ACR–SPR–SSR PRACTICE PARAMETER FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF QUANTITATIVE COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY (QCT) BONE MINERAL DENSITY

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

This practice parameter was revised collaboratively by the American College of Radiology (ACR), the Society for Pediatric Radiology (SPR), and the Society of Skeletal Radiology (SSR).

Musculoskeletal quantitative computed tomography (QCT) can be used to accurately and reproducibly measure bone mineral density (BMD) [1-11] or body composition [12-15]. QCT is used primarily in the diagnosis and management of osteoporosis and other disease states that may be characterized by abnormal BMD, as well as to monitor response to therapy for these conditions [16-18].

For BMD measurement, QCT has some advantages over dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA). DXA measurements may be significantly biased by severe degenerative changes of the hip or spine, vascular calcifications, oral contrast agents, and foods or dietary supplements containing significant quantities of calcium or other heavier minerals or elements [19-21]. DXA is a 2-D technique and is only able to quantify areal BMD. Because of its planar acquisition, it is also more susceptible to vertebral size and patient positioning [22,23]. QCT allows the volumetric assessment of BMD, which can eliminate confounding factors such as overlapping anatomy, and is able to quantify trabecular and cortical BMD [11]. There are well-documented differences in the response of cortical and trabecular bone to aging and therapeutic interventions [16,24,25]. QCT is also accurate in patients with extremely high or low body mass index, or following extreme changes in body mass index, such as after weight loss surgery [26-28]. Sources of error in BMD assessment from QCT include the presence of excess bone marrow adipose tissue, which can be seen in many osteoporotic states. The effect of excess bone marrow adipose tissue on BMD measurements can be overcome by the assessing both bone marrow adipose tissue and BMD with dual energy CT [29].

Standard QCT methods cover the spine and hip. Peripheral QCT of the distal forearm and tibia is used less frequently, mostly with dedicated scanners and for research purposes [30-32]. Over the last decade opportunistic QCT methods have evolved and multiple publications have described algorithms that provide phantom free measurements that measure bone density and can be used to diagnose osteoporosis and predict fracture risk [33,34].

This practice parameter outlines the principles of performing standardized QCT for BMD assessment.

II. INDICATIONS AND CONTRAINDICATIONS

QCT measurement for BMD is indicated whenever a clinical decision is likely to be directly influenced by the result of the test. For measurement of BMD, QCT may be considered in place of or in addition to DXA in the following circumstances [35-41]:

II. INDICATIONS AND CONTRAINDICATIONS

A. Adult Patients Indications and Considerations

Indications for QCT include, but are not limited to, individuals with suspected abnormal bone metabolism including:

1. All women 65 years and older and men 70 years and older (asymptomatic screening).
2. All postmenopausal women younger than 65 years and men younger than 70 years who have risk factors for osteoporosis including:
    a. A history of fracture; a wrist, hip, spine, or proximal humerus fracture with minimal or no trauma, excluding pathologic fractures
    b. Family history of osteoporotic fracture
    c. Low body mass index (under 18.5kg/m^2)
    d. Current use of cigarettes
    e. Excessive use of alcohol
    f. Loss of height, increasing thoracic kyphosis

3. Individuals of any age with findings suggestive of demineralization [42] or fragility fractures on imaging studies, such as radiographs, computed tomography (CT), or magnetic resonance imaging examinations.
4. Individuals receiving (or expected to receive) glucocorticoid therapy for more than 3 months.
5. Individuals beginning or receiving long-term therapy with medications known to adversely affect BMD (eg, anticonvulsant drugs, androgen deprivation therapy, aromatase inhibitor therapy,chronic heparin, or chemotherapy (such as methotrexate) in cancer patients).
6. Individuals with an endocrine disorder known to adversely affect BMD (eg, hyperparathyroidism, hyperthyroidism, or Cushing syndrome).
7. Postpubertal hypogonadal males with surgically or chemotherapeutically induced castration [43,44].
8. Individuals with medical conditions associated with abnormal BMD, such as:
    a. Chronic kidney disease
    b. Rheumatoid arthritis and other inflammatory arthritides
    c. Eating disorders, including anorexia nervosa and bulimia
    d. Gastrointestinal malabsorption including celiac disease
    e. Osteomalacia
    f. Acromegaly
    g. Chronic alcoholism or established cirrhosis
    h. Multiple myeloma
    i. Metabolic and bariatric surgery
    j. Organ transplantation
    k. Prolonged immobilization
    l. Relative energy deficiency in sport [45]
9. Individuals being monitored to:
    a. Assess the effectiveness of osteoporosis drug therapy [42-44]
    b. Follow-up medical conditions associated with abnormal BMD

QCT has some advantages over DXA and may be used as a problem solving tool in particular for the three clinical indications listed below [11]. Advantages are based on the fact that axial QCT of the lumbar spine is a volumetric measurement allowing to selectively measure trabecular and cortical bone and QCT is also not as dependent on body size and overlying tissue.

1. Individuals with extremely high or low body mass index or small body frame, in whom DXA measurements of BMD may not be accurate.
2. Individuals with severe degenerative disease of the spine and lumbar diffuse idiopathic skeletal hyperostosis.
3. Patients who are undergoing therapies that have a high impact on bone metabolic activity such as parathyroid hormone and corticosteroids may be better monitored with QCT because it selectively measures BMD in the trabecular bone.

