ACR–SAR–SPR PRACTICE PARAMETER FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING (MRI) OF THE ABDOMEN (Excluding the Liver)

The American College of Radiology, with more than 40,000 members, is the principal organization of radiologists, radiation oncologists, and clinical medical physicists in the United States. The College is a nonprofit professional society whose primary purposes are to advance the science of radiology, improve radiologic services to the patient, study the socioeconomic aspects of the practice of radiology, and encourage continuing education for radiologists, radiation oncologists, medical physicists, and persons practicing in allied professional fields.

The American College of Radiology will periodically define new practice parameters and technical standards for radiologic practice to help advance the science of radiology and to improve the quality of service to patients throughout the United States. Existing practice parameters and technical standards will be reviewed for revision or renewal, as appropriate, on their fifth anniversary or sooner, if indicated.

Each practice parameter and technical standard, representing a policy statement by the College, has undergone a thorough consensus process in which it has been subjected to extensive review and approval. The practice parameters and technical standards recognize that the safe and effective use of diagnostic and therapeutic radiology requires specific training, skills, and techniques, as described in each document. Reproduction or modification of the published practice parameter and technical standard by those entities not providing these services is not authorized.

PREAMBLE

This document is an educational tool designed to assist practitioners in providing appropriate radiologic care for patients. Practice Parameters and Technical Standards are not inflexible rules or requirements of practice and are not intended, nor should they be used, to establish a legal standard of care[1]. For these reasons and those set forth below, the American College of Radiology and our collaborating medical specialty societies caution against the use of these documents in litigation in which the clinical decisions of a practitioner are called into question.

The ultimate judgment regarding the propriety of any specific procedure or course of action must be made by the practitioner considering all the circumstances presented. Thus, an approach that differs from the guidance in this document, standing alone, does not necessarily imply that the approach was below the standard of care. To the contrary, a conscientious practitioner may responsibly adopt a course of action different from that set forth in this document when, in the reasonable judgment of the practitioner, such course of action is indicated by variables such as the condition of the patient, limitations of available resources, or advances in knowledge or technology after publication of this document. However, a practitioner who employs an approach substantially different from the guidance in this document may consider documenting in the patient record information sufficient to explain the approach taken.

The practice of medicine involves the science, and the art of dealing with the prevention, diagnosis, alleviation, and treatment of disease. The variety and complexity of human conditions make it impossible to always reach the most appropriate diagnosis or to predict with certainty a particular response to treatment. Therefore, it should be recognized that adherence to the guidance in this document will not assure an accurate diagnosis or a successful outcome. All that should be expected is that the practitioner will follow a reasonable course of action based on current knowledge, available resources, and the needs of the patient to deliver effective and safe medical care. The purpose of this document is to assist practitioners in achieving this objective.

---

1 *Iowa Medical Society and Iowa Society of Anesthesiologists v. Iowa Board of Nursing, 831 N.W.2d 826 (Iowa 2013) Iowa Supreme Court refuses to find that the "ACR Technical Standard for Management of the Use of Radiation in Fluoroscopic Procedures (Revised 2008)" sets a national standard for who may perform fluoroscopic procedures in light of the standard's stated purpose that ACR standards are educational tools and not intended to establish a legal standard of care. See also, Stanley v. McCarver, 63 P.3d 1076 (Ariz. App. 2003) where in a concurring opinion the Court stated that "published standards or guidelines of specialty medical organizations are useful in determining the duty owed or the standard of care applicable in a given situation" even though ACR standards themselves do not establish the standard of care.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the abdomen is a proven and useful tool for the evaluation, assessment of severity, and follow-up of diseases of the abdomen. It should be performed only for a valid medical reason. MRI of the abdomen is an evolving technology involving a variety of pulse sequences and protocols that are continuously being modified and improved. Detailed imaging protocols are not presented here to avoid promoting obsolete methodology. This document pertains to the MRI assessment of the abdomen, excluding the liver. For practice parameters pertaining to the liver, see the ACR–SAR–SPR Practice Parameter for the

Performance of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) of the Liver [1].

The choice of MRI of the abdomen requires an analysis of the strengths of MRI as well as its suitability for each unique patient and clinical situation. In patients without a contraindication (see Section IV below), MRI is appropriately used for lesion characterization requiring high soft-tissue contrast, multiplanar evaluation of a lesion not well depicted on other imaging modalities, and multiphasic contrast enhanced imaging. MRI benefits from a lack of ionizing radiation. See the ACR Manual on MR Safety [2] and the ACR Manual on Contrast Media [3].

Peer-reviewed literature pertaining to MR safety should be reviewed on a regular basis [2,4].

II. INDICATIONS

Indications for MRI of the abdomen (excluding the liver) include, but are not limited to, the following:

A. Pancreas
1. Detection of pancreatic masses and preoperative staging in patients unable to receive iodinated contrast media
2. Characterization of indeterminate lesions and/or unexplained gland enlargement detected with other imaging modalities
3. Identification of causes of pancreatic duct obstruction, including calculi, stricture, or mass
4. Detection and characterization of pancreatic duct anomalies
5. Evaluation of pancreatic or peripancreatic fluid collections or fistulae
6. Evaluation of chronic pancreatitis, including assessment of pancreatic exocrine function, evaluation of acute pancreatitis, and associated complications
7. Postoperative/treatment follow-up after pancreatic surgery

B. Spleen
1. Characterization of indeterminate lesions detected with other imaging modalities
2. Detection and characterization of suspected diffuse abnormalities of the spleen
3. Evaluation of suspected accessory splenic tissue

C. Kidneys, Ureters, and Retroperitoneum
1. Detection of renal tumors
2. Characterization of indeterminate lesions detected with other imaging modalities
3. Preoperative assessment of renal neoplasms to include evaluation of the arterial supply, renal vein, and inferior vena cava
4. Evaluation of the urinary tract for abnormalities of anatomy or physiology (MR urography)
5. Postprocedure surveillance after renal tumor ablation or surgical extirpation via partial or complete nephrectomy
6. Evaluation of ureteral abnormalities
7. Evaluation of suspected retroperitoneal fibrosis and other benign lesions
8. Characterization and staging of retroperitoneal malignant neoplasms
9. Evaluation or follow-up of lymphadenopathy
10. Surveillance imaging of the upper urinary tract in patients with urothelial carcinoma
11. Characterization of complex congenital anomalies
12. Identification of causes of urinary tract obstruction

D. Adrenal Glands
1. Detection of suspected pheochromocytoma and functioning adrenal adenoma
2. Characterization of indeterminate lesions detected with other imaging modalities
3. Staging of malignant adrenal neoplasms
4. Detection and characterization of congenital anomalies

E. Vascular (see the ACR–NASCI–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Body Magnetic Resonance Angiography (MRA) [5]).

