

**American College of Radiology
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®**

Clinical Condition: **Avascular Necrosis of the Hip**

Variant 1: **Initial study when avascular necrosis suspected clinically.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
X-ray pelvis AP	9	Essential for initial evaluation in patients at risk for AVN who present with hip pain.	Low
X-ray hips frogleg lateral	9	Frogleg view is necessary to evaluate anterosuperior involvement of the femoral head.	Med
NUC bone scan targeted	1	Sensitive method for detection of AVN, but not indicated before radiographs.	Med
X-ray hips cross-table lateral	1	Poor detail due to overlapping soft tissues limits usefulness.	Med
MRI hip	1	Most sensitive method for detection of AVN, but not indicated before radiographs.	None
CT hip	1	Not useful for initial evaluation.	Med
<u>Rating Scale:</u> 1=Least appropriate, 9=Most appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Variant 2: **Avascular necrosis with femoral head collapse by radiographs in the painful hip: no surgery contemplated at this time.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
MRI hip without contrast	3	May be useful if knowledge of occult AVN in the opposite hip is needed.	None
CT hip axial and coronal and sagittal reformatted images	1	May be useful if planning osteotomy by defining anatomic localization of the AVN and the extent of bone deformity.	Med
NUC bone scan targeted	1	May be useful if knowledge of occult AVN in the opposite hip is needed and MR is not available.	Med
CT hip axial images only	1	Provides no more information than conventional radiographs.	Med
MRI hip without and with contrast	1	Assessment of perfusion is not needed.	None
<u>Rating Scale:</u> 1=Least appropriate, 9=Most appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

An ACR Committee on Appropriateness Criteria and its expert panels have developed criteria for determining appropriate imaging examinations for diagnosis and treatment of specified medical condition(s). These criteria are intended to guide radiologists, radiation oncologists and referring physicians in making decisions regarding radiologic imaging and treatment. Generally, the complexity and severity of a patient's clinical condition should dictate the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Only those exams generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.

Clinical Condition:**Avascular Necrosis of the Hip****Variant 3:****Avascular necrosis with femoral head collapse by radiographs in the painful hip: surgery contemplated.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	<u>RRL*</u>
MRI hip without contrast	5	May be useful if knowledge of occult AVN in the opposite hip is needed.	None
CT hip axial and coronal and sagittal reformatted images	1	May be useful if planning osteotomy by defining anatomic localization of the AVN and the extent of bone deformity.	Med
MRI hip without and with contrast	1	Assessment of perfusion is not needed.	None
NUC bone scan targeted	1	May be useful if knowledge of occult AVN in the opposite hip is needed and MR is not available.	Med
CT hip axial images only	1	Provides no more information than conventional radiographs.	Med
Rating Scale: 1=Least appropriate, 9=Most appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Variant 4:**Radiograph shows mottled femoral head, suspicious but not definite for avascular necrosis in the painful hip(s). Further clinical evaluation is needed.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	<u>RRL*</u>
MRI hip without contrast	9	MRI provides definitive diagnosis when radiograph findings are equivocal.	None
CT hip axial and coronal and sagittal reformatted images	1	Less sensitive than bone scanning or MRI.	Med
MRI hip without and with contrast	1	Assessment of perfusion is not needed.	None
NUC bone scan targeted	1	Indicated if MRI is not available.	Med
CT hip axial images only	1	Less sensitive than bone scanning or MRI.	Med
Rating Scale: 1=Least appropriate, 9=Most appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

An ACR Committee on Appropriateness Criteria and its expert panels have developed criteria for determining appropriate imaging examinations for diagnosis and treatment of specified medical condition(s). These criteria are intended to guide radiologists, radiation oncologists and referring physicians in making decisions regarding radiologic imaging and treatment. Generally, the complexity and severity of a patient's clinical condition should dictate the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Only those exams generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.

Clinical Condition:**Avascular Necrosis of the Hip****Variant 5:**

Avascular necrosis suspected clinically but radiographs are normal. Further clinical evaluation needed.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
MRI hip without contrast	9	Most sensitive and specific method to establish or exclude AVN.	None
MRI hip without and with contrast	1	Assessment of perfusion is not needed.	None
NUC bone scan targeted	1	Might be indicated if MRI is not available or MR is negative and AVN is still suspected.	Med
CT hip axial images only	1	Not as sensitive as bone scan or MRI.	Med
CT hip axial and coronal and sagittal reformatted images	1	Not as sensitive as bone scan or MRI.	Med
Rating Scale: 1=Least appropriate, 9=Most appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Variant 6:

Displaced or nondisplaced femoral neck fracture on radiographs.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
MRI hip without and with contrast	1	If MRI were to be proven to accurately predict the femoral heads that go on to collapse, evaluation of perfusion may be useful before surgery.	None
CT hip axial and coronal and sagittal reformatted images	1	Not needed for clinical management and not predictive of later AVN.	Med
MRI hip without contrast	1	Not needed for clinical management and not predictive of later AVN.	None
CT hip axial images only	1	Not needed for clinical management and not predictive of later AVN.	Med
NUC bone scan targeted	1	Not needed for clinical management and not predictive of later AVN.	Med
Rating Scale: 1=Least appropriate, 9=Most appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

An ACR Committee on Appropriateness Criteria and its expert panels have developed criteria for determining appropriate imaging examinations for diagnosis and treatment of specified medical condition(s). These criteria are intended to guide radiologists, radiation oncologists and referring physicians in making decisions regarding radiologic imaging and treatment. Generally, the complexity and severity of a patient's clinical condition should dictate the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Only those exams generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.

AVASCULAR NECROSIS OF THE HIP

Expert Panel on Musculoskeletal Imaging: Arthur A. De Smet, MD¹; Murray K. Dalinka, MD²; Naomi P. Alazraki, MD³; Richard H. Daffner, MD⁴; George Y. El-Khoury, MD⁵; John B. Kneeland, MD⁶; B.J. Manaster, MD, PhD⁷; Helene Pavlov, MD⁸; David A. Rubin, MD⁹; Lynne S. Steinbach, MD¹⁰; Barbara N. Weissman, MD¹¹; Robert H. Haralson III, MD.¹²

Summary of Literature Review

Avascular necrosis (AVN) is a relatively common disease in which there is death of the cellular elements of bone or marrow [1]. The femoral heads are the most commonly affected sites for clinically significant AVN. There are numerous predisposing causes, including dislocation of the hip, femoral neck fracture, corticosteroid usage, collagen vascular disease, and the hemoglobinopathies [1,2]. Femoral head AVN is a significant problem in healthcare because it often affects young adults [2,3]. With secondary collapse of the femoral head, disabling hip pain may result in the need for total joint replacement in early adulthood. For nontraumatic causes of AVN, the disease is often bilateral, which further increases the extent of disability.

There are no specific physical findings or laboratory tests to establish the diagnosis of AVN [3]. Clinically suspected AVN can be confirmed only by diagnostic imaging or biopsy. Imaging methods for definitive diagnosis include radiographs, conventional tomography, computed tomography (CT), radionuclide bone scans, and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). These methods vary considerably in their cost, diagnostic accuracy, and the information provided. The importance of these methods for diagnosis of AVN is directly related to the influence of early diagnosis on patient outcome. Core decompression of an avascular femoral head has been proposed as a method to reduce the likelihood of subsequent femoral head collapse. This technique has shown good results in some series [4-8] but not in others [9,10]. A study of 18 patients with early AVN by radiographs found that core decompression was associated with a better outcome if the area of involvement measured by MRI was small [11-13]. Other techniques have been recommended for treatment of AVN of the femoral head, including free bone grafts,

vascularized bone grafts, osteochondral allografts, osteotomy, and electrical stimulation [14]. More studies are needed to determine the long-term benefits of the many procedures that are used to treat AVN of the femoral head [15]. While the optimal treatment is still debated, early diagnosis and staging of AVN are important for two reasons. First, establishing that AVN is the cause for a patient's hip pain allows exclusion of conditions such as infection, neoplasm, or occult fracture that require early specific treatment [16]. Second, accurate diagnosis and staging of AVN will be essential in assessing the efficacy of any treatment developed in the future.

Radiographs are the least expensive and most widely available imaging technology. Radiographs should be obtained as the initial study in every patient suspected with AVN. In the presence of AVN, the radiograph findings may be normal, abnormal or nonspecific. Although the radiograph findings for AVN of the femoral head are well known, there are no studies that determine the diagnostic efficacy of individual radiographic views. Most authorities believe that both anteroposterior and frogleg lateral views are necessary because a subchondral fracture or cortical depression may be seen only on one of the two views [17]. Although anecdotal examples of the value of tomography have been presented, no study has been performed to determine the sensitivity or specificity of tomography for the diagnosis of AVN.

Computed tomography with multiplanar reconstruction is less sensitive than bone scanning and MRI in the diagnosis of AVN with an accuracy comparable [18,19] or superior [3,20,21] to that of radiographs. Its major role is in determining the severity of secondary degenerative joint disease or the extent of collapse of the femoral head [22]. This information is useful in surgical planning for either osteotomy or joint replacement [19,20]. In addition, CT has been shown to be more sensitive than radiography and MRI in the detection of subchondral fractures [23].