II. INDICATIONS AND CONTRAINDICATIONS

B. Pediatric Indications and Considerations

Indications for performing BMD examinations and its subsequent assessment in children differ significantly from those in adults. Interpreting BMD measurements in children is complicated by the growing skeleton [46,47]. DXA only indirectly takes into account changes in body and skeletal size during growth, limiting its usefulness in longitudinal studies. For example, an increase in DXA-measured areal BMD in the spine is more likely a reflection of change of vertebral size than a change in BMD [48]. However, several DXA software providers have normative data based on age and additional height-adjusted data online calculators through https://zscore.research.chop.edu/.

QCT is particularly helpful in pediatric patients who cannot hold still for DXA or whose spinal curvature results in inaccurate lumbar spine BMD. Because QCT can assess both volume and density of bone in the axial and appendicular skeleton, it may be more useful than DXA in children [49].

In children and adolescents, BMD measurement is indicated whenever a clinical decision is likely to be directly influenced by the result of the test. Indications for QCT include, but are not limited to [50]:

1. Individuals receiving (or expected to receive) glucocorticoid therapy for more than 3 months.
2. Individuals receiving radiation or chemotherapy for malignancies.
3. Individuals with an endocrine disorder known to adversely affect BMD (eg, hyperparathyroidism, hyperthyroidism, growth hormone deficiency, or Cushing syndrome).
4. Individuals with bone dysplasias known to have excessive fracture risk (osteogenesis imperfecta, osteopetrosis) or high BMD, such as prolonged exposure to fluoride
5. Individuals with medical conditions that could alter BMD, such as [50]:
    a. Primary bone disorders
        i. Idiopathic juvenile osteoporosis
        ii. Osteogenesis imperfecta
    b. Potential secondary bone diseases
        i. Chronic inflammatory disorders
            - Inflammatory bowel disease
            - Juvenile idiopathic arthritis
            - Celiac disease
            - Cystic fibrosis
    c. Chronic immobilization
        i. Cerebral palsy
        ii. Myopathic disease
        iii. Epidermolysis bullosa
    d. Endocrine disturbance
        i. Turner syndrome
        ii. Anorexia nervosa
        iii. Type 1 diabetes
    e. Cancer and therapies with adverse effects on bone health
        i. Acute lymphoblastic leukemia
        ii. Chemotherapy for childhood cancer
        iii. Transplantation (nonrenal)
    f. Hematologic disorders
        i. Thalassemia
        ii. Sickle cell disease
    g. Genetic disorders
        i. Ehlers Danlos syndrome
        ii. Galactosemia
        iii. Marfan syndrome

II. INDICATIONS AND CONTRAINDICATIONS

C. Contraindications

1. There are no absolute contraindications to performing QCT. However, a QCT examination may be of limited value or require modification of the technique or rescheduling of the examination in some situations, including:
    a. Administration of intravascular iodinated contrast. If a QCT of the spine and contrast-enhanced examination of the abdomen are performed simultaneously, BMD may be increased by the contrast enhancement [51]. Spurious increase in BMD due to contrast is typically higher at the lumbar spine (30.3%) than at the proximal femur (2.3%) [51]. However, it should be noted that to correct for the effect of intravenous contrast at the spine, conversion factors have been suggested [51,52].
    b. Pregnancy
    c. Severe degenerative changes with deformity or fracture deformity in the measurement area
    d. Implants, hardware, devices, or other foreign material in the measurement area causing artifacts or

altered measurements.
e. Inability to position the patient completely within the scanning field of view

For the pregnant or potentially pregnant patient, see the ACR–SPR Practice Parameter for Imaging Pregnant or Potentially Pregnant Patients with Ionizing Radiation [53].

III. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

For the physician, medical physicist, and radiologic technologist qualifications, see the ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Diagnostic Computed Tomography (CT) [54]. Additional specific qualifications and responsibilities include:

III. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

A. Physician

1. The examination must be performed under the supervision of and interpreted by a licensed physician with the following qualifications:
    a. Documented training in and understanding of the physics of X-ray absorption and radiation protection, including the potential hazards of radiation exposure to both patients and personnel and the monitoring requirements.
    b. Knowledge and understanding of the process of QCT data and image acquisition, including proper patient positioning and placement of regions of interest, and artifacts and anatomic abnormalities that may falsely increase or decrease measured values.
    c. Knowledge and understanding of the analysis and reporting of QCT, including, but not limited to: BMD values, T-score, Z-score, and fracture risk.
    d. Knowledge and understanding of the criteria for comparison of serial measurements, including limitations of comparing measurements made by different techniques and different devices.
    e. Knowledge and understanding of other bone densitometry techniques, including DXA, to fulfill a consultative role in recommending further bone densitometry studies, future serial measurements, or diagnostic procedures to confirm suspected abnormalities seen on QCT images.
2. The supervising physician is responsible for overseeing the QCT facility and its equipment quality control program. The physician accepts final responsibility for the quality of all QCT examinations

III. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

B. Radiologic Technologist

1. The examination must be performed by a technologist with the following responsibilities and qualifications:
    a. Ensuring patient comfort and safety, preparing and properly positioning the patient, placing regions of interest, monitoring the patient during the procedure, and obtaining the measurements prescribed by the supervising physician.
    b. Determining the precision error of the equipment (see section VII).
    c. Documented formal training in the use of the QCT equipment, including performance of all manufacturer-specified quality assurance procedures.
    d. Knowledge of and familiarity with the manufacturer's operator manual for the specific scanner model being used.
    e. State licensure and/or certification, if required.
    f. Certification by the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists in CT is also desirable.