F. Bile Ducts and Gallbladder
1. Detection, staging, and posttreatment follow-up of bile duct and gallbladder cancer

2. Detection of bile duct or gallbladder stones
3. Evaluation of bile duct dilation and/or narrowing
4. Evaluation of suspected congenital abnormalities of the gallbladder or bile ducts
5. Detection and anatomic delineation of bile leaks
6. Delineation of ductal anatomy prior to liver transplantation
7. Assessment of post–liver transplant biliary complications

G. Gastrointestinal Tract and Peritoneum

1. Preoperative assessment of gastric neoplasms
2. Detection of small-bowel neoplasms
3. Assessment of inflammatory disorders of the small or large bowel and mesenteries (including MR enterography); for MR enterography, see the ACR–SAR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Magnetic Resonance (MR) Enterography [6]
4. Assessment of peritoneal adhesive disease
5. Detection and evaluation of primary and metastatic peritoneal or mesenteric neoplasms
6. Detection and characterization of intra-abdominal fluid collections as well as follow-up after percutaneous or surgical drainage
7. Second-line imaging tests after an initial ultrasound for diagnosis of acute appendicitis in children and adults, including pregnant women [7-9]
8. Evaluation and follow-up of lymphadenopathy

H. Other

1. Imaging follow-up of abnormalities of the abdomen deemed indeterminate on initial MRI and for which surgery is not advised
2. Detection and characterization of extraperitoneal neoplasms other than those mentioned above
3. Evaluation of the abdomen as an alternative to CT when radiation exposure is an overriding concern in susceptible patients, such as pregnant or pediatric patients or in patients with a contraindication to iodinated contrast agents
4. Assessment of treatment response to medical therapy of malignant neoplasms of the abdomen
5. Determining organ of origin of an indeterminate (benign or malignant) lesion in the abdomen when the origin is not obvious from other imaging modalities
6. Identification and characterization of vascular malformations (see the ACR–NASCI–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Body Magnetic Resonance Angiography (MRA) [5])
7. Evaluation of abdominal wall abnormalities not adequately assessed by other imaging modalities
8. Assessment of traumatic injury of the abdomen when CT is contraindicated

See the ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) [10], the ACR Manual on MR Safety [2], and the ACR Manual on Contrast Media [3].

III. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

See the ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) **[10]**.

IV. SPECIFICATIONS OF THE EXAMINATION

The written or electronic request for MRI of the abdomen should provide sufficient information to demonstrate the medical necessity of the examination and allow for the proper performance and interpretation of the examination.

Documentation that satisfies medical necessity includes 1) signs and symptoms and/or 2) relevant history (including known diagnoses). The provision of additional information regarding the specific reason for the examination or a provisional diagnosis would be helpful and may at times be needed to allow for the proper performance and interpretation of the examination.

The request for the examination must be originated by a physician or other appropriately licensed health care provider. The accompanying clinical information should be provided by a physician or other appropriately licensed health care provider familiar with the patient's clinical problem or question and consistent with the state scope of practice requirements. (ACR Resolution 35 adopted in 2006 – revised in 2016, Resolution 12-b)

The supervising physician must have adequate understanding of the indications, risks, and benefits of the

examination as well as alternative imaging procedures. The physician must be familiar with potential hazards associated with MRI, including potential adverse reactions to contrast media. The physician should be familiar with relevant prior ancillary studies. The physician performing MRI interpretation must have a clear understanding and knowledge of the relevant anatomy and pathophysiology.

The supervising physician must also understand the pulse sequences to be used and their effect on the appearance of the images, including the potential generation of image artifacts. Standard imaging protocols may be established and varied on a case-by-case basis when necessary. These protocols should be reviewed and updated on a regular basis.

A. Patient Selection

The physician responsible for the examination should supervise patient selection and preparation and be available for consultation by direct communication. Patients and any family members or others who will accompany the patient into the MRI suite must be screened and interviewed prior to the examination to exclude individuals who may have contraindications to MRI, in which the risks may outweigh the benefits. All sites should have an established and documented screening mechanism for establishing MRI compatibility.

Certain indications require administration of intravenous (IV) contrast media. IV contrast enhancement should be performed using appropriate injection protocols and in accordance with the institution's policy on IV contrast use (see the ACR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Use of Intravascular Contrast Media [11]).

Patients suffering from anxiety or claustrophobia, or who are unable to cooperate or suspend respiration, may require sedation or additional assistance. Administration of sedation may be necessary to achieve a successful examination. If sedation is necessary, refer to the ACR–SIR Practice Parameter for Sedation/Analgesia [12].

B. Facility Requirements

Appropriate emergency equipment and medications must be immediately available to treat adverse reactions associated with administered medications. The equipment and medications should be monitored for inventory and drug expiration dates on a regular basis. The equipment, medications, and other emergency support must also be appropriate for the range of ages and sizes in the patient population. Furthermore, regular training on the use of such equipment and medication is recommended for those providing patient care in the MRI environment.

All sites should employ site-access restrictions, with clear demarcation of safety zones I–IV, utilizing signage and physical barriers as appropriate (see the ACR Manual on MR Safety [2]).

C. Examination Technique

A phased array surface coil should be used unless precluded by patient body habitus or condition. In pediatric patients, coil selection will depend on patient size and the region being imaged. In small neonates, a surface coil should be considered, whereas infants and children may be imaged with a cardiac, flex, or body coil, depending on the size of the abdomen. The field of view (FOV) should be selected to provide the highest resolution possible to include the entire region or organ of interest, allowing for an adequate signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) and minimization of relevant artifacts. Multiple acquisitions with repositioning of the surface coil may be necessary when the region of interest exceeds the potential FOV of the surface coil. For most applications, evaluation of the abdomen should include T1 and T2-weighted images. Acquisitions in multiple imaging planes may be beneficial in defining anatomic relationships. For most applications, slice thickness for acquisitions should not exceed 8 mm, with the interslice gap not exceeding 2 mm, although thinner slices and gaps are desirable. In children, slice thicknesses typically range from 3-8 mm, depending on the size of the area to be imaged.

T1-weighted imaging may be performed using an echo train spin-echo (turbo spin-echo [TSE] or fast spin-echo [FSE]) sequence, although the gradient-echo technique is typically favored because it has a much shorter acquisition time. T2-weighted images may be accomplished using one of the echo train spin-echo sequences (TSE or FSE) or a hybrid gradient and spin-echo technique [13]. Fat suppression is frequently beneficial and may be accomplished using chemical shift/Dixon-based techniques [14-16].

Although fast gradient-echo T1-weighted images can usually be acquired during breath-holding, some patients are unable to cooperate with even short breath holds. Compressed sensing, often in combination with parallel imaging (PI) and view sharing or non-Cartesian acquisition, is a technique offered by multiple vendors that allow dramatic reduction in scan time and even free-breathing dynamic postcontrast imaging [17-19]. The duration of conventional and FSE T2-weighted imaging is often too long for complete acquisition during breath holding. Breath-hold techniques can be used for T2-weighted imaging if the scan time is reduced by a) long echo trains, b) partial-Fourier imaging, c) use of PI techniques, and/or d) dividing the volume of interest into several smaller volumes that can each be imaged in individual breath holds. Traditional strategies to reduce respiratory motion during free-breathing image acquisition include respiratory compensation (respiratory-ordered phase encoding), respiratory triggering with respiratory bellows, the use of navigator pulses [20,21], the acquisition of k-space data in concentric rectangular strips [22] and signal averaging. Familiarity with these methods is helpful when scanning young children or other patients who may not be able to follow breath-hold commands, as well as sedated/anesthetized patients. Inclusion of at least one in-phase and out-of-phase gradient-echo sequence is useful for detecting intracellular lipid within certain adrenal (eg, adenoma) and renal (eg, clear-cell carcinoma) tumors and to confirm fatty infiltration of organs, such as the pancreas [23-27]. The technique can also be useful for the detection of hemosiderin, such as can occur in renal masses, or other sources of susceptibility artifact [28,29]. A single dual-echo gradient-echo sequence is more effective than separate gradient-echo sequences that differ in echo times (TEs) because the former will depict the exact same anatomy, without misregistration artifacts. It is essential that the out-of-phase TE is shorter than the in-phase TE so that signal reduction on the out-of-phase TE will be unambiguous evidence of lipid content. Breath-held dual-echo sequences are generally preferable.

Three-dimensional (3-D) techniques are available for both T1 and T2-weighted imaging. Numerous advantages over traditional two-dimensional (2-D) sequences include higher inherent SNR, higher in-plane and through-plane resolution, and homogenous fat suppression, most of which are better realized in T1-weighted imaging. Isotropic voxel dimensions allow for multiplanar reconstructions that may obviate the need for additional acquisition in other planes. Several publications have illustrated the value of T2-weighted 3-D imaging for the depiction of complex anatomy and volumetric imaging [30-32].

IV gadolinium-based contrast agents (GBCAs) are beneficial to detect and characterize many intra-abdominal neoplasms, vascular abnormalities, and inflammatory processes. However, the use of those agents may be omitted when noncontrast images are sufficiently diagnostic, in the opinion of the supervising physician such that the administration of IV contrast is unlikely to be of further benefit to the patient or where the risks of the administration outweigh the potential benefits. IV contrast may also be omitted when there is a) no IV access, b) a history of prior allergic-like reaction to GBCAs and the patient has not been premedicated, c) a relative contraindication exists to parenteral exposure to gadolinium chelates (eg, pregnancy), d) severe renal insufficiency with an estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) <30 mL/min/1.73 m^2 or acute renal injury of any severity, or e) known or suspected diagnosis of nephrogenic systemic fibrosis. Of note, for an eGFR of 15–30, many practices are now opting to perform a clinically indicated contrast-enhanced MR examination utilizing a macrocyclic GBCA. Detailed information that can help in forming practice-specific policies regarding handling of GBCA administration is provided in the ACR Manual on Contrast Media [3].

Multiphase contrast-enhanced sequences acquired through the abdomen are commonly composed of precontrast, arterial, venous, and delayed phase images, which are beneficial for evaluating various blood vessels and solid organ tumors [33,34]. Subtraction images may also be generated, which can aid in identifying tumor enhancement [35]. Postcontrast enhanced imaging may be performed with a 2-D or 3-D technique. 3-D imaging allows isotropic or near-isotropic resolution and facilitates multiplanar reconstructions [36]. The use of fat suppression during dynamic contrast-enhanced, T1-weighted imaging is strongly encouraged, as it improves the conspicuity of enhancing structures and abnormalities. Fat suppression can typically be accomplished using frequency selective saturation or chemical shift/Dixon techniques. Inversion recovery sequences should be avoided for postcontrast imaging, as the relative enhancement of tissues due to gadolinium that falls within the nulling range for fat is also suppressed by this technique.

Specific timings and adjunctive measures in dynamic contrast-enhanced imaging can be employed for particular applications. For instance, delayed postcontrast T1-weighted imaging (5 minutes or later after administration of extracellular GCBA) can be useful in excretory MR urography for detecting pathology of the urinary tract [37,38], and IV hydration and/or diuretic administration has been shown to improve

visualization of the nondilated collecting system [39] and ureters [40]. Delayed imaging with extracellular gadolinium-based agents may also be useful in diagnosing cancer of the biliary system [41]. Note that different GBCAs that allow visualization of particular organs and organ systems are available. Specifically, hepatobiliary agents (eg, gadoxetate disodium, gadobenate dimeglumine) localize to the liver and biliary tree, and fat-suppressed T1-weighted imaging during the hepatobiliary phase provide images based on hepatocyte uptake and biliary excretion of these agents [42]. (See the ACR–SAR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) of the Liver [1].)

The addition of a heavily T2-weighted MR cholangiopancreatography (MRCP) sequence may be beneficial for evaluating the biliary and pancreatic ducts [41-43]. Such heavily T2-weighted sequences may also serve to evaluate dilated renal collecting systems (static-fluid MR urography) [34,43] as well as in the evaluation of the lymphatic system to demonstrate pathologic lymphatic structures and the presence and distribution of lymphatic fluid in different body cavities [44,45].