For the detection of radiographically occult AVN, radionuclide bone scanning and MRI are both sensitive methods [21,24-27]. However, MRI is preferred because it has greater sensitivity and a greater specificity than bone scanning [3,16,18,19,21,28-37]. The sensitivity for detection of AVN has ranged from 88%-100% for MRI and from 72%-87% for radionuclide bone scanning [10,21,28,30,33]. The addition of single-photon-emission computed tomography (SPECT) improves the accuracy of radionuclide imaging for the diagnosis of AVN, with MRI found to be more accurate than SPECT in one study [8] but SPECT more accurate than MRI in another [33,38]. One potential cause for incorrect diagnosis of AVN by MRI is transient osteoporosis, but attention to the MRI

¹Principal Author, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis; ²Panel Chair, University of Pennsylvania Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa; ³Emory University/Nuclear Medicine, Decatur, Ga; ⁴Allegheny General Hospital, Pittsburgh, Pa; ⁵University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics, Iowa City, Iowa; ⁶University of Pennsylvania Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa; ⁷University of Colorado Health Science Center, Denver, Colo; ⁸Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY; ⁹Washington University of St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo; ¹⁰University of California, San Francisco, Calif; ¹¹Brigham & Women's Hospital, Boston, Mass; ¹²Southeast Orthopedics, Knoxville, Tenn, American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons.

Reprint requests to: Department of Quality & Safety, American College of Radiology, 1891 Preston White Drive, Reston, VA 20191-4397.

An ACR Committee on Appropriateness Criteria and its expert panels have developed criteria for determining appropriate imaging examinations for diagnosis and treatment of specified medical condition(s). These criteria are intended to guide radiologists, radiation oncologists and referring physicians in making decisions regarding radiologic imaging and treatment. Generally, the complexity and severity of a patient's clinical condition should dictate the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Only those exams generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.

findings will usually allow differentiation of these two entities [39-42].

MRI has a second advantage over bone scanning, because the MRI findings of AVN are usually characteristic, which allows differentiation from other hip diseases [15]. There are occasional cases of AVN with normal radiographs in which either bone scanning or MRI may be falsely negative [3,25,28,43]. In these cases, both studies might be performed. Although MRI costs more than radionuclide bone scanning, a limited MRI examination may permit the diagnosis of AVN at a lower cost [44-46].

The indications for which diagnostic modalities to use vary depending on the clinical situation. In the typical patient presenting with hip pain, there have been no studies to indicate that MRI should be used routinely to detect occult AVN. Because of the large number of patients who have bursitis or osteoarthritis, it would not be cost effective to obtain an MRI on every patient presenting with hip pain.

A less clear situation is when the patient is being treated with high-dose corticosteroids. These patients are at a high risk for development of AVN, and MRI is commonly recommended if they develop hip pain [31,47,48]. There have also been studies evaluating MRI or radionuclide bone scanning in patients without hip pain who are at high risk for AVN [49,50]. Patients who are on corticosteroids for renal transplants were found to have a high incidence of AVN despite the absence of hip pain. MRI shows typical changes of AVN in 6%-22% of these asymptomatic patients [44,51,52]. In a well controlled prospective study of 104 patients who had renal transplants, 14 patients developed MRI evidence of AVN [52]. Four of these patients subsequently developed pain with collapse of the femoral heads and ultimately required hip arthroplasty. The other 10 patients remained asymptomatic; the MRI returned to normal in five patients. Similarly, in a prospective study of 23 patients on corticosteroids for systemic lupus erythematosus, MRI findings of AVN were noted in 12 (52%) of the 23 patients; three patients subsequently developed hip pain [16]. In another study of patients with systemic lupus erythematosus, 24 asymptomatic hips were found to have AVN on MRI with only four hips showing worsening on follow-up MRI [12]. It is clear that MRI can detect AVN in these high-risk, asymptomatic patients. Because of the variability in development of later symptoms, the difficulty has been in deciding in which patient's early intervention may be useful [51]. Several studies have found that the extent of involvement of the femoral head on MRI predicts subsequent bone collapse [49,50,53-55]. These studies would suggest that early intervention should be considered in patients who have involvement of a large portion of the apex of the femoral head. Certainly, future studies evaluating treatment of AVN to prevent collapse should include pretreatment MRI evaluation of

the extent of disease [3]. The current literature suggests that core decompression should be performed only when the area of involvement as measured by MRI is small [11,12]. However, patients with a small area of involvement are more likely to have a good outcome even without intervention.