2. Continuing Medical Education

    The technologist's CME should be in accordance with the national registry or state licensure requirements, where applicable.

IV. SPECIFICATIONS OF THE EXAMINATION

The written or electronic request for a QCT examination 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)

A. QCT

For BMD measurement, QCT may involve phantom-based or phantomless acquisition. Anatomic areas of prior surgery or known fracture should be excluded from measurement.

1. Phantom-based QCT acquisition
    a. Phantom-based QCT acquisition can be performed with simultaneous scanning patient and phantom or with asynchronous scanning of patient and phantom: QCT has historically been performed with simultaneous scanning of the patient and a calibration phantom. There are a number of different techniques, with technical parameters dependent on manufacturer [56]. The QCT software uses known phantom densities and measured CT attenuation to calculate BMD of the spine or hip. The primary advantage of this technique is that any variation in CT scanner output is corrected for by the simultaneous scan.
    b. Asynchronous techniques allow for scanning of the calibration phantom at a different time from the scanning patient. The greater stability of the x-ray output by modern CT scanners makes this possible [10,56,57]. The temporal decoupling of phantom and patient scanning allows more convenient scanning because there is no need to use the phantom for each patient scan. In addition, BMD can be calculated from CT examinations originally obtained for purposes other than BMD measurement (opportunistic screening).

2. Phantomless QCT Acquisition
    Various phantomless techniques for QCT are gaining in popularity [10,56]. All of these techniques have the obvious benefit of not requiring a calibration phantom. One technique uses the patient's muscle and fat for calibration when calculating BMD [58]. Another technique estimates BMD by performing calcium material decomposition using dual-energy CT acquisition [59]. Other phantomless techniques do not attempt to measure BMD but instead use the actual CT attenuation values to screen for osteoporosis [33,60]. This technique has broad appeal in that it can be easily performed by measuring the mean CT attenuation on PACS viewers. However, CT attenuation of bone can vary significantly with varying CT parameters such as kVp [60]. Like asynchronous techniques, phantomless techniques can be applied to CT examinations originally obtained for purposes other than BMD measurement (opportunistic screening) [61-64].

    All three of the methods for acquiring QCT provide accurate BMD determinations suitable for assessing bone status. There are, however, differences in their precision, which results in different sensitivities in detecting significant change in BMD through serial measurement comparisons. Precision is typically best when the patient and the calibration standard are imaged simultaneously, and volumetric QCT measurements often have better precision than single slice QCT because of their reduced dependence on operator skills, patient positioning, and data processing.

B. Diagnosis of osteoporosis

1. Hip QCT measurements

   Two-dimensional areal BMD of the proximal femur can be obtained from 3-D QCT. This technique (CT X-ray absorptiometry [CTXA]) generates a 2-D image that is analogous to hip DXA image and can be analyzed using the same regions of interest [8,65]. The CTXA femoral neck T-scores can be directly compared to DXA T-scores that use the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) reference data [66]. World Health Organization (WHO) diagnostic categories should only be assigned based on CTXA hip T-score, not spine QCT T-score. The femoral neck CTXA BMD measurement can also be used to determine fracture risk using the Fracture Risk Assessment Tool (FRAX) [67].

   Unlike spine QCT measurements, which are optimally obtained using noncontrast CT examinations, CTXA values from both enhanced and unenhanced CT scans can be used [68].

2. Spine QCT measurements

   Currently there are no consensus standards for assigning diagnostic categories based on spine QCT measurements. Typically, L1 to L3 levels of the lumbar spine are used. Although some QCT software manufacturers provide spine T-scores, these should not be used to assign a diagnostic category using the WHO DXA guidelines. Instead, the following diagnostic cut points may be used for assigning a spine QCT diagnostic category approximately equivalent to the WHO guidelines.

QCT Trabecular Spine BMD Range	Equivalent WHO Diagnostic Category
BMD > 120 mg/cm3	Normal
80 mg/cm3 = BMD = 120 mg/cm3	Osteopenia
BMD < 80 mg/cm3	Osteoporosis

   The above categories were derived by selecting thresholds that result in approximately the same fraction of the population being assigned to a specific category based on QCT spine T-score as would be assigned based on QCT hip T-score. Numbers for the spine would also be similar compared to DXA spine T-scores. The use of T-scores has been avoided in this categorization to reinforce the fact that QCT spine T-scores and hip T-scores are frequently different. Assigning a WHO diagnostic category based on a QCT spine T-score may result in overestimating a patient's fracture risk.

C. For premenopausal women and men younger than 50 years, the BMD and Z-score should be reported for each skeletal site examined. The WHO classification does not apply to these individuals (except for women in menopausal transition). Z-scores above -0 are considered within the expected range for age. Individuals with Z- scores of -2.0 and lower are considered to have low bone density for their age.

D. For children and adolescents, T-scores should not be reported. The WHO classification does not apply; the terms "osteopenia" and "osteoporosis" should not be used. When BMD Z-scores are less than or equal to -2.0, "Low bone mineral mass or bone mineral density" is the preferred terminology for pediatric QCT reports [60,69,70].

E. For follow-up examinations, comparison should be made to any prior comparable QCT examinations of the same site. The precision error of the specific scanner(s) should be determined to identify whether any changes are statistically significant [71]. A precision error of 1–5% has been reported for volumetric spine QCT measurements [72] and of 1.8% for total hip and 2.0% for femoral neck CTXA [65]. Comparable scans include, in order of decreasing validity:

1. Previous examinations on the same well-maintained unit.
2. Previous examinations on another unit from the same manufacturer.
3. Previous examinations on a unit from another manufacturer, with results reported in standardized units.