The use of secretin has been shown to significantly improve visualization of the pancreatic duct during MRCP, which can aid in the diagnosis of anatomic variants [44-46], chronic pancreatitis [47,48], and side-branch intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasms [49]. Secretin has also been used to measure pancreatic exocrine function [50,51]. T2-weighted imaging can be performed using a rapid acquisition relaxation enhancement (RARE) or half-Fourier single-shot echo train spin-echo sequence. These sequences can be performed as a thick slab acquisition in multiple projections or as multiple thin (< 5 mm) slices in at least one imaging plane during breath holding. 3-D respiratory triggered T2-weighted FSE techniques can also be used, potentially offering improved SNR and isotropic spatial resolution [52]. Additional sequences, such as postcontrast T1-weighted and FSE T2-weighted sequences, can aid in the assessment of periductal tissues, the evaluation for causes of extrinsic ductal compression, and the staging of cholangiocarcinoma [54,55].

The use of an oral contrast agent for MRI of the abdomen is considered optional but may occasionally be beneficial for gastrointestinal imaging [46]. For MR enterography, see the ACR–SAR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Magnetic Resonance (MR) Enterography [6]. Negative oral contrast agents may be helpful in selected cases to suppress signal and reduce artifact from bowel contents when imaging other organs or structures, such as the peritoneum, pancreaticobiliary tree, or urinary system. When using oral contrast media for assessing the small bowel and its serosal surface, a nonabsorbable agent that produces a dark enteric lumen on T1-weighted images can optimize detection of mural enhancement after IV administration of GBCA. Administration of spasmolytic agents, such as glucagon [47], can reduce peristalsis and its resultant motion artifact. This can be particularly helpful for contrast-enhanced fast gradient-echo T1-weighted imaging of the bowel [48] or for evaluating the mesentery and peritoneal surfaces [49].

Steady-state free-precession (SSFP) sequences display bright fluid and blood while minimizing motion and flow-related artifacts. Such sequences can provide a rapid abdominal survey [50] and can be useful for cine imaging of the bowel during MR enterography and for demonstration of intra-abdominal adhesions [50-53].

3T imaging systems have become widely available, and potential advantages include increased SNR [54], increased conspicuity of enhancement after administration of a gadolinium chelate [55], and more rapid chemical shift-type sequences (based on shorter in-phase and opposed-phase TEs compared with 1.5T). Potential disadvantages include decreased image contrast on T1-weighted images, increased susceptibility artifact, increased chemical shift artifact, increased specific absorption rate (SAR), and standing wave phenomena from B1 inhomogeneity [56]. The latter can be partially compensated for by the use of radiofrequency cushions [57]. In short, 3T imaging can offer substantial improvements in SNR and spatial resolution and/or decreases in imaging times, but careful sequence optimization is required to maintain desired image contrast and reduce artifacts [58,59].

PI techniques take advantage of spatial sensitivity information from multiple independent receiver coil elements in order to reduce the number of phase encoding steps, thereby reducing scan times [60]. These can also expand the options for breath-hold imaging and provide shorter effective TEs and decreased blurring on echo-train sequences, such as single-shot FSE. The primary penalty of this method of time savings is reduced SNR [61]. However, there is a potentially synergistic effect between PI and imaging at 3T: 1) the decreased SNR inherent to PI is partially offset by the increased SNR of 3T, and 2) the SAR issues inherent to 3T can be offset by a reduced number of excitations [62]. 2-D PI techniques have become available, which provide higher-order acceleration factors by reducing the number of measurements required to fill k-space in both the phase and partition directions [63,64]. Emerging applications are also being developed with other means of image acquisition acceleration, such as non-Cartesian kernels and simultaneous multislice techniques (SMS) [65].

Diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) can be utilized for abdominal application [66]. Most research to date has

centered on oncologic applications, either for staging disease or monitoring response to therapy [67-73]. The most common technique uses single-shot echo-planar imaging (SS-EPI). Breath-held, free-breathing multiple-averaging, and respiratory-gated SS-EPI techniques have been described [74,75]. PI can be used to decrease imaging time, reduce susceptibility-related signal loss by shortening the effective TE, and has been shown to result in accurate apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) values [76]. DWI is a value-added sequence capable of improving lesion detection and characterization, as restricted diffusion can be quite sensitive in suggesting the presence of hypercellularity, such as with small metastases or the purulent core of an abscess, and is useful in examinations for which IV contrast is not or cannot be utilized [77]. There is also increasing evidence of its utility in the evaluation of infectious and inflammatory processes, possibly obviating the need for IV gadolinium-based contrast in the study of inflammatory bowel disease during MR enterography and for the diagnosis of acute appendicitis and its postoperative complications [78-84]. ADC maps can be generated to help differentiate between restricted diffusion and T2 shine-through when at least 2 b-values are obtained, such as b = 0 to 50 s/mm2 and b = 500 to 1,000 s/mm2. Many vendors offer computed DWI, in which additional higher b-value images are generated from a set of measured v-values by voxel-wise fitting, thus providing images with greater diffusion weighting in less time and with higher relative SNR than directly acquired DWIs [85]. In addition, more complex models of diffusion, such as the intravoxel incoherent motion (IVIM) model, have shown the potential to separate perfusion effects from true restricted diffusion and may provide more robust measures of diffusion compared with the ADC model [86].

V. DOCUMENTATION

Reporting should be in accordance with the ACR Practice Parameter for Communication of Diagnostic Imaging Findings [87].

VI. EQUIPMENT SPECIFICATIONS

Equipment performance monitoring should be in accordance with the ACR–AAPM Technical Standard for Diagnostic Medical Physics Performance Monitoring of Magnetic Resonance (MR) Imaging Equipment [88].

The MRI equipment specifications and performance must meet all state and federal requirements. The requirements include, but are not limited to, specifications of maximum static magnetic strength, maximum rate of change of magnetic field strength (dB/dt), maximum radiofrequency power deposition (specific absorption rate), and maximum acoustic noise levels.

VII. QUALITY CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT, SAFETY, INFECTION CONTROL, AND PATIENT EDUCATION

Policies and procedures related to quality, patient education, infection control, and safety should be developed and implemented in accordance with the ACR Policy on Quality Control and Improvement, Safety, Infection Control, and Patient Education appearing under the heading *ACR Position Statement on Quality Control and Improvement, Safety, Infection Control and Patient Education* on the ACR website (https://www.acr.org/Advocacy-and-Economics/ACR-Position-Statements/Quality-Control-and-Improvement).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This practice parameter was revised according to the process described under the heading *The Process for Developing ACR Practice Parameters and Technical Standards* on the ACR website (https://www.acr.org/Clinical-Resources/Practice-Parameters-and-Technical-Standards) by the Committee on Body Imaging (Abdominal) of the Commission on Body Imaging and by the Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology of the Commission on Pediatric Radiology, in collaboration with the SAR and the SPR.