A second clinical consideration is the risk of developing AVN in patients who have acute femoral neck fractures. Most patients with minimally displaced femoral neck fractures are treated empirically with internal fixation. With markedly displaced fractures, femoral head replacement is usually performed because of the increased risk of fracture nonunion and avascular necrosis. There may be a role for diagnostic imaging in determining which femoral heads are avascular after fracture. If the femoral head is still vascularized, internal fixation might be an alternative to femoral head replacement. If the head were avascular, femoral head replacement could be done immediately. Neither conventional MRI [56] nor radionuclide bone scanning is effective in evaluating the vascular perfusion of the femoral head in the 48-hour period after development of ischemia. However, MRI after gadolinium injection accurately assessed femoral head vascularity both in a dog model of acute AVN [56] and in a study of 13 humans with acute femoral neck fractures [57]. This assessment should be confirmed in a controlled study before it can be routinely recommended. Serial MRI after fixation of femoral neck fractures was shown to be useful in the prediction of development of AVN, but this has been noted in only one study [58].

In summary, the following guidelines are proposed. When a patient who is at high risk for avascular necrosis develops hip pain, the initial examination should consist of an anteroposterior pelvis and frogleg lateral radiograph of the symptomatic hip. If the radiograph findings are definite for avascular necrosis, an MRI might be indicated only if knowledge of asymptomatic AVN in the opposite hip is clinically important [59]. If the radiograph findings are equivocal for AVN or are normal in the symptomatic hip, then MRI is necessary to confirm the diagnosis of avascular necrosis and to exclude other causes for the patient's hip pain. In patients in whom MRI cannot be performed, a bone scan with SPECT imaging is a reasonable alternative for the diagnosis of radiographically occult AVN. Screening of the patient who is at high risk for AVN may be of value only if prophylactic treatment of asymptomatic AVN is proven useful. The use of MRI with gadolinium enhancement is currently of unproven value in managing patients with acute hip fractures.

Anticipated Exceptions

Clinical factors will certainly play a role in determining the necessity of diagnostic imaging. If the patient at high risk for AVN has equivocal radiograph findings for AVN,

An ACR Committee on Appropriateness Criteria and its expert panels have developed criteria for determining appropriate imaging examinations for diagnosis and treatment of specified medical condition(s). These criteria are intended to guide radiologists, radiation oncologists and referring physicians in making decisions regarding radiologic imaging and treatment. Generally, the complexity and severity of a patient's clinical condition should dictate the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Only those exams generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.

those findings may be adequate for clinical management if the pain is mild and there are no laboratory or clinical findings to suggest underlying infection, tumor, or occult fracture. If the patient with hip pain and at risk for AVN has a normal radiograph, the radiograph alone may be adequate if the clinical findings suggest a condition such as bursitis. In the future, interventional treatment may be developed that significantly reduces the risk of femoral head collapse in the patient with early AVN. If so, screening of asymptomatic patients at high risk for AVN may become clinically appropriate.

Relative Radiation Level Information

Potential adverse health effects associated with radiation exposure are an important factor to consider when selecting the appropriate imaging procedure. Because there is a wide range of radiation exposures associated with different diagnostic procedures, a relative radiation level (RRL) indication has been included for each imaging examination. The RRLs are based on effective dose, which is a radiation dose quantity that is used to estimate population total radiation risk associated with an imaging procedure. Additional information regarding radiation dose assessment for imaging examinations can be found in the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® [Radiation Dose Assessment Introduction](#) document.

Relative Radiation Level Designations	
Relative Radiation Level	Effective Dose Estimate Range
None	0
Minimal	< 0.1 mSv
Low	0.1-1 mSv
Medium	1-10 mSv
High	10-100 mSv

References

- Sweet DE, Madewell JE. Pathogenesis of osteonecrosis. In Resnick D, Niwayama G, ed. *Diagnosis of Bone and Joint Disorders*. Philadelphia, Pa: WB Saunders; 1988:3188-3237.
- Lavernia CJ, Sierra RJ, Grieco FR. Osteonecrosis of the femoral head. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg* 1999; 7(4):250-261. Review.
- Steinberg ME. Early diagnosis of avascular necrosis of the femoral head. *Instr Course Lect* 1988; 37:51-57.
- Ficat RP. Idiopathic bone necrosis of the femoral head. Early diagnosis and treatment. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1985; 67(1):3-9.
- Tooke SM, Nugent PJ, Bassett LW, et al. Results of core decompression for femoral head osteonecrosis. *Clin Orthop* 1988; 228:99-104.
- Coleman BG, Kressel HY, Dalinka MK, et al. Radiographically negative avascular necrosis: detection with MR imaging. *Radiology* 1988; 168(2):525-528.
- Smith SW, Fehring TK, Griffin WL, Beaver WB. Core decompression of the osteonecrotic femoral head. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1995; 77(5):674-680.
- Aigner N, Schneider W, Eberