life Sci* 2017;60:16-22.
71. Shin SK, Kim YS, Choi SJ, et al. Characterization of small (≤ 3 cm) hepatic lesions with atypical enhancement feature and hypointensity in hepatobiliary phase of gadoxetic acid-enhanced MRI in cirrhosis: A STARD-compliant article. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2017;96:e7278.
72. Takahashi M, Maruyama H, Shimada T, et al. Characterization of hepatic lesions (≤ 30 mm) with liver-specific contrast agents: a comparison between ultrasound and magnetic resonance imaging. *Eur J Radiol* 2013;82:75-84.
73. Xu PJ, Yan FH, Wang JH, Shan Y, Ji Y, Chen CZ. Contribution of diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging in the characterization of hepatocellular carcinomas and dysplastic nodules in cirrhotic liver. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2010;34:506-12.
74. Santillan C, Chernyak V, Sirlin C. LI-RADS categories: concepts, definitions, and criteria. *Abdom Radiol (NY)* 2018;43:101-10.
75. Silva MA, Hegab B, Hyde C, Guo B, Buckels JA, Mirza DF. Needle track seeding following biopsy of liver lesions in the diagnosis of hepatocellular cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gut* 2008;57:1592-6.
76. Wu W, Chen M, Yan K, et al. Evaluation of contrast-enhanced ultrasound for diagnosis of dysplastic nodules with a focus of hepatocellular carcinoma in liver cirrhosis patients. *Chin J Cancer Res* 2015;27:83-9.
77. Jang HJ, Kim TK, Wilson SR. Small nodules (1-2 cm) in liver cirrhosis: characterization with contrast-enhanced ultrasound. *Eur J Radiol* 2009;72:418-24.
78. Wildner D, Bernatik T, Greis C, Seitz K, Neurath MF, Strobel D. CEUS in hepatocellular carcinoma and intrahepatic cholangiocellular carcinoma in 320 patients - early or late washout matters: a subanalysis of the DEGUM multicenter trial. *Ultraschall Med* 2015;36:132-9.
79. Wildner D, Pfeifer L, Goertz RS, et al. Dynamic contrast-enhanced ultrasound (DCE-US) for the characterization of hepatocellular carcinoma and cholangiocellular carcinoma. *Ultraschall Med* 2014;35:522-7.
80. Kamaya A, Maturen KE, Tye GA, Liu YI, Parti NN, Desser TS. Hypervascular liver lesions. *Semin Ultrasound CT MR* 2009;30:387-407.
81. Jang HJ, Lim HK, Lee WJ, Lee SJ, Yun JY, Choi D. Small hypoattenuating lesions in the liver on single-phase helical CT in preoperative patients with gastric and colorectal cancer: prevalence, significance, and differentiating features. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2002;26:718-24.

82. Schwartz LH, Gandras EJ, Colangelo SM, Ercolani MC, Panicek DM. Prevalence and importance of small hepatic lesions found at CT in patients with cancer. *Radiology* 1999;210:71-4.
83. Elnahal SM, Shinagare AB, Szymonifka J, Hong TS, Enzinger PC, Mamon HJ. Prevalence and significance of subcentimeter hepatic lesions in patients with localized pancreatic adenocarcinoma. *Pract Radiat Oncol* 2012;2:e89-e94.
84. Holzapfel K, Bruegel M, Eiber M, et al. Characterization of small (≤ 10 mm) focal liver lesions: value of respiratory-triggered echo-planar diffusion-weighted MR imaging. *Eur J Radiol* 2010;76:89-95.
85. Khalil HI, Patterson SA, Panicek DM. Hepatic lesions deemed too small to characterize at CT: prevalence and importance in women with breast cancer. *Radiology* 2005;235:872-8.
86. Holalkere NS, Sahani DV, Blake MA, Halpern EF, Hahn PF, Mueller PR. Characterization of small liver lesions: Added role of MR after MDCT. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2006;30:591-6.
87. Niekel MC, Bipat S, Stoker J. Diagnostic imaging of colorectal liver metastases with CT, MR imaging, FDG PET, and/or FDG PET/CT: a meta-analysis of prospective studies including patients who have not previously undergone treatment. *Radiology* 2010;257:674-84.
88. Laghi F, Catalano O, Maresca M, Sandomenico F, Siani A. Indeterminate, subcentimetric focal liver lesions in cancer patients: additional role of contrast-enhanced ultrasound. *Ultraschall Med* 2010;31:283-8.
89. Chernyak V, Fowler KJ, Kamaya A, et al. Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System (LI-RADS) Version 2018: Imaging of Hepatocellular Carcinoma in At-Risk Patients. *Radiology* 2018;289:816-30.
90. Golfieri R, Marini E, Bazzocchi A, et al. Small (≤ 3 cm) hepatocellular carcinoma in cirrhosis: the role of double contrast agents in MR imaging vs. multidetector-row CT. *Radiol Med* 2009;114:1239-66.
91. Bottcher J, Hansch A, Pfeil A, et al. Detection and classification of different liver lesions: comparison of Gd-EOB-DTPA-enhanced MRI versus multiphasic spiral CT in a clinical single centre investigation. *Eur J Radiol* 2013;82:1860-9.
92. Forner A, Vilana R, Ayuso C, et al. Diagnosis of hepatic nodules 20 mm or smaller in cirrhosis: Prospective validation of the noninvasive diagnostic criteria for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hepatology* 2008;47:97-104.
93. Kojiro M. Pathological diagnosis at early stage: reaching international consensus. *Oncology* 2010;78 Suppl 1:31-5.
94. Zheng SG, Xu HX, Liu LN, et al. Parametric imaging with contrast-enhanced ultrasound: usefulness for characterization of dynamic effects of microvascularization for hepatocellular carcinoma and focal nodular hyperplasia. *Clin Hemorheol Microcirc* 2013;55:375-89.
95. American College of Radiology. ACR Appropriateness Criteria[®] Radiation Dose Assessment Introduction. Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Appropriateness-Criteria/RadiationDoseAssessmentIntro.pdf>. Accessed March 27, 2020.

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.