Writing Committee

Members represent their societies in the initial and final revision of this practice parameter.

ACR	SAR	SPR
David D. Childs, MD, Chair	Ravi Kaza, MD	Hansel J. Otero, MD
Tara M. Catanzano, MD, BCh		Ethan A. Smith, MD
Jao J. Ou, MD		

Committee on Practice Parameters - Body Imaging (Abdominal)

(ACR Committee responsible for sponsoring the draft through the process)

Benjamin M. Yeh, MD, Chair
Mahmoud M. Al-Hawary, MD
Mark E. Baker, MD, FACR
Olga R. Brook, MD
Lindsay Busby MD, MPH
Jay P. Heiken MD, FACR
David Kim, MD, FACR
Diego Martin, MD, PhD
Alec Megibow, MD, MPH, FACR
Achille Mileto, MD
Erick Remer, MD, FACR
Kumar Sandrasegaran, MD
Adam S. Young, MD, MBA

Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology

(ACR Committee responsible for sponsoring the draft through the process)

Beverley Newman, MB, BCh, BSc, FACR, Chair
Terry L. Levin, MD, FACR, Vice Chair
John B. Amodio, MD, FACR
Tara M. Catanzano, MB, BCh
Harris L. Cohen, MD, FACR
Kassa Darge, MD, PhD
Dorothy L. Gilbertson-Dahdal, MD
Lauren P. Golding, MD
Safwan S. Halabi, MD
Jason Higgins, DO
Jane Sun Kim, MD
Jessica Kurian, MD
Matthew P. Lungren, MD, MPH
Helen R. Nadel, MD
Erica Poletto, MD
Richard B. Towbin, MD, FACR
Andrew T. Trout, MD
Esben S. Vogelius, MD

Lincoln L. Berland, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Body Imaging
Richard A. Barth, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Pediatric Radiology
Jacqueline A. Bello, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Quality and Safety
Mary S. Newell, MD, FACR, Chair, Committee on Practice Parameters and Technical Standards

Comments Reconciliation Committee

Aradhana Venkatesan, MD– Chair
Andy Moriarity, MD– Vice Chair
Richard A. Barth, MD, FACR
Jacqueline Anne Bello, MD
Lincoln L. Berland, MD, FACR
Priyadarshani R. Bhosale, MD
Travis G. Browning, MD
Tara M. Catanzano, MD, BCh
David D. Childs, MD
Richard Duszak, Jr., MD
Ravi Kaza, MD
Amy L. Kotsenas, MD
Paul A. Larson, MD, FACR
Mary S. Newell, MD
Beverley Newman, MB, BCh, BSc, FACR
Hansel J. Otero, MD
Jao J. Ou, MD
Alvin Silva, MD
Ethan A. Smith, MD
Benjamin M. Yeh, MD

Writing Committee

Members represent their societies in the initial and final revision of this practice parameter.

ACR	SAR	SPR
David D. Childs, MD, Chair	Ravi Kaza, MD	Hansel J. Otero, MD
Tara M. Catanzano, MD, BCh		Ethan A. Smith, MD
Jao J. Ou, MD		

Committee on Practice Parameters - Body Imaging (Abdominal)

(ACR Committee responsible for sponsoring the draft through the process)

Benjamin M. Yeh, MD, Chair
Diego Martin, MD, PhD

Mahmoud M. Al-Hawary, MD
Mark E. Baker, MD, FACR
Olga R. Brook, MD
Lindsay Busby MD, MPH
Jay P. Heiken MD, FACR
David Kim, MD, FACR
Alec Megibow, MD, MPH, FACR
Achille Mileto, MD
Erick Remer, MD, FACR
Kumar Sandrasegaran, MD
Adam S. Young, MD, MBA

Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology

(ACR Committee responsible for sponsoring the draft through the process)

Beverley Newman, MB, BCh, BSc, FACR, Chair
Terry L. Levin, MD, FACR, Vice Chair
John B. Amodio, MD, FACR
Tara M. Catanzano, MB, BCh
Harris L. Cohen, MD, FACR
Kassa Darge, MD, PhD
Dorothy L. Gilbertson-Dahdal, MD
Lauren P. Golding, MD
Safwan S. Halabi, MD
Jason Higgins, DO
Jane Sun Kim, MD
Jessica Kurian, MD
Matthew P. Lungren, MD, MPH
Helen R. Nadel, MD
Erica Poletto, MD
Richard B. Towbin, MD, FACR
Andrew T. Trout, MD
Esben S. Vogelius, MD

Lincoln L. Berland, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Body Imaging
Richard A. Barth, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Pediatric Radiology
Jacqueline A. Bello, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Quality and Safety
Mary S. Newell, MD, FACR, Chair, Committee on Practice Parameters and Technical Standards

Comments Reconciliation Committee

Aradhana Venkatesan, MD– Chair
Andy Moriarity, MD– Vice Chair
Richard A. Barth, MD, FACR
Jacqueline Anne Bello, MD
Lincoln L. Berland, MD, FACR
Priyadarshani R. Bhosale, MD
Travis G. Browning, MD
Tara M. Catanzano, MD, BCh
David D. Childs, MD
Ravi Kaza, MD
Amy L. Kotsenas, MD
Paul A. Larson, MD, FACR
Mary S. Newell, MD
Beverley Newman, MB, BCh, BSc, FACR
Hansel J. Otero, MD
Jao J. Ou, MD
Alvin Silva, MD
Ethan A. Smith, MD

REFERNCES

1. American College of Radiology. ACR-SAR-SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) of the Liver. Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-Liver.pdf. Accessed March 5, 2019.
2. American College of Radiology. ACR guidance document on MR safe practices: 2020. Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Radiology-Safety/MR-Safety/Manual-on-MR-Safety.pdf. Accessed July 2, 2020.
3. American College of Radiology. Manual on Contrast Media. Available at: http://www.acr.org/Quality-Safety/Resources/Contrast-Manual. Accessed February 3, 2020.
4. Shellock FG. *Reference Manual for Magnetic Resonance Safety, Implants, and Devices*. Playa Del Rey, CA Biomedical Research Publishing Group; 2013.
5. American College of Radiology. ACR–NASCI–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Body Magnetic Resonance Angiography (MRA). Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-

Parameters/Body-MRA.pdf. Accessed March 5, 2019.
6. American College of Radiology. ACR_SAR-SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Magnetic Resonance (MR) Enterography. Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-Enterog.pdf. Accessed June 17, 2019.
7. Eng KA, Abadeh A, Ligocki C, et al. Acute Appendicitis: A Meta-Analysis of the Diagnostic Accuracy of US, CT, and MRI as Second-Line Imaging Tests after an Initial US. Radiology 2018;288:717-27.
8. Repplinger MD, Pickhardt PJ, Robbins JB, et al. Prospective Comparison of the Diagnostic Accuracy of MR Imaging versus CT for Acute Appendicitis. Radiology 2018;288:467-75.
9. Zhang H, Liao M, Chen J, Zhu D, Byanju S. Ultrasound, computed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging - which is preferred for acute appendicitis in children? A Meta-analysis. Pediatric radiology 2017;47:186-96.
10. American College of Radiology. ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI). Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-Perf-Interpret.pdf. Accessed March 5, 2019.
11. American College of Radiology. ACR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Use of Intravascular Contrast Media. Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Sed-Analgesia.pdf. Accessed March 5, 2019.
12. American College of Radiology. ACR-SIR Practice Parameter for Sedation/Analgesia. Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Sed-Analgesia.pdf. Accessed March 5, 2019.
13. Karantanas AH, Papanikolaou N. T2-weighted magnetic resonance imaging of the liver: comparison of fat-suppressed GRASE with conventional spin echo, fat-suppressed turbo spin echo, and gradient echo at 1.0 T. Abdominal imaging 2001;26:139-45.
14. Ma J. Dixon techniques for water and fat imaging. Journal of magnetic resonance imaging : JMRI 2008;28:543-58.
15. Low RN, Ma J, Panchal N. Fast spin-echo triple-echo Dixon: initial clinical experience with a novel pulse sequence for fat-suppressed T2-weighted abdominal MR imaging. Journal of magnetic resonance imaging : JMRI 2009;30:569-77.
16. Vasanawala SS, Madhuranthakam AJ, Venkatesan R, Sonik A, Lai P, Brau AC. Volumetric fat-water separated T2-weighted MRI. Pediatric radiology 2011;41:875-83.
17. Kim YC, Min JH, Kim YK, et al. Intra-individual comparison of gadolinium-enhanced MRI using pseudo-golden-angle radial acquisition with gadoxetic acid-enhanced MRI for diagnosis of HCCs using LI-RADS. European radiology 2019;29:2058-68.
18. Hope TA, Petkovska I, Saranathan M, Hargreaves BA, Vasanawala SS. Combined parenchymal and vascular imaging: High spatiotemporal resolution arterial evaluation of hepatocellular carcinoma. Journal of magnetic resonance imaging : JMRI 2016;43:859-65.
19. Chandarana H, Feng L, Ream J, et al. Respiratory Motion-Resolved Compressed Sensing Reconstruction of Free-Breathing Radial Acquisition for Dynamic Liver Magnetic Resonance Imaging. Investigative radiology 2015;50:749-56.
20. Kim BS, Kim JH, Choi GM, et al. Comparison of three free-breathing T2-weighted MRI sequences in the evaluation of focal liver lesions. AJR. American journal of roentgenology 2008;190:W19-27.
21. Lee SS, Byun JH, Hong HS, et al. Image quality and focal lesion detection on T2-weighted MR imaging of the liver: comparison of two high-resolution free-breathing imaging techniques with two breath-hold imaging techniques. Journal of magnetic resonance imaging : JMRI 2007;26:323-30.
22. Hirokawa Y, Isoda H, Maetani YS, Arizono S, Shimada K, Togashi K. Evaluation of motion correction effect and image quality with the periodically rotated overlapping parallel lines with enhanced reconstruction (PROPELLER) (BLADE) and parallel imaging acquisition technique in the upper abdomen. Journal of magnetic resonance imaging : JMRI 2008;28:957-62.
23. Pokharel SS, Macura KJ, Kamel IR, Zaheer A. Current MR imaging lipid detection techniques for diagnosis of lesions in the abdomen and pelvis. Radiographics : a review publication of the Radiological Society of North America, Inc 2013;33:681-702.
24. Kim HJ, Byun JH, Park SH, et al. Focal fatty replacement of the pancreas: usefulness of chemical shift MRI. AJR. American journal of roentgenology 2007;188:429-32.
25. Bilbey JH, McLoughlin RF, Kurkjian PS, et al. MR imaging of adrenal masses: value of chemical-shift imaging for distinguishing adenomas from other tumors. AJR. American journal of roentgenology 1995;164:637-42.

26. Israel GM, Hindman N, Hecht E, Krinsky G. The use of opposed-phase chemical shift MRI in the diagnosis of renal angiomyolipomas. AJR. American journal of roentgenology 2005;184:1868-72.
27. Yoshimitsu K, Irie H, Tajima T, et al. MR imaging of renal cell carcinoma: its role in determining cell type. Radiation medicine 2004;22:371-6.
28. Yoshimitsu K, Kakihara D, Irie H, et al. Papillary renal carcinoma: diagnostic approach by chemical shift gradient-echo and echo-planar MR imaging. Journal of magnetic resonance imaging : JMRI 2006;23:339-44.
29. Childs DD, Clingan MJ, Zagoria RJ, et al. In-phase signal intensity loss in solid renal masses on dual-echo gradient-echo MRI: association with malignancy and pathologic classification. AJR. American journal of roentgenology 2014;203:W421-8.
30. Arizono S, Isoda H, Maetani YS, et al. High-spatial-resolution three-dimensional MR cholangiography using a high-sampling-efficiency technique (SPACE) at 3T: comparison with the conventional constant flip angle sequence in healthy volunteers. Journal of magnetic resonance imaging : JMRI 2008;28:685-90.
31. Futterer JJ, Yakar D, Strijk SP, Barentsz JO. Preoperative 3T MR imaging of rectal cancer: local staging accuracy using a two-dimensional and three-dimensional T2-weighted turbo spin echo sequence. European journal of radiology 2008;65:66-71.
32. Lichy MP, Wietek BM, Mugler JP, 3rd, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging of the body trunk using a single-slab, 3-dimensional, T2-weighted turbo-spin-echo sequence with high sampling efficiency (SPACE) for high spatial resolution imaging: initial clinical experiences. Investigative radiology 2005;40:754-60.
33. Ho VB, Allen SF, Hood MN, Choyke PL. Renal masses: quantitative assessment of enhancement with dynamic MR imaging. Radiology 2002;224:695-700.
34. Tajima Y, Kuroki T, Tsutsumi R, Isomoto I, Uetani M, Kanematsu T. Pancreatic carcinoma coexisting with chronic pancreatitis versus tumor-forming pancreatitis: diagnostic utility of the time-signal intensity curve from dynamic contrast-enhanced MR imaging. World journal of gastroenterology : WJG 2007;13:858-65.
35. Hecht EM, Israel GM, Krinsky GA, et al. Renal masses: quantitative analysis of enhancement with signal intensity measurements versus qualitative analysis of enhancement with image subtraction for diagnosing malignancy at MR imaging. Radiology 2004;232:373-8.
36. Rofsky NM, Lee VS, Laub G, et al. Abdominal MR imaging with a volumetric interpolated breath-hold examination. Radiology 1999;212:876-84.
37. Leyendecker JR, Barnes CE, Zagoria RJ. MR urography: techniques and clinical applications. Radiographics : a review publication of the Radiological Society of North America, Inc 2008;28:23-46; discussion 46-7.
38. Takahashi N, Kawashima A, Glockner JF, et al. Small (<2-cm) upper-tract urothelial carcinoma: evaluation with gadolinium-enhanced three-dimensional spoiled gradient-recalled echo MR urography. Radiology 2008;247:451-7.
39. Ergen FB, Hussain HK, Carlos RC, et al. 3D excretory MR urography: improved image quality with intravenous saline and diuretic administration. Journal of magnetic resonance imaging : JMRI 2007;25:783-9.
40. Nolte-Ernsting CC, Bucker A, Adam GB, et al. Gadolinium-enhanced excretory MR urography after low-dose diuretic injection: comparison with conventional excretory urography. Radiology 1998;209:147-57.
41. Manfredi R, Barbaro B, Masselli G, Vecchioli A, Marano P. Magnetic resonance imaging of cholangiocarcinoma. Seminars in liver disease 2004;24:155-64.
42. Seale MK, Catalano OA, Saini S, Hahn PF, Sahani DV. Hepatobiliary-specific MR contrast agents: role in imaging the liver and biliary tree. Radiographics : a review publication of the Radiological Society of North America, Inc 2009;29:1725-48.
43. Gillams AR, Lees WR. Quantitative secretin MRCP (MRCPQ): results in 215 patients with known or suspected pancreatic pathology. European radiology 2007;17:2984-90.
44. Itkin M, Nadolski GJ. Modern Techniques of Lymphangiography and Interventions: Current Status and Future Development. Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol 2018;41:366-76.
45. Chavhan GB, Amaral JG, Temple M, Itkin M. MR Lymphangiography in Children: Technique and Potential Applications. Radiographics : a review publication of the Radiological Society of North America, Inc 2017;37:1775-90.
46. Giovagnoni A, Fabbri A, Maccioni F. Oral contrast agents in MRI of the gastrointestinal tract. Abdominal imaging 2002;27:367-75.
47. Marti-Bonmati L, Graells M, Ronchera-Oms CL. Reduction of peristaltic artifacts on magnetic resonance imaging of the abdomen: a comparative evaluation of three drugs. Abdominal imaging 1996;21:309-13.

48. Fidler J. MR imaging of the small bowel. Radiologic clinics of North America 2007;45:317-31.
49. Low RN. MR imaging of the peritoneal spread of malignancy. Abdominal imaging 2007;32:267-83.
50. Dutka MV, Bergin D, O'Kane PL, Frangos AJ, Parker L, Mitchell DG. Rapid multiplanar abdominal survey using MRI with the steady-state free-precession technique. Journal of magnetic resonance imaging : JMRI 2008;27:198-203.
51. Froehlich JM, Waldherr C, Stoupis C, Erturk SM, Patak MA. MR motility imaging in Crohn's disease improves lesion detection compared with standard MR imaging. European radiology 2010;20:1945-51.
52. Heye T, Stein D, Antolovic D, Dueck M, Kauczor HU, Hosch W. Evaluation of bowel peristalsis by dynamic cine MRI: detection of relevant functional disturbances--initial experience. Journal of magnetic resonance imaging : JMRI 2012;35:859-67.
53. Lienemann A, Sprenger D, Steitz HO, Korell M, Reiser M. Detection and mapping of intraabdominal adhesions by using functional cine MR imaging: preliminary results. Radiology 2000;217:421-5.
54. Choi JY, Kim MJ, Chung YE, et al. Abdominal applications of 3.0-T MR imaging: comparative review versus a 1.5-T system. Radiographics : a review publication of the Radiological Society of North America, Inc 2008;28:e30.
55. Soher BJ, Dale BM, Merkle EM. A review of MR physics: 3T versus 1.5T. Magnetic resonance imaging clinics of North America 2007;15:277-90, v.
56. Leyendecker JR, Childs DD. Kidneys and MR urography. Magnetic resonance imaging clinics of North America 2007;15:373-82, vii.
57. Franklin KM, Dale BM, Merkle EM. Improvement in B1-inhomogeneity artifacts in the abdomen at 3T MR imaging using a radiofrequency cushion. Journal of magnetic resonance imaging : JMRI 2008;27:1443-7.
58. Hussain SM, Wielopolski PA, Martin DR. Abdominal magnetic resonance imaging at 3.0 T: problem or a promise for the future? Topics in magnetic resonance imaging : TMRI 2005;16:325-35.
59. Martin DR, Friel HT, Danrad R, De Becker J, Hussain SM. Approach to abdominal imaging at 1.5 Tesla and optimization at 3 Tesla. Magnetic resonance imaging clinics of North America 2005;13:241-54, v-vi.
60. Glockner JF, Hu HH, Stanley DW, Angelos L, King K. Parallel MR imaging: a user's guide. Radiographics : a review publication of the Radiological Society of North America, Inc 2005;25:1279-97.
61. Larkman DJ, Nunes RG. Parallel magnetic resonance imaging. Physics in medicine and biology 2007;52:R15-55.
62. Pruessmann KP. Parallel imaging at high field strength: synergies and joint potential. Topics in magnetic resonance imaging : TMRI 2004;15:237-44.
63. Breuer FA, Blaimer M, Heidemann RM, Mueller MF, Griswold MA, Jakob PM. Controlled aliasing in parallel imaging results in higher acceleration (CAIPIRINHA) for multi-slice imaging. Magnetic resonance in medicine : official journal of the Society of Magnetic Resonance in Medicine / Society of Magnetic Resonance in Medicine 2005;53:684-91.
64. Pietryga JA, Burke LM, Marin D, Jaffe TA, Bashir MR. Respiratory motion artifact affecting hepatic arterial phase imaging with gadoxetate disodium: examination recovery with a multiple arterial phase acquisition. Radiology 2014;271:426-34.
65. Barth M, Breuer F, Koopmans PJ, Norris DG, Poser BA. Simultaneous multislice (SMS) imaging techniques. Magnetic resonance in medicine : official journal of the Society of Magnetic Resonance in Medicine / Society of Magnetic Resonance in Medicine 2016;75:63-81.
66. Koh DM, Collins DJ. Diffusion-weighted MRI in the body: applications and challenges in oncology. AJR. American journal of roentgenology 2007;188:1622-35.
67. Akduman EI, Momtahen AJ, Balci NC, Mahajann N, Havlioglu N, Wolverson MK. Comparison between malignant and benign abdominal lymph nodes on diffusion-weighted imaging. Academic radiology 2008;15:641-6.
68. Cova M, Squillaci E, Stacul F, et al. Diffusion-weighted MRI in the evaluation of renal lesions: preliminary results. The British journal of radiology 2004;77:851-7.
69. Fujii S, Matsusue E, Kanasaki Y, et al. Detection of peritoneal dissemination in gynecological malignancy: evaluation by diffusion-weighted MR imaging. European radiology 2008;18:18-23.
70. Liapi E, Geschwind JF, Vossen JA, et al. Functional MRI evaluation of tumor response in patients with neuroendocrine hepatic metastasis treated with transcatheter arterial chemoembolization. AJR. American journal of roentgenology 2008;190:67-73.
71. Low RN, Gurney J. Diffusion-weighted MRI (DWI) in the oncology patient: value of breathhold DWI

compared to unenhanced and gadolinium-enhanced MRI. Journal of magnetic resonance imaging : JMRI 2007;25:848-58.
72. Shinya S, Sasaki T, Nakagawa Y, Guiquing Z, Yamamoto F, Yamashita Y. Usefulness of diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) for the detection of pancreatic cancer: 4 case reports. Hepato-gastroenterology 2008;55:282-5.
73. Zhang J, Tehrani YM, Wang L, Ishill NM, Schwartz LH, Hricak H. Renal masses: characterization with diffusion-weighted MR imaging--a preliminary experience. Radiology 2008;247:458-64.
74. Gourtsoyianni S, Papanikolaou N, Yarmenitis S, Maris T, Karantanas A, Gourtsoyiannis N. Respiratory gated diffusion-weighted imaging of the liver: value of apparent diffusion coefficient measurements in the differentiation between most commonly encountered benign and malignant focal liver lesions. European radiology 2008;18:486-92.
75. Koh DM, Takahara T, Imai Y, Collins DJ. Practical aspects of assessing tumors using clinical diffusion-weighted imaging in the body. Magnetic resonance in medical sciences : MRMS : an official journal of Japan Society of Magnetic Resonance in Medicine 2007;6:211-24.
76. Yoshikawa T, Kawamitsu H, Mitchell DG, et al. ADC measurement of abdominal organs and lesions using parallel imaging technique. AJR. American journal of roentgenology 2006;187:1521-30.
77. Moore WA, Khatri G, Madhuranthakam AJ, Sims RD, Pedrosa I. Added value of diffusion-weighted acquisitions in MRI of the abdomen and pelvis. AJR. American journal of roentgenology 2014;202:995-1006.
78. Masselli G, De Vincentiis C, Aloi M, et al. Detection of Crohn's disease with diffusion images versus contrast-enhanced images in pediatric using MR enterography with histopathological correlation. Radiol Med 2019.
79. Barat M, Hoeffel C, Bouquot M, et al. Preoperative evaluation of small bowel complications in Crohn's disease: comparison of diffusion-weighted and contrast-enhanced MR imaging. European radiology 2019;29:2034-44.
80. Khachab F, Loundou A, Roman C, et al. Can diffusion weighting replace gadolinium enhancement in magnetic resonance enterography for inflammatory bowel disease in children? Pediatric radiology 2018;48:1432-40.
81. Lee MH, Eutsler EP, Sheybani EF, Khanna G. Rapid non-contrast magnetic resonance imaging for post appendectomy intra-abdominal abscess in children. Pediatric radiology 2017;47:935-41.
82. Ozdemir O, Metin Y, Metin NO, Kupeli A, Kalcan S, Tasci F. Contribution of diffusion-weighted MR imaging in follow-up of inflammatory appendiceal mass: Preliminary results and review of the literature. Eur J Radiol Open 2016;3:207-15.
83. Bayraktutan U, Oral A, Kantarci M, et al. Diagnostic performance of diffusion-weighted MR imaging in detecting acute appendicitis in children: comparison with conventional MRI and surgical findings. Journal of magnetic resonance imaging : JMRI 2014;39:1518-24.
84. Inci E, Kilickesmez O, Hocaoglu E, Aydin S, Bayramoglu S, Cimilli T. Utility of diffusion-weighted imaging in the diagnosis of acute appendicitis. European radiology 2011;21:768-75.
85. Higaki T, Nakamura Y, Tatsugami F, et al. Introduction to the Technical Aspects of Computed Diffusion-weighted Imaging for Radiologists. Radiographics : a review publication of the Radiological Society of North America, Inc 2018;38:1131-44.
86. Le Bihan D, Breton E, Lallemand D, Aubin ML, Vignaud J, Laval-Jeantet M. Separation of diffusion and perfusion in intravoxel incoherent motion MR imaging. Radiology 1988;168:497-505.
87. American College of Radiology. ACR Practice Parameter for Communication of Diagnostic Imaging Findings. Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CommunicationDiag.pdf. Accessed March 5, 2019.
88. American College of Radiology. ACR-AAPM Technical Standard for Diagnostic Medical Physics Performance Monitoring of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) Equipment. Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-Equip.pdf. Accessed March 5, 2019.

*Practice Parameters and Technical Standards are published annually with an effective date of October 1 in the year in which amended, revised, or approved by the ACR Council. For Practice Parameters and Technical Standards published before 1999, the effective date was January 1 following the year in which the Practice Parameters and Technical Standards was amended, revised, or approved by the ACR Council.

Development Chronology for this Practice Parameter
2005 (Resolution 5)
Amended 2006 (Resolution 35)

Revised 2010 (Resolution 16)
Revised 2020 (Resolution 25)
Amended 2014 (Resolution 39)
Revised 2015 (Resolution 2)
Revised 2020 (Resolution 25)
Amended 2023 (Resolution 2c)