F. Because of radiation dose considerations, least significant change parameters are not used for clinical evaluations, although they may be obtained for research purposes. Appropriate quality assurance procedures should be performed according to hardware and software manufacturers' guidelines. In children, QCT protocols should be modified and optimized to minimize radiation exposures [73].

V. DOCUMENTATION

Reporting should be in accordance with the ACR Practice Parameter for Communication of Diagnostic Imaging Findings [74].

A. For evaluation of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women and men older than 50 years using phantom-based QCT, reports of the hip (if CTXA is performed) should include the BMD (in g/cm^2) for area density, T-score, and WHO diagnostic classification whereas reports of the spine should include BMD (in mg/cm3) for trabecular volumetric density.

B. QCT hip BMD (CTXA) may be used to obtain a fracture risk using the FRAX tool.

C. In premenopausal women, men younger than 50, and children, the QCT reports should include BMD values and Z-scores. Z-scores above -0 are within the expected range. Z-scores of -2.0 or lower are considered to be below the expected range for age.

D. In children and adolescents, QCT reports should include BMD values and Z-scores. Z-scores should be height adjusted, when possible. Z-scores above -0 are within the expected range. Z-scores of -2.0 or lower are considered to be below the expected range for age. The terms "osteopenia" and "osteoporosis" should not be used in QCT reports [75]. T-scores should not be reported.

E. The QCT report should indicate whether artifacts or other technical issues may have influenced the reported BMD measurement(s). A statement comparing the current study to prior available comparable studies should include an assessment of whether any changes in measured BMD are statistically significant. Recommendations for and the timing of follow-up QCT studies may be included. When appropriate, recommendations for alternative modality densitometry examinations, ancillary imaging tests, or other diagnostic measures should be provided.

F. The QCT report should mention relevant incidental finding, such as vertebral compression fractures or other fragility fractures. These findings may result in initiation of treatment for osteoporosis, regardless of the measured BMD. Density measurements should not be performed in fractured vertebrae or if there is deformity or posttraumatic change at the proximal femur. Guidance regarding reporting of additional incidental findings not related to bones can be found elsewhere [76]. It should be highlighted that in particular renal abnormalities (eg, tumors) and abnormal para-aortic lymph nodes need to be reported.

VI. EQUIPMENT SPECIFICATIONS

QCT quality control is extremely important for accuracy in sequential monitoring of the effectiveness of therapy or progression of disease.

Quality control is generally implemented on two systems. The first system is the CT system used to acquire image data. The second system is the QCT subsystem (software, phantoms, and associated accessories).

A. CT System—For the CT system, basic quality control procedures, as specified by the manufacturer, should

be performed and recorded by a trained technologist. The results should be interpreted immediately upon completion according to the guidelines provided by the manufacturer to ensure proper system performance. If a problem is detected according to manufacturer guidelines, the service representative should be notified, and patients should not be examined until the equipment has been cleared for use.

B. QCT Phantoms—Precision error measurements of the phantom or standard should be performed on a schedule according to manufacturer's specifications and the results recorded. The results of the phantom measurements should not exceed the specifications or recommendations of the manufacturer and generally should be within 1%.

C. For the QCT software, basic quality control procedures, as specified by the manufacturer, should be performed and recorded by a trained technologist. The results should be interpreted immediately upon completion according to the guidelines provided by the manufacturer to ensure proper system performance. If a problem is detected according to manufacturer guidelines, the service representative should be notified, and patients should not be examined until the software has been cleared for use.

Equipment performance monitoring should be in accordance with the ACR-AAPM Technical Standard for Diagnostic Medical Physics Performance Monitoring of Computed Tomography (CT) Equipment [77].

VII. RADIATION SAFETY IN IMAGING

Radiologists, medical physicists, non-physician radiology providers**,** radiologic technologists, and all supervising physicians have a responsibility for safety in the workplace by keeping radiation exposure to staff, and to society as a whole, "as low as reasonably achievable" (ALARA) and to assure that radiation doses to individual patients are appropriate, taking into account the possible risk from radiation exposure and the diagnostic image quality necessary to achieve the clinical objective. All personnel who work with ionizing radiation must understand the key principles of occupational and public radiation protection (justification, optimization of protection, application of dose constraints and limits) and the principles of proper management of radiation dose to patients (justification, optimization including the use of dose reference levels). https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/PUB1775_web.pdf

Nationally developed guidelines, such as the ACR's Appropriateness Criteria®, should be used to help choose the most appropriate imaging procedures to prevent unnecessary radiation exposure.

Facilities should have and adhere to policies and procedures that require ionizing radiation examination protocols (radiography, fluoroscopy, interventional radiology, CT) to vary according to diagnostic requirements and patient body habitus to optimize the relationship between appropriate radiation dose and adequate image quality. Automated dose reduction technologies available on imaging equipment should be used, except when inappropriate for a specific exam. If such technology is not available, appropriate manual techniques should be used.

Additional information regarding patient radiation safety in imaging is available from the following websites – Image Gently® for children (www.imagegently.org) and Image Wisely® for adults (www.imagewisely.org). These advocacy and awareness campaigns provide free educational materials for all stakeholders involved in imaging (patients, technologists, referring providers, medical physicists, and radiologists).

Radiation exposures or other dose indices should be periodically measured by a Qualified Medical Physicist in accordance with the applicable ACR Technical Standards. Monitoring or regular review of dose indices from patient imaging should be performed by comparing the facility's dose information with national benchmarks, such as the ACR Dose Index Registry and relevant publications relying on its data, applicable ACR Practice Parameters, NCRP Report No. 172, Reference Levels and Achievable Doses in Medical and Dental Imaging: Recommendations for the United States or the Conference of Radiation Control Program Director's National Evaluation of X-ray Trends; 2006, 2009, amended 2013, revised 2023 (Res. 2d).

There is published information on Diagnostic Reference Levels for pediatric CT [78].

VIII. 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 *Position Statement on QC & Improvement, Safety, Infection Control*, *and Patient Education* on the ACR web site (https://www.acr.org/Advocacy-and-Economics/ACR-Position-Statements/Quality-Control-and-Improvement).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

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 (Musculoskeletal) of the Commission on Body Imaging and the Committee on Practice Parameters – General, Small, and Rural and the Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology, of the Commissions on General, Small, Emergency and/or Rural Practice, and Pediatric Radiology, in collaboration with the SPR and the SSR.

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

ACR	SPR	SSR
Miriam A. Bredella, MD, MBA, FACR, Co-Chair	Michael F. Fadell, II, MD	Catherine Petchprapa, MD, CCD
Thomas M. Link, MD, Co-Chair	Richard Jones, MD	Richard Walker, MD
Robert Boutin, MD	Kathryn Milks, MD	
Helen Nadel, MD		
Robert Ward, MD		

Committee on Body Imaging – Musculoskeletal

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

Naveen Subhas, MD, Chair	Soterios Gyftopoulos, MD
Miriam Bredella, MD	Douglas Mintz, MD
Connie Y. Chang, MD	Carlos A. Rivera, BSc
Hillary W. Garner, MD	Jonathan D. Samet, MD

Committee on Body Imaging – Musculoskeletal

Felix Gonzalez, MD

Elaine S. Gould, MD, FACR

Jonelle Thomas, MD

Fangbai Wu, MD

Committee on Practice Parameters – General, Small, Emergency and/or Rural Practices (GSER)

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

Candice Johnstone, MD, Chair

Justin P. Dodge, MD

Brian D. Gale, MD, MBA

Rachel Gerson, MD ,

Mallikarjunarao Kasam, PhD

Nathan J. Rohling, DO

Samir S. Shah, MD

Derrick Siebert, MD

Michael Straza, MD, PhD

Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology

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

Terry L. Levin, MD, FACR, 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

Jane Sun Kim, MD

Jessica Kurian, MD

Helen R. Nadel, MD

Erica Poletto, MD

Richard B. Towbin, MD, FACR

Andrew T. Trout, MD

Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology

Lauren P. Golding, MD

Adam Goldman-Yassen, MD

Safwan S. Halabi, MD

Esben S. Vogelius, MD

Jason Wright, MD

Andrew B. Rosenkrantz, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Body Imaging

Robert S. Pyatt, Jr., MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on General, Small, Emergency and/or Rural Practice

Richard A. Barth, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Pediatric Radiology

David B. Larson, MD, MBA, FACR, Chair, Commission on Quality and Safety

Mary S. Newell, MD, FACR, Chair, Committee on Practice Parameters and Technical Standards

