American College of Radiology
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®
Neck Mass/Adenopathy

Variant 1: **Nonpulsatile neck mass(es). Not parotid region or thyroid. Initial imaging.**

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
CT neck with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	☢☢☢
MRI neck without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	O
MRI neck without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	O
US neck	May Be Appropriate	O
CT neck without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	☢☢☢
CT neck without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢
CTA neck with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢☢
FDG-PET/MRI skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢
MRA neck without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O
Arteriography cervicocerebral	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢
MRA neck without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O

Variant 2: **Pulsatile neck mass(es). Not parotid region or thyroid. Initial imaging.**

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
CT neck with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	☢☢☢
CTA neck with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	☢☢☢
MRI neck without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	O
MRA neck without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	O
MRI neck without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	O
US neck	May Be Appropriate	O
CT neck without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	☢☢☢
MRA neck without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	O
Arteriography cervicocerebral	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢
CT neck without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢☢
FDG-PET/MRI skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢

Variant 3: **Parotid region mass(es). Initial imaging.**

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
CT neck with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	☢ ☢ ☢
MRI neck without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	O
US neck	Usually Appropriate	O
MRI neck with parotid sialography without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	O
MRI neck with parotid sialography without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	O
MRI neck without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	O
CT neck without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	☢ ☢ ☢
Fluoroscopy sialography parotid	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	Varies
CT neck with parotid sialography	Usually Not Appropriate	☢ ☢ ☢
CT neck without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☢ ☢ ☢
CTA neck with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☢ ☢ ☢
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	☢ ☢ ☢ ☢
FDG-PET/MRI skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	☢ ☢ ☢
MRA neck without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O
MRA neck without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O
Arteriography cervicocerebral	Usually Not Appropriate	☢ ☢ ☢

Variant 4: **Child. Neck mass(es). Not parotid region or thyroid. Initial imaging.**

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
CT neck with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	☢ ☢ ☢
MRI neck without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	O
US neck	Usually Appropriate	O
MRI neck without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	O
CT neck without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	☢ ☢ ☢
MRA neck without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O
MRA neck without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O
CT neck without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☢ ☢ ☢ ☢
CTA neck with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☢ ☢ ☢
Arteriography cervicocerebral	Usually Not Appropriate	☢ ☢ ☢ ☢
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	☢ ☢ ☢ ☢ ☢
FDG-PET/MRI skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	☢ ☢ ☢

NECK MASS/ADENOPATHY

Expert Panel on Neurologic Imaging: Joseph M. Aulino, MD[a]; Claudia F. E. Kirsch, MD[b]; Judah Burns, MD[c]; Paul M. Busse, MD, PhD[d]; Santanu Chakraborty, MBBS, MSc[e]; Asim F. Choudhri, MD[f]; David B. Conley, MD[g]; Christopher U. Jones, MD[h]; Ryan K. Lee, MD, MRMD, MBA[i]; Michael D. Luttrull, MD[j]; Toshio Moritani, MD, PhD[k]; Bruno Policeni, MD[l]; Maura E. Ryan, MD[m]; Lubdha M. Shah, MD[n]; Aseem Sharma, MD[o]; Robert Y. Shih, MD[p]; Rathan M. Subramaniam, MD, PhD, MPH[q]; Sophia C. Symko, MD, MS[r]; Julie Bykowski, MD.[s]

Summary of Literature Review

Introduction/Background

Imaging may be requested in adult or pediatric patients with a palpable neck mass or neck fullness to determine whether a discrete mass or abnormal lymph node is present and to identify associated findings that may not be palpable. In adults, a neck mass is most likely to be either neoplastic or inflammatory [1-5], whereas in children the differential also includes congenital lymphovascular malformations and branchial cleft cysts among other benign entities [6]. For patients >40 years of age, especially with a smoking history, the diagnosis overwhelmingly favors a malignancy [7-10]. With the rise of human papillomavirus–related oral, pharyngeal, and laryngeal carcinomas, vigilance for carcinoma is now warranted for all adult age-groups [11,12]. The evidence for imaging of neck nodes is often inextricable from that of staging cancer, including evaluation of the primary site. Ultimately, histology is needed to confirm any suspected malignancy [13,14].

The American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery recently created clinical guidelines for the evaluation of a neck mass in adults [14], emphasizing the importance of timely diagnosis. They issued a strong recommendation for contrast-enhanced neck CT or contrast-enhanced neck MRI for patients with a neck mass deemed at risk for malignancy. In their treatment flow chart, imaging was considered in parallel with fine-needle aspiration of the palpable mass or node for timing of diagnostic evaluation. Ultrasound (US) was considered an option for initial imaging in suspected thyroid or salivary masses or as an adjunct to expedite sampling.

It is important to acknowledge overlap of symptoms and examination findings. If the suspected origin of the neck mass is the thyroid gland, imaging should be guided by the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® topic on "Thyroid Disease" [15]. Additional evaluation of vascular processes in the neck is addressed in the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® topic on "Cerebrovascular Disease" [16] and the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® topic on "Tinnitus" [17]. Evaluation of neurological features associated with neck masses should be guided by the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® topic on "Plexopathy" [18].

Discussion of Procedures by Variant

Variant 1: Nonpulsatile neck mass(es). Not parotid region or thyroid. Initial imaging.

Cross-sectional imaging with CT or MRI allows for precise localization of the palpable finding. Both CT and MRI can accurately assess tumors and inflammation, and CT and MRI are considered equally effective studies for clinical oncologic evaluation [14,19].

Intravenous (IV) contrast is essential for detecting neck abscesses, especially those that are intramuscular [20-22]. Contrast-enhanced imaging is helpful for identifying nodal necrosis and can help guide the search for primary tumor [23,24]. Contrast also helps to clarify primary tumor within the upper aerodigestive tract and the relationship of neck masses to the major vessels of the neck.

[a]Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee. [b]Panel Chair, Northwell Health, Zucker Hofstra School of Medicine at Northwell, Manhasset, New York. [c]Montefiore Medical Center, Bronx, New York. [d]Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts. [e]Ottawa Hospital Research Institute and the Department of Radiology, The University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, Canadian Association of Radiologists. [f]Le Bonheur Children's Hospital, University of Tennessee Health Science Center, Memphis, Tennessee. [g]Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, Illinois, American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery. [h]Sutter Medical Center Sacramento, Sacramento, California. [i]Einstein Healthcare Network, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. [j]The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center, Columbus, Ohio. [k]University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. [l]University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics, Iowa City, Iowa. [m]Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. [n]University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. [o]Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology, Saint Louis, Missouri. [p]Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland. [q]UT Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, Texas. [r]Neuroradiology Consultant, Denver, Colorado. [s]Specialty Chair, UC San Diego Health Center, San Diego, California.

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

Certain CT neck protocols do not scan above the hard palate in order to reduce radiation exposure to the eye lenses. Therefore, CT or MRI with inclusion of the face may also be necessary, depending on the clinical and endoscopic examination findings. If the suspected origin of the neck mass is the thyroid gland, imaging should be guided by the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® topic on "Thyroid Disease" [15].

CT Neck
Contrast-enhanced CT has the advantage of superior spatial resolution and is the preferred initial imaging modality for a palpable nonpulsatile neck mass in an adult, particularly considering the risk of head and neck cancer [14,19,25,26]. The presence and distribution of abnormal lymph nodes may be helpful when refining the differential as a reactive or malignant process and in guiding the search for an unknown primary malignancy [19,27,28]. Dual-phase CT imaging (without and with IV contrast) is not usually necessary. CT performed only without IV contrast may be helpful in some cases.

CT can help identify a dental source of infection in the febrile patient [20] and may be superior to US for evaluating the extent of deep neck inflammation [29-31]. CT Hounsfield units can confirm fat-containing lesions in the neck [28]. Advances in lower dose protocols and reconstruction algorithms vary among vendors [32], and all imaging should reflect "as low as reasonably achievable" (ALARA) practices [33].

CTA Neck
There is no evidence to support the use of CT angiography (CTA) for evaluation of a nonpulsatile neck mass.

MRI Neck
The primary advantage of MRI is improved soft-tissue intrinsic contrast. Intrinsic T1-hyperintensity and fat suppression techniques can confirm fat-containing lesions in the neck [28]. Diffusion-weighted imaging can identify soft-tissue abscess [34]. Apparent diffusion coefficient values also have been proposed as a discriminator between benign and malignant nodal disease in the neck [34-36] and with intravoxel incoherent motion features for both primary and nodal disease [37]; however, histology is needed to confirm any suspected malignancy [13,14,19]. Motion artifact may be a significant issue, particularly for patients who have difficulty managing secretions that are due to neck disease. MRI performed without IV contrast may be helpful in some cases.

MRA Neck
There is no evidence to support the use of MR angiography (MRA) for evaluation of a nonpulsatile neck mass.

US Neck
The overall use of neck US in the United States has lagged behind the use of US in Europe and Southeast Asia, which is due, in part, to greater accessibility of CT and MRI in the United States [38-40]. For discrete cystic lesions of the neck, US may suffice to characterize a lesion prior to definitive management. A few studies suggested that US can distinguish between metastatic and inflammatory neck nodes [41-47]. Although these results are promising, scans are user dependent. US serves as a powerful tool for image-guided sampling [48], which is beyond the scope of this document. Advantages of US include the ability to be performed at the point of care and to expedite sampling [14]; however, US is limited for comprehensive evaluation of the deep spaces of the neck, and for larger, multispatial, and malignant lesions.

US may play a future rule in identifying unknown primary mucosal tumors, notably in the oropharynx [49]. Techniques such as US elastography and contrast-enhanced US are being explored for possible future clinical applications [44,45,50-58].

FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh
While there is established literature regarding the use of PET using the tracer fluorine-18-2-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose (FDG)/CT for staging and surveillance of head or neck malignancy, FDG-PET/CT is not an initial imaging study for evaluation of a nonpulsatile neck mass.

FDG-PET/MRI Skull Base to Mid-Thigh
While there is growing literature regarding the use of FDG-PET/MRI for staging and surveillance of head or neck malignancy, FDG-PET/MRI is not an initial imaging study for evaluation of a nonpulsatile neck mass.

Arteriography Cervicocerebral
There is no evidence to support the use of catheter angiography for evaluation of a nonpulsatile neck mass.

Variant 2: Pulsatile neck mass(es). Not parotid region or thyroid. Initial imaging.

A pulsatile neck mass may reflect a normal tortuous artery, atypical lymphovascular malformation, arteriovenous fistula, pseudoaneurysm, paraganglioma, or other mass abutting an artery. Additional evaluation of vascular processes in the neck is addressed in the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® topic on "Cerebrovascular Disease" [16] and the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® topic on "Tinnitus" [17].

CT Neck

Neck CT should be performed with IV contrast. Dual-phase CT imaging (without and with IV contrast) is not usually necessary. CT performed only without IV contrast may be helpful in a small minority of cases. Contrast is useful for distinguishing vessels from lymph nodes and confirming whether a mass is hypervascular as many pulsatile neck masses (especially those in level II or III) are lymph nodes overlying the carotid artery rather than true vascular masses. There is no current literature comparing the efficacy of contrast-enhanced CT to CTA or MRI and MRA for the evaluation of a pulsatile neck mass. Advances in lower dose protocols and reconstruction vary among vendors [32], and all imaging should reflect ALARA practices [33].

CTA Neck

Although CTA is optimized to visualize the cervical arteries, the soft tissues are usually well characterized. There is no current literature comparing efficacy of contrast-enhanced CT to CTA or MRI and MRA for the evaluation of a pulsatile neck mass.

MRI Neck

The primary advantage of MRI is improved soft-tissue intrinsic contrast. A noncontrast MRI also serves a role for anatomic definition of a pulsatile neck mass in patients who cannot receive contrast. There is no current literature comparing efficacy of contrast-enhanced CT to CTA or MRI and MRA for the evaluation of a pulsatile neck mass. Arterial phase, time-resolved (4-D) MRI may be useful for evaluation of possible paragangliomas in the head and neck [59-61], but it is not an initial imaging study of a new palpable neck mass.

MRA Neck

MRA is complementary to MRI in the evaluation of a pulsatile neck mass to achieve anatomic and vascular detail. Time resolved (4-D) contrast-enhanced MRA technique may be useful for characterization of head and neck arteriovenous malformations [62]. There is no current literature comparing efficacy of contrast-enhanced CT to CTA or MRI and MRA for the evaluation of a pulsatile neck mass. The use of contrast for MRA is institution dependent but generally preferred.

US Neck

US may identify a distinct mass overlying or adjacent to an artery, may confirm vascularity of a lesion, or may be useful to confirm a clinical suspicion of a tortuous artery. The characteristic US appearance of phleboliths may aid in the diagnosis of low-flow vascular malformations [59].

FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

Patients with suspected recurrent paraganglioma may benefit from additional types of PET imaging beyond the scope of this document [63-65]; however, PET/CT is not an initial imaging study for evaluation of a pulsatile neck mass.

FDG-PET/MRI Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

Patients with suspected recurrent paraganglioma may benefit from additional types of PET imaging beyond the scope of this document [63-65]; however, PET/MRI is not an initial imaging study for evaluation of a pulsatile neck mass.

Arteriography Cervicocerebral

Catheter angiography may be used for surgical planning and endovascular treatment or for further characterization of vascular neck lesions identified on US or cross-sectional imaging; however, it is not an initial imaging study for evaluation of a pulsatile neck mass.

Variant 3: Parotid region mass(es). Initial imaging.

Imaging generally cannot determine if a newly symptomatic or palpable parotid lesion is benign or malignant. However, imaging may help determine whether the mass is arising from within or outside the parotid gland, the characteristics of the mass, and whether additional masses are present [66]. An extraparotid mass usually reflects a lymph node. For an intraparotid lesion, differential considerations include lymph nodes, benign, malignant, inflammatory, and congenital etiologies. Although certain imaging findings often suggest a specific diagnosis for a parotid mass, histologic diagnosis is usually needed to exclude malignancy [26,67-72]. Clinical history and

physical examination also influences the workup as numbness, trismus, fixation, and facial weakness may suggest a malignant etiology. Radiologist consultation is essential to achieve appropriate anatomic coverage.

CT Neck
CT face and/or neck with IV contrast is commonly used to evaluate palpable parotid region abnormalities, usually in the setting of suspected parotid acute inflammation [73]. CT performed only without IV contrast may be helpful in a small number of cases. Bony details (landmarks, erosion, remodeling) and sialoliths are better delineated by CT compared with MRI [74]. Dual phase (without and with IV contrast) is not usually necessary as most sialoliths are not obscured by contrast. A noncontrast CT study is usually not indicated in patients presenting with a neck mass suspected of being a swollen major salivary gland that is due to obstructing sialolith [20]. CT imaging coverage of the entire neck should be considered if full assessment of regional nodes is required. Advances in lower dose protocols and reconstruction vary among vendors [32], and all imaging should reflect ALARA practices [33]. CT perfusion imaging is still a research tool for evaluation of parotid pathology [75,76].

CT Neck Parotid Sialography
In the absence of acute infection, CT sialography may provide detailed assessment of the parotid ducts if there is a clinical concern for duct obstruction.

CTA Neck
There is no evidence to support the use of CTA for evaluation of a parotid region mass.

MRI Neck
MRI with and without IV contrast is the preferred evaluation as it provides comprehensive information about the full extent of the mass (deep lobe involvement, local invasion), perineural tumor spread, and possible extension into the temporal bone [74,77,78]. MRI performed without IV contrast may be helpful in some cases. MRI characteristics, such as T2-hypointensity [79], intratumoral cystic components [80], and apparent diffusion coefficient values [81], have been proposed as features of malignancy. Ultimately, histologic confirmation is required. Depending on clinical examination features, such as cranial neuropathy (see the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® topic on "Cranial Neuropathy" [82]), or additional palpable nodes in the neck, MRI of the face and/or MRI of the neck should be considered for assessment, with radiologist consultation to achieve appropriate coverage. The main disadvantages of MRI are increased time, susceptibility artifacts, and motion artifacts. Advanced MRI techniques, such as perfusion imaging and texture analysis, show promise in differentiating benign from malignant lesions but are currently not used in routine clinical practice [83-87].

MRI Neck Parotid Sialography
Noninvasive MRI sialography may provide assessment of the parotid ducts [88] complementary to anatomic MRI of the face or neck, if there is a clinical concern for acute parotitis in the setting of duct obstruction.

MRA Neck
There is no evidence to support the use of MRA for evaluation of a parotid region mass.

US Neck
US is adept at localization of parotid versus extraparotid masses [77,89], and identifying features suspicious for malignancy [90]. Deep lobe lesions are generally not as well delineated with US as in the superficial lobe. Much of the published literature focuses on US-guided fine-needle aspiration, and not the diagnostic utility of US. Contrast-enhanced US and US elastography are newer techniques currently being explored for evaluation of salivary pathology [71,91-94].

FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh
While there is established literature regarding the use of FDG-PET/CT for staging and surveillance of parotid malignancy, FDG-PET/CT is not an initial imaging study for evaluation.

FDG-PET/MRI Skull Base to Mid-Thigh
There is no evidence to support the use of FDG-PET/MRI for evaluation of a new parotid mass.

Arteriography Cervicocerebral
There is no evidence to support the use of catheter angiography for evaluation of a new parotid mass.

Fluoroscopy Sialography Parotid
In the absence of acute infection, conventional fluoroscopic parotid sialography may provide detailed assessment of the parotid ducts if there is a clinical concern for duct obstruction.

Variant 4: Child. Neck mass(es). Not parotid region or thyroid. Initial imaging.

In children who present with neck masses, congenital etiologies should be added to differential diagnostic considerations [6,95] in addition to infectious and malignant etiologies. Clinical examination features and correlation with onset, change in mass size, fluctuance, fever, overlying skin erythema, or recent trauma are important to guiding imaging.

CT Neck

CT with IV contrast can be performed in children suspected of a having a malignancy or a deep neck infection that may require surgery [21,29,96]. CT has reduced or absent sedation requirements given the shorter examination time. Dual phase (without and with IV contrast) is not usually necessary, as most sialoliths are not obscured by contrast. [20]. CT performed only without IV contrast may be useful in some cases. Advances in lower dose protocols and reconstruction vary among vendors [32], and all imaging should reflect ALARA practices [33].

CTA Neck

There is no evidence to support the use of CTA for evaluation of a palpable neck mass in a child.

MRI Neck

MRI of the neck can be performed in children suspected of having a malignancy or a deep neck abscess that may require surgical drainage [21,29,96]. Additionally, in suspected vascular malformation, MRI provides detail of trans-spatial extent and adjacent neurovascular structures [97,98]. The addition of contrast is usually helpful for evaluation of suspected vascular lesions [99]; however, it should be considered on a case-by-case basis as it is not always necessary to achieve diagnosis [100].

MRA Neck

There is no evidence to support the use of MRA for evaluation of a palpable neck mass in a child, though time-resolved postcontrast MRA could be useful for evaluating venous malformations and other pathology [59]. Contrast may not be necessary for defining arterial anatomy.

US Neck

In children suspected of having a congenital abnormality, US is useful in differentiating solid from cystic neck lesions and in discriminating high-flow from low-flow vascular malformations [59,101-103]. Color-flow Doppler US is also helpful for characterizing vascular flow in solid lesions [41,104]. US may suffice for evaluation of superficial infection [105].

FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

There is no evidence to support the use of FDG-PET/CT for evaluation of a palpable neck mass in a child.

FDG-PET/MRI Skull Base to Mid-Thigh

There is no evidence to support the use of FDG-PET/MRI for evaluation of a palpable neck mass in a child.

Arteriography Cervicocerebral

There is no evidence to support the use of catheter angiography for evaluation of a palpable neck mass in a child.

Summary of Recommendations

- **Variant 1:** CT neck with IV contrast or MRI neck without and with IV contrast is usually appropriate for the initial imaging of nonpulsatile neck masses, not parotid region or thyroid. These procedures are equivalent alternatives.
- **Variant 2:** CT neck with IV contrast, CTA neck with IV contrast, MRI neck without and with IV contrast, or MRA neck is usually appropriate for the initial imaging of pulsatile neck masses, not parotid region or thyroid. These procedures are equivalent alternatives, although CTA or MRA may be complementary to CT and MRI.
- **Variant 3:** CT neck with IV contrast, MRI neck without and with IV contrast, or US neck is usually appropriate for the initial imaging of parotid region masses. These procedures are equivalent alternatives.
- **Variant 4:** CT neck with IV contrast, MRI neck without and with IV contrast, US neck, or MRI neck without IV contrast is usually appropriate for the initial imaging in children with neck masses, not parotid region or thyroid. CT and MRI studies may be complementary to US.

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 [106].

Relative Radiation Level Designations		
Relative Radiation Level*	**Adult Effective Dose Estimate Range**	**Pediatric Effective Dose Estimate Range**
O	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. Choi JW, Kim SS, Kim EY, Heran M. Peripheral T-cell lymphoma in the neck: CT findings of lymph node involvement. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 2006;27:1079-82.
2. Kim HJ, Lee HK, Seo JJ, et al. MR imaging of solitary fibrous tumors in the head and neck. Korean J Radiol 2005;6:136-42.
3. Kim ST, Kim HJ, Park SW, Baek CH, Byun HS, Kim YM. Nodular fasciitis in the head and neck: CT and MR imaging findings. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 2005;26:2617-23.
4. Lanka B, Turner M, Orton C, Carrington BM. Cross-sectional imaging in non-melanoma skin cancer of the head and neck. Clin Radiol 2005;60:869-77.
5. Smith JL, 2nd, Hsu JM, Chang J. Predicting deep neck space abscess using computed tomography. Am J Otolaryngol 2006;27:244-7.
6. Tanaka T, Morimoto Y, Takano H, et al. Three-dimensional identification of hemangiomas and feeding arteries in the head and neck region using combined phase-contrast MR angiography and fast asymmetric spin-echo sequences. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod 2005;100:609-13.
7. Giannitto C, Esposito AA, Casiraghi E, Biondetti PR. Epidemiological profile of non-traumatic emergencies of the neck in CT imaging: our experience. Radiol Med 2014;119:784-9.
8. Haugen BR, Alexander EK, Bible KC, et al. 2015 American Thyroid Association Management Guidelines for Adult Patients with Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer: The American Thyroid Association Guidelines Task Force on Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer. Thyroid 2016;26:1-133.
9. Kataoka M, Ueda H, Koyama T, et al. Contrast-enhanced volumetric interpolated breath-hold examination compared with spin-echo T1-weighted imaging of head and neck tumors. AJR Am J Roentgenol 2005;184:313-9.
10. Padovani RP, Kasamatsu TS, Nakabashi CC, et al. One month is sufficient for urinary iodine to return to its baseline value after the use of water-soluble iodinated contrast agents in post-thyroidectomy patients requiring radioiodine therapy. Thyroid 2012;22:926-30.
11. Kirsch C, Dellacerra G. Increasing Incidence and Imaging in Pediatric Head and Neck Cancer and Role of the Human Papilloma Virus and Epstein–Barr Virus. Journal of Pediatric Neuroradiology 2016;05:221-28.
12. Sidell D, Nabili V, Lai C, Cheung G, Kirsch C, Abemayor E. Pediatric squamous cell carcinoma: Case report and literature review. Laryngoscope 2009;119:1538-41.
13. Chuang SY, Lin HT, Wen YS, Hsu FJ. Pitfalls of CT for deep neck abscess imaging assessment: a retrospective review of 162 cases. B-ENT 2013;9:45-52.
14. Pynnonen MA, Gillespie MB, Roman B, et al. Clinical Practice Guideline: Evaluation of the Neck Mass in Adults Executive Summary. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2017;157:355-71.
15. American College of Radiology. ACR Appropriateness Criteria®: Thyroid Disease. Available at: https://acsearch.acr.org/docs/3102386/Narrative/.
16. Salmela MB, Mortazavi S, Jagadeesan BD, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria(R) Cerebrovascular Disease. J Am Coll Radiol 2017;14:S34-S61.

17. Kessler MM, Moussa M, Bykowski J, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria(R) Tinnitus. J Am Coll Radiol 2017;14:S584-S91.
18. Bykowski J, Aulino JM, Berger KL, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria(R) Plexopathy. J Am Coll Radiol 2017;14:S225-S33.
19. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Head and Neck Cancers. Version 2.2017. Available at: https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/head-and-neck.pdf.
20. Gamss C, Gupta A, Chazen JL, Phillips CD. Imaging evaluation of the suprahyoid neck. Radiol Clin North Am 2015;53:133-44.
21. Wang B, Gao BL, Xu GP, Xiang C. Images of deep neck space infection and the clinical significance. Acta Radiol 2014;55:945-51.
22. Bartz BH, Case IC, Srinivasan A, Mukherji SK. Delayed MDCT imaging results in increased enhancement in patients with head and neck neoplasms. J Comput Assist Tomogr 2006;30:972-4.
23. Fujita A, Buch K, Truong MT, et al. Imaging characteristics of metastatic nodes and outcomes by HPV status in head and neck cancers. Laryngoscope 2016;126:392-8.
24. Goldenberg D, Begum S, Westra WH, et al. Cystic lymph node metastasis in patients with head and neck cancer: An HPV-associated phenomenon. Head Neck 2008;30:898-903.
25. Eisenmenger LB, Wiggins RH, 3rd. Imaging of head and neck lymph nodes. Radiol Clin North Am 2015;53:115-32.
26. Haynes J, Arnold KR, Aguirre-Oskins C, Chandra S. Evaluation of neck masses in adults. Am Fam Physician 2015;91:698-706.
27. Pepper C, Pai I, Hay A, et al. Investigation strategy in the management of metastatic adenocarcinoma of unknown primary presenting as cervical lymphadenopathy. Acta Otolaryngol 2014;134:838-42.
28. Kale HA, Prabhu AV, Sinelnikov A, Branstetter Bt. Fat: friend or foe? A review of fat-containing masses within the head and neck. Br J Radiol 2016;89:20150811.
29. Baldassari CM, Howell R, Amorn M, Budacki R, Choi S, Pena M. Complications in pediatric deep neck space abscesses. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2011;144:592-5.
30. Favaretto N, Fasanaro E, Staffieri A, et al. Deep neck infections originating from the major salivary glands. Am J Otolaryngol 2015;36:559-64.
31. Nougue H, Le Maho AL, Boudiaf M, et al. Clinical and imaging factors associated with severe complications of cervical necrotizing fasciitis. Intensive Care Med 2015;41:1256-63.
32. Ibrahim M, Parmar H, Christodoulou E, Mukherji S. Raise the bar and lower the dose: current and future strategies for radiation dose reduction in head and neck imaging. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 2014;35:619-24.
33. American College of Radiology. ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Diagnostic Computed Tomography (CT). Available at: https://www.acr.org/~/media/ACR/Documents/PGTS/guidelines/CT_Performing_Interpreting.pdf.
34. Kito S, Morimoto Y, Tanaka T, et al. Utility of diffusion-weighted images using fast asymmetric spin-echo sequences for detection of abscess formation in the head and neck region. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod 2006;101:231-8.
35. Holzapfel K, Duetsch S, Fauser C, Eiber M, Rummeny EJ, Gaa J. Value of diffusion-weighted MR imaging in the differentiation between benign and malignant cervical lymph nodes. Eur J Radiol 2009;72:381-7.
36. Sumi M, Sakihama N, Sumi T, et al. Discrimination of metastatic cervical lymph nodes with diffusion-weighted MR imaging in patients with head and neck cancer. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 2003;24:1627-34.
37. Noij DP, Martens RM, Marcus JT, et al. Intravoxel incoherent motion magnetic resonance imaging in head and neck cancer: A systematic review of the diagnostic and prognostic value. Oral Oncol 2017;68:81-91.
38. Ashraf M, Biswas J, Jha J, et al. Clinical utility and prospective comparison of ultrasonography and computed tomography imaging in staging of neck metastases in head and neck squamous cell cancer in an Indian setup. Int J Clin Oncol 2011;16:686-93.
39. Jayachandran S, Sachdeva SK. Diagnostic accuracy of color doppler ultrasonography in evaluation of cervical lymph nodes in oral cancer patients. Indian J Dent Res 2012;23:557-8.
40. Khanna R, Sharma AD, Khanna S, Kumar M, Shukla RC. Usefulness of ultrasonography for the evaluation of cervical lymphadenopathy. World J Surg Oncol 2011;9:29.
41. Ahuja AT, Ying M, Ho SY, et al. Ultrasound of malignant cervical lymph nodes. Cancer Imaging 2008;8:48-56.

42. Gronkiewicz JJ, Vade A. Cervical lymph node fine needle aspiration in patients with no history of malignancy. Ultrasound Q 2013;29:323-6.
43. Gupta A, Rahman K, Shahid M, et al. Sonographic assessment of cervical lymphadenopathy: role of high-resolution and color Doppler imaging. Head Neck 2011;33:297-302.
44. Ryu KH, Lee KH, Ryu J, et al. Cervical Lymph Node Imaging Reporting and Data System for Ultrasound of Cervical Lymphadenopathy: A Pilot Study. AJR Am J Roentgenol 2016;206:1286-91.
45. Ying M, Bhatia KS, Lee YP, Yuen HY, Ahuja AT. Review of ultrasonography of malignant neck nodes: greyscale, Doppler, contrast enhancement and elastography. Cancer Imaging 2013;13:658-69.
46. Ying M, Ahuja A, Brook F. Accuracy of sonographic vascular features in differentiating different causes of cervical lymphadenopathy. Ultrasound Med Biol 2004;30:441-7.
47. Zhang J, Wang Y, Yu B, Shi X, Zhang Y. Application of Computer-Aided Diagnosis to the Sonographic Evaluation of Cervical Lymph Nodes. Ultrason Imaging 2016;38:159-71.
48. Tillman BN, Glazer TA, Ray A, Brenner JC, Spector ME. A lean neck mass clinic model: Adding value to care. Laryngoscope 2015;125:2509-13.
49. Fakhry C, Agrawal N, Califano J, et al. The use of ultrasound in the search for the primary site of unknown primary head and neck squamous cell cancers. Oral Oncol 2014;50:640-5.
50. Bhatia KS, Cho CC, Yuen YH, Rasalkar DD, King AD, Ahuja AT. Real-time qualitative ultrasound elastography of cervical lymph nodes in routine clinical practice: interobserver agreement and correlation with malignancy. Ultrasound Med Biol 2010;36:1990-7.
51. Che D, Zhou X, Sun ML, Wang X, Jiang Z, Changjun W. Differentiation of metastatic cervical lymph nodes with ultrasound elastography by virtual touch tissue imaging: preliminary study. J Ultrasound Med 2015;34:37-42.
52. Choi YJ, Lee JH, Lim HK, et al. Quantitative shear wave elastography in the evaluation of metastatic cervical lymph nodes. Ultrasound Med Biol 2013;39:935-40.
53. Desmots F, Fakhry N, Mancini J, et al. Shear Wave Elastography in Head and Neck Lymph Node Assessment: Image Quality and Diagnostic Impact Compared with B-Mode and Doppler Ultrasonography. Ultrasound Med Biol 2016;42:387-98.
54. Fujiwara T, Tomokuni J, Iwanaga K, Ooba S, Haji T. Acoustic radiation force impulse imaging for reactive and malignant/metastatic cervical lymph nodes. Ultrasound Med Biol 2013;39:1178-83.
55. Jin ZQ, Lin MY, Hu WH, Li WY, Bai SJ. Gray-scale ultrasonography combined with elastography imaging for the evaluation of papillary thyroid microcarcinoma: as a prognostic clinicopathology factor. Ultrasound Med Biol 2014;40:1769-77.
56. Lenghel LM, Bolboaca SD, Botar-Jid C, Baciut G, Dudea SM. The value of a new score for sonoelastographic differentiation between benign and malignant cervical lymph nodes. Med Ultrason 2012;14:271-7.
57. Meng W, Xing P, Chen Q, Wu C. Initial experience of acoustic radiation force impulse ultrasound imaging of cervical lymph nodes. Eur J Radiol 2013;82:1788-92.
58. Poanta L, Serban O, Pascu I, Pop S, Cosgarea M, Fodor D. The place of CEUS in distinguishing benign from malignant cervical lymph nodes: a prospective study. Med Ultrason 2014;16:7-14.
59. Griauzde J, Srinivasan A. Imaging of vascular lesions of the head and neck. Radiol Clin North Am 2015;53:197-213.
60. Neves F, Huwart L, Jourdan G, et al. Head and neck paragangliomas: value of contrast-enhanced 3D MR angiography. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 2008;29:883-9.
61. Romano A, Tavanti F, Rossi Espagnet MC, et al. The role of time-resolved imaging of contrast kinetics (TRICKS) magnetic resonance angiography (MRA) in the evaluation of head-neck vascular anomalies: a preliminary experience. Dentomaxillofac Radiol 2015;44:20140302.
62. Razek AA, Gaballa G, Megahed AS, Elmogy E. Time resolved imaging of contrast kinetics (TRICKS) MR angiography of arteriovenous malformations of head and neck. Eur J Radiol 2013;82:1885-91.
63. Archier A, Varoquaux A, Garrigue P, et al. Prospective comparison of (68)Ga-DOTATATE and (18)F-FDOPA PET/CT in patients with various pheochromocytomas and paragangliomas with emphasis on sporadic cases. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 2016;43:1248-57.
64. Heimburger C, Veillon F, Taieb D, et al. Head-to-head comparison between 18F-FDOPA PET/CT and MR/CT angiography in clinically recurrent head and neck paragangliomas. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging 2017;44:979-87.
65. Janssen I, Chen CC, Taieb D, et al. 68Ga-DOTATATE PET/CT in the Localization of Head and Neck Paragangliomas Compared with Other Functional Imaging Modalities and CT/MRI. J Nucl Med 2016;57:186-91.

66. Inohara H, Akahani S, Yamamoto Y, et al. The role of fine-needle aspiration cytology and magnetic resonance imaging in the management of parotid mass lesions. Acta Otolaryngol 2008;128:1152-8.
67. de Ru JA, van Leeuwen MS, van Benthem PP, Velthuis BK, Sie-Go DM, Hordijk GJ. Do magnetic resonance imaging and ultrasound add anything to the preoperative workup of parotid gland tumors? J Oral Maxillofac Surg 2007;65:945-52.
68. Eom HJ, Lee JH, Ko MS, et al. Comparison of fine-needle aspiration and core needle biopsy under ultrasonographic guidance for detecting malignancy and for the tissue-specific diagnosis of salivary gland tumors. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 2015;36:1188-93.
69. Huang YC, Wu CT, Lin G, Chuang WY, Yeow KM, Wan YL. Comparison of ultrasonographically guided fine-needle aspiration and core needle biopsy in the diagnosis of parotid masses. J Clin Ultrasound 2012;40:189-94.
70. Ishibashi M, Fujii S, Kawamoto K, et al. Capsule of parotid gland tumor: evaluation by 3.0 T magnetic resonance imaging using surface coils. Acta Radiol 2010;51:1103-10.
71. Wierzbicka M, Kaluzny J, Szczepanek-Parulska E, et al. Is sonoelastography a helpful method for evaluation of parotid tumors? Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol 2013;270:2101-7.
72. Zaghi S, Hendizadeh L, Hung T, Farahvar S, Abemayor E, Sepahdari AR. MRI criteria for the diagnosis of pleomorphic adenoma: a validation study. Am J Otolaryngol 2014;35:713-8.
73. Brucker JL, Gentry LR. Imaging of head and neck emergencies. Radiol Clin North Am 2015;53:215-52.
74. Lim CY, Chang HS, Nam KH, Chung WY, Park CS. Preoperative prediction of the location of parotid gland tumors using anatomical landmarks. World J Surg 2008;32:2200-3.
75. Bisdas S, Baghi M, Wagenblast J, et al. Differentiation of benign and malignant parotid tumors using deconvolution-based perfusion CT imaging: feasibility of the method and initial results. Eur J Radiol 2007;64:258-65.
76. Yerli H, Aydin E, Coskun M, et al. Dynamic multislice computed tomography findings for parotid gland tumors. J Comput Assist Tomogr 2007;31:309-16.
77. Imaizumi A, Kuribayashi A, Okochi K, et al. Differentiation between superficial and deep lobe parotid tumors by magnetic resonance imaging: usefulness of the parotid duct criterion. Acta Radiol 2009;50:806-11.
78. Kontzialis M, Glastonbury CM, Aygun N. Evaluation: Imaging Studies. Adv Otorhinolaryngol 2016;78:25-38.
79. Christe A, Waldherr C, Hallett R, Zbaeren P, Thoeny H. MR imaging of parotid tumors: typical lesion characteristics in MR imaging improve discrimination between benign and malignant disease. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 2011;32:1202-7.
80. Kato H, Kanematsu M, Watanabe H, Mizuta K, Aoki M. Salivary gland tumors of the parotid gland: CT and MR imaging findings with emphasis on intratumoral cystic components. Neuroradiology 2014;56:789-95.
81. Kato H, Fujimoto K, Matsuo M, Mizuta K, Aoki M. Usefulness of diffusion-weighted MR imaging for differentiating between Warthin's tumor and oncocytoma of the parotid gland. Jpn J Radiol 2017;35:78-85.
82. Policeni B, Corey AS, Burns J, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria(R) Cranial Neuropathy. J Am Coll Radiol 2017;14:S406-S20.
83. Alibek S, Zenk J, Bozzato A, et al. The value of dynamic MRI studies in parotid tumors. Acad Radiol 2007;14:701-10.
84. Eida S, Ohki M, Sumi M, Yamada T, Nakamura T. MR factor analysis: improved technology for the assessment of 2D dynamic structures of benign and malignant salivary gland tumors. J Magn Reson Imaging 2008;27:1256-62.
85. Eida S, Sumi M, Sakihama N, Takahashi H, Nakamura T. Apparent diffusion coefficient mapping of salivary gland tumors: prediction of the benignancy and malignancy. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 2007;28:116-21.
86. Fruehwald-Pallamar J, Czerny C, Holzer-Fruehwald L, et al. Texture-based and diffusion-weighted discrimination of parotid gland lesions on MR images at 3.0 Tesla. NMR Biomed 2013;26:1372-9.
87. Habermann CR, Arndt C, Graessner J, et al. Diffusion-weighted echo-planar MR imaging of primary parotid gland tumors: is a prediction of different histologic subtypes possible? AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 2009;30:591-6.
88. Capaccio P, Cuccarini V, Ottaviani F, et al. Comparative ultrasonographic, magnetic resonance sialographic, and videoendoscopic assessment of salivary duct disorders. Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol 2008;117:245-52.

89. Onkar PM, Ratnaparkhi C, Mitra K. High-frequency ultrasound in parotid gland disease. Ultrasound Q 2013;29:313-21.
90. Rzepakowska A, Osuch-Wojcikiewicz E, Sobol M, Cruz R, Sielska-Badurek E, Niemczyk K. The differential diagnosis of parotid gland tumors with high-resolution ultrasound in otolaryngological practice. Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol 2017;274:3231-40.
91. Fischer T, Paschen CF, Slowinski T, et al. Differentiation of parotid gland tumors with contrast-enhanced ultrasound. Rofo 2010;182:155-62.
92. Klotz LV, Ingrisch M, Eichhorn ME, et al. Monitoring parotid gland tumors with a new perfusion software for contrast-enhanced ultrasound. Clin Hemorheol Microcirc 2014;58:261-9.
93. Matsuzuka T, Suzuki M, Saijo S, et al. Stiffness of salivary gland and tumor measured by new ultrasonic techniques: Virtual touch quantification and IQ. Auris Nasus Larynx 2015;42:128-33.
94. Strieth S, Siedek V, Rytvina M, Gurkov R, Berghaus A, Clevert DA. Dynamic contrast-enhanced ultrasound for differential diagnosis of submandibular gland disease. Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol 2014;271:163-9.
95. Brown RE, Harave S. Diagnostic imaging of benign and malignant neck masses in children-a pictorial review. Quant Imaging Med Surg 2016;6:591-604.
96. Lee DY, Seok J, Kim YJ, Kim MS, Sung MW, Hah JH. Neck computed tomography in pediatric neck mass as initial evaluation in ED: is it malpractice? Am J Emerg Med 2014;32:1237-40.
97. Baker LL, Dillon WP, Hieshima GB, Dowd CF, Frieden IJ. Hemangiomas and vascular malformations of the head and neck: MR characterization. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 1993;14:307-14.
98. Fordham LA, Chung CJ, Donnelly LF. Imaging of congenital vascular and lymphatic anomalies of the head and neck. Neuroimaging Clin N Am 2000;10:117-36, viii.
99. Kollipara R, Dinneen L, Rentas KE, et al. Current classification and terminology of pediatric vascular anomalies. AJR Am J Roentgenol 2013;201:1124-35.
100. Donnelly LF, Adams DM, Bisset GS, 3rd. Vascular malformations and hemangiomas: a practical approach in a multidisciplinary clinic. AJR Am J Roentgenol 2000;174:597-608.
101. LaPlante JK, Pierson NS, Hedlund GL. Common pediatric head and neck congenital/developmental anomalies. Radiol Clin North Am 2015;53:181-96.
102. Hohlweg-Majert B, Metzger MC, Voss PJ, Holzle F, Wolff KD, Schulze D. Preoperative cervical lymph node size evaluation in patients with malignant head/neck tumors: comparison between ultrasound and computer tomography. J Cancer Res Clin Oncol 2009;135:753-9.
103. Wong KT, Lee YY, King AD, Ahuja AT. Imaging of cystic or cyst-like neck masses. Clin Radiol 2008;63:613-22.
104. Scholbach T, Scholbach J, Krombach GA, Gagel B, Maneschi P, Di Martino E. New method of dynamic color doppler signal quantification in metastatic lymph nodes compared to direct polarographic measurements of tissue oxygenation. Int J Cancer 2005;114:957-62.
105. Collins B, Stoner JA, Digoy GP. Benefits of ultrasound vs. computed tomography in the diagnosis of pediatric lateral neck abscesses. Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol 2014;78:423-6.
106. American College of Radiology. ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Radiation Dose Assessment Introduction. Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Appropriateness-Criteria/RadiationDoseAssessmentIntro.pdf.

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.