Comments Reconciliation Committee

Juan Battle, MD, FACR -CSC Chair

Rachel Gerson, MD-CSC Co-Chair

Miriam A. Bredella, MD, MBA, FACR

Robert Boutin, MD

Timothy A. Crummy, MD, MHA, FACR

Michael F. Fadell, II, MD

Richard Jones, MD

Amy L. Kotsenas, MD, FACR

David A. Larson, MD

Paul A. Larson, MD, FACR

Terry L. Levin, MD, FACR

Thomas M. Link, MD

Kathryn Milks, MD

Helen Nadel, MD

Mary S. Newell, MD, FACR

Catherine Petchprapa, MD, CCD

Andrew B Rosenkrantz, MD

Naveen Subhas, MD

Richard Walker, MD

Robert Ward, MD

Roland Wong, MD

REFERENCES

1. Adams JE. Quantitative computed tomography. European journal of radiology 2009;71:415-24.
2. Baran DT, Faulkner KG, Genant HK, Miller PD, Pacifici R. Diagnosis and management of osteoporosis: guidelines for the utilization of bone densitometry. Calcified tissue international 1997;61:433-40.
3. Bousson V, Le Bras A, Roqueplan F, et al. Volumetric quantitative computed tomography of the proximal femur: relationships linking geometric and densitometric variables to bone strength. Role for compact bone. Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA 2006;17:855-64.
4. Boutroy S, Bouxsein ML, Munoz F, Delmas PD. In vivo assessment of trabecular bone microarchitecture by high-resolution peripheral quantitative computed tomography. The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism 2005;90:6508-15.
5. Cann CE, Genant HK. Precise measurement of vertebral mineral content using computed tomography. Journal of computer assisted tomography 1980;4:493-500.
6. Engelke K, Libanati C, Liu Y, et al. Quantitative computed tomography (QCT) of the forearm using general purpose spiral whole-body CT scanners: accuracy, precision and comparison with dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA). Bone 2009;45:110-8.
7. Lang TF, Keyak JH, Heitz MW, et al. Volumetric quantitative computed tomography of the proximal femur: precision and relation to bone strength. Bone 1997;21:101-8.
8. Engelke K, Lang T, Khosla S, et al. Clinical Use of Quantitative Computed Tomography (QCT) of the Hip in the Management of Osteoporosis in Adults: the 2015 ISCD Official Positions—Part I. Journal of Clinical Densitometry 2015;18:338-58.
9. Zysset P, Qin L, Lang T, et al. Clinical Use of Quantitative Computed Tomography–Based Finite Element Analysis of the Hip and Spine in the Management of Osteoporosis in Adults: the 2015 ISCD Official Positions—Part II. Journal of Clinical Densitometry 2015;18:359-92.
10. Engelke K, Lang T, Khosla S, et al. Clinical Use of Quantitative Computed Tomography–Based Advanced Techniques in the Management of Osteoporosis in Adults: the 2015 ISCD Official Positions—Part III. Journal of Clinical Densitometry 2015;18:393-407.
11. Link TM, Lang TF. Axial QCT: clinical applications and new developments. Journal of clinical densitometry : the official journal of the International Society for Clinical Densitometry 2014;17:438-48.
12. Tsampalieros A, Griffin L, Terpstra AM, et al. Changes in DXA and quantitative CT measures of musculoskeletal outcomes following pediatric renal transplantation. Am J Transplant 2014;14:124-32.
13. Scott D, Trbojevic T, Skinner E, et al. Associations of calf inter- and intra-muscular adipose tissue with cardiometabolic health and physical function in community-dwelling older adults. J Musculoskelet Neuronal Interact 2015;15:350-7.
14. Joseph RP, Casazza K, Durant NH. The effect of a 3-month moderate-intensity physical activity program on body composition in overweight and obese African American college females. Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA 2014;25:2485-91.
15. Laddu DR, Farr JN, Laudermilk MJ, et al. Longitudinal relationships between whole body and central adiposity on weight-bearing bone geometry, density, and bone strength: a pQCT study in young girls. Arch Osteoporos 2013;8:156.
16. Paggiosi MA, Yang L, Blackwell D, et al. Teriparatide treatment exerts differential effects on the central and peripheral skeleton: results from the MOAT study. Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA 2018;29:1367-78.
17. Brown JP, Engelke K, Keaveny TM, et al. Romosozumab improves lumbar spine bone mass and bone strength parameters relative to alendronate in postmenopausal women: results from the Active-Controlled Fracture Study in Postmenopausal Women With Osteoporosis at High Risk (ARCH) trial. Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research 2021;36:2139-52.
18. Kemmler W, Kohl M, Fröhlich M, et al. Effects of High-Intensity Resistance Training on Osteopenia and Sarcopenia Parameters in Older Men with Osteosarcopenia—One-Year Results of the Randomized Controlled Franconian Osteopenia and Sarcopenia Trial (FrOST). Journal of Bone and Mineral Research

2020;35:1634-44.
19. Ito M, Hayashi K, Yamada M, Uetani M, Nakamura T. Relationship of osteophytes to bone mineral density and spinal fracture in men. Radiology 1993;189:497-502.
20. Liu G, Peacock M, Eilam O, Dorulla G, Braunstein E, Johnston CC. Effect of osteoarthritis in the lumbar spine and hip on bone mineral density and diagnosis of osteoporosis in elderly men and women. Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA 1997;7:564-9.
21. Orwoll ES, Oviatt SK, Mann T. The impact of osteophytic and vascular calcifications on vertebral mineral density measurements in men. The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism 1990;70:1202-7.
22. Chan C-H, Huang W-C, Lu Y-C, Hsiao H-F, Chan WP. BatchBMD as an Efficient and Accurate Dual-Energy X-ray Absorptiometry Report Generator. Diagnostics (Basel) 2021;11:2403.
23. Jain RK, Vokes T. Dual-energy X-ray Absorptiometry. Journal of clinical densitometry : the official journal of the International Society for Clinical Densitometry 2017;20:291-303.
24. Rehman Q, Lang T, Modin G, Lane NE. Quantitative computed tomography of the lumbar spine, not dual x-ray absorptiometry, is an independent predictor of prevalent vertebral fractures in postmenopausal women with osteopenia receiving long-term glucocorticoid and hormone-replacement therapy. Arthritis and rheumatism 2002;46:1292-7.
25. Schafer AL, Kazakia GJ, Vittinghoff E, et al. Effects of Gastric Bypass Surgery on Bone Mass and Microarchitecture Occur Early and Particularly Impact Postmenopausal Women. Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research 2018;33:975-86.
26. Binkley N, Krueger D, Vallarta-Ast N. An overlying fat panniculus affects femur bone mass measurement. Journal of clinical densitometry : the official journal of the International Society for Clinical Densitometry 2003;6:199-204.
27. Blake GM, McKeeney DB, Chhaya SC, Ryan PJ, Fogelman I. Dual energy x-ray absorptiometry: the effects of beam hardening on bone density measurements. Medical physics 1992;19:459-65.
28. Yu EW, Thomas BJ, Brown JK, Finkelstein JS. Simulated increases in body fat and errors in bone mineral density measurements by DXA and QCT. Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research 2011.
29. Bredella MA, Daley SM, Kalra MK, Brown JK, Miller KK, Torriani M. Marrow Adipose Tissue Quantification of the Lumbar Spine by Using Dual-Energy CT and Single-Voxel (1)H MR Spectroscopy: A Feasibility Study. Radiology 2015;277:230-5.
30. Sornay-Rendu E, Boutroy S, Munoz F, Delmas PD. Alterations of cortical and trabecular architecture are associated with fractures in postmenopausal women, partially independent of decreased BMD measured by DXA: the OFELY study. Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research 2007;22:425-33.
31. Riggs BL, Melton Iii LJ, 3rd, Robb RA, et al. Population-based study of age and sex differences in bone volumetric density, size, geometry, and structure at different skeletal sites. Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research 2004;19:1945-54.
32. Kalkwarf HJ, Laor T, Bean JA. Fracture risk in children with a forearm injury is associated with volumetric bone density and cortical area (by peripheral QCT) and areal bone density (by DXA). Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA 2011;22:607-16.
33. Pickhardt PJ, Pooler BD, Lauder T, del Rio AM, Bruce RJ, Binkley N. Opportunistic screening for osteoporosis using abdominal computed tomography scans obtained for other indications. Annals of internal medicine 2013;158:588-95.
34. Michalski AS, Besler BA, Burt LA, Boyd SK. Opportunistic CT screening predicts individuals at risk of major osteoporotic fracture. Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA 2021;32:1639-49.
35. Baim S, Binkley N, Bilezikian JP, et al. Official Positions of the International Society for Clinical Densitometry and executive summary of the 2007 ISCD Position Development Conference. Journal of clinical densitometry : the official journal of the International Society for Clinical Densitometry 2008;11:75-91.
36. Bates DW, Black DM, Cummings SR. Clinical use of bone densitometry: clinical applications. JAMA : the

journal of the American Medical Association 2002;288:1898-900.
37. Brown JP, Josse RG. 2002 clinical practice guidelines for the diagnosis and management of osteoporosis in Canada. CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne 2002;167:S1-34.
38. Kanis JA. Diagnosis of osteoporosis and assessment of fracture risk. Lancet 2002;359:1929-36.
39. Kanis JA, Delmas P, Burckhardt P, Cooper C, Torgerson D. Guidelines for diagnosis and management of osteoporosis. The European Foundation for Osteoporosis and Bone Disease. Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA 1997;7:390-406.
40. Watts NB, Bilezikian JP, Camacho PM, et al. American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists Medical Guidelines for Clinical Practice for the diagnosis and treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis. Endocrine practice : official journal of the American College of Endocrinology and the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists 2010;16 Suppl 3:1-37.
41. LeBoff MS, Greenspan SL, Insogna KL, et al. The clinician's guide to prevention and treatment of osteoporosis. Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA 2022.
42. Bonnick SL. Monitoring changes in bone density. Womens Health (Lond Engl) 2008;4:89-97.
43. Borggrefe J, Graeff C, Nickelsen TN, Marin F, Gluer CC. Quantitative computed tomographic assessment of the effects of 24 months of teriparatide treatment on 3D femoral neck bone distribution, geometry, and bone strength: results from the EUROFORS study. Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research 2010;25:472-81.
44. Li W, Sode M, Saeed I, Lang T. Automated registration of hip and spine for longitudinal QCT studies: integration with 3D densitometric and structural analysis. Bone 2006;38:273-9.
45. Mountjoy M, Sundgot-Borgen JK, Burke LM, et al. IOC consensus statement on relative energy deficiency in sport (RED-S): 2018 update. British journal of sports medicine 2018;52:687-97.
46. Bachrach LK. Dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DEXA) measurements of bone density and body composition: promise and pitfalls. Journal of pediatric endocrinology & metabolism : JPEM 2000;13 Suppl 2:983-8.
47. Gafni RI, Baron J. Overdiagnosis of osteoporosis in children due to misinterpretation of dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry (DEXA). The Journal of pediatrics 2004;144:253-7.
48. Ott SM, O'Hanlan M, Lipkin EW, Newell-Morris L. Evaluation of vertebral volumetric vs. areal bone mineral density during growth. Bone 1997;20:553-6.
49. Wren TA, Liu X, Pitukcheewanont P, Gilsanz V. Bone densitometry in pediatric populations: discrepancies in the diagnosis of osteoporosis by DXA and CT. The Journal of pediatrics 2005;146:776-9.
50. Bachrach LK, Gordon CM, Section On E. Bone Densitometry in Children and Adolescents. Pediatrics 2016;138.
51. Bauer JS, Henning TD, Mueller D, Lu Y, Majumdar S, Link TM. Volumetric quantitative CT of the spine and hip derived from contrast-enhanced MDCT: conversion factors. AJR. American journal of roentgenology 2007;188:1294-301.
52. Perez AA, Pickhardt PJ, Elton DC, Sandfort V, Summers RM. Fully automated CT imaging biomarkers of bone, muscle, and fat: correcting for the effect of intravenous contrast. Abdom Radiol (NY) 2021;46:1229-35.
53. American College of Radiology. ACR-SPR Practice Parameter for Imaging Pregnant or Potentially Pregnant Patients with Ionizing Radiation. http://www.acr.org/~/media/ACR/Documents/PGTS/guidelines/Pregnant_Patients.pdf. Accessed February 7, 2022.
54. American College of Radiology. ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Diagnostic Computed Tomography (CT). Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CT-Perf-Interpret.pdf. Accessed February 7, 2022.
55. Hawkinson J, Timins J, Angelo D, Shaw M, Takata R, Harshaw F. Technical white paper: bone densitometry. Journal of the American College of Radiology : JACR 2007;4:320-7.
56. Engelke K. Quantitative Computed Tomography-Current Status and New Developments. Journal of clinical densitometry : the official journal of the International Society for Clinical Densitometry 2017;20:309-21.
57. Brown JK, Timm W, Bodeen G, et al. Asynchronously Calibrated Quantitative Bone Densitometry. Journal of

Clinical Densitometry 2017;20:216-25.
58. Weaver AA, Beavers KM, Hightower RC, Lynch SK, Miller AN, Stitzel JD. Lumbar Bone Mineral Density Phantomless Computed Tomography Measurements and Correlation with Age and Fracture Incidence. Traffic Inj Prev 2015;16 Suppl 2:S153-60.
59. Wichmann JL, Booz C, Wesarg S, et al. Dual-energy CT-based phantomless in vivo three-dimensional bone mineral density assessment of the lumbar spine. Radiology 2014;271:778-84.
60. Crabtree NJ, Arabi A, Bachrach LK, et al. Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry Interpretation and Reporting in Children and Adolescents: The Revised 2013 ISCD Pediatric Official Positions. Journal of Clinical Densitometry 2014;17:225-42.
61. Jang S, Graffy PM, Ziemlewicz TJ, Lee SJ, Summers RM, Pickhardt PJ. Opportunistic Osteoporosis Screening at Routine Abdominal and Thoracic CT: Normative L1 Trabecular Attenuation Values in More than 20 000 Adults. Radiology 2019;291:360-67.
62. Pickhardt PJ, Graffy PM, Zea R, et al. Automated Abdominal CT Imaging Biomarkers for Opportunistic Prediction of Future Major Osteoporotic Fractures in Asymptomatic Adults. Radiology 2020;297:64-72.
63. Boutin RD, Hernandez AM, Lenchik L, Seibert JA, Gress DA, Boone JM. CT Phantom Evaluation of 67,392 American College of Radiology Accreditation Examinations: Implications for Opportunistic Screening of Osteoporosis Using CT. AJR. American journal of roentgenology 2021;216:447-52.
64. Boutin RD, Lenchik L. Value-Added Opportunistic CT: Insights Into Osteoporosis and Sarcopenia. AJR. American journal of roentgenology 2020;215:582-94.
65. Cann CE, Adams JE, Brown JK, Brett AD. CTXA hip--an extension of classical DXA measurements using quantitative CT. PLoS One 2014;9:e91904.
66. Bokshan SL, DePasse JM, Daniels AH. Sarcopenia in Orthopedic Surgery. Orthopedics 2016;39:e295-300.
67. Ziemlewicz TJ, Maciejewski A, Binkley N, Brett AD, Brown JK, Pickhardt PJ. Opportunistic Quantitative CT Bone Mineral Density Measurement at the Proximal Femur Using Routine Contrast-Enhanced Scans: Direct Comparison With DXA in 355 Adults. Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research 2016;31:1835-40.
68. Ziemlewicz TJ, Maciejewski A, Binkley N, Brett AD, Brown JK, Pickhardt PJ. Direct Comparison of Unenhanced and Contrast-Enhanced CT for Opportunistic Proximal Femur Bone Mineral Density Measurement: Implications for Osteoporosis Screening. American Journal of Roentgenology 2016;206:694-98.
69. Adams JE, Engelke K, Zemel BS, Ward KA. Quantitative computer tomography in children and adolescents: the 2013 ISCD Pediatric Official Positions. Journal of clinical densitometry : the official journal of the International Society for Clinical Densitometry 2014;17:258-74.
70. International Society for Clinical D. 2019 ISCD Official Positions. https://iscd.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/2019-Official-Positions-Pediatric-1.pdf.
71. Khoo BC, Brown K, Cann C, et al. Comparison of QCT-derived and DXA-derived areal bone mineral density and T scores. Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA 2009;20:1539-45.
72. Engelke K, Adams JE, Armbrecht G, et al. Clinical use of quantitative computed tomography and peripheral quantitative computed tomography in the management of osteoporosis in adults: the 2007 ISCD Official Positions. Journal of clinical densitometry : the official journal of the International Society for Clinical Densitometry 2008;11:123-62.
73. Adams JE, Engelke K, Zemel BS, Ward KA, International Society of Clinical D. Quantitative computer tomography in children and adolescents: the 2013 ISCD Pediatric Official Positions. Journal of clinical densitometry : the official journal of the International Society for Clinical Densitometry 2014;17:258-74.
74. 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 February 7, 2022.
75. Gordon CM, Leonard MB, Zemel BS, International Society for Clinical D. 2013 Pediatric Position Development Conference: executive summary and reflections. Journal of clinical densitometry : the official journal of the International Society for Clinical Densitometry 2014;17:219-24.
76. Berland LL, Silverman SG, Gore RM, et al. Managing Incidental Findings on Abdominal CT: White Paper of the ACR Incidental Findings Committee. Journal of the American College of Radiology 2010;7:754-73.

77. ACR Committee on Radiology. ACR–AAPM Technical Standard for Diagnostic Medical Physics Performance Monitoring of Computed Tomography (CT) Equipment. Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CT-Equip.pdf. Accessed February 7, 2022.
78. Kanal KM, Butler PF, Chatfield MB, et al. U.S. Diagnostic Reference Levels and Achievable Doses for 10 Pediatric CT Examinations. Radiology 2022;302:E6.

*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 parameter or technical standard was amended, revised, or approved by the ACR Council.

Development Chronology for this Practice Parameter

2008 (Resolution 33)

Amended 2009 (Resolution 11)

Revised 2013 (Resolution 32)

Amended 2014 (Resolution 39)

Revised 2018 (Resolution 9)
Revised 2023 (Resolution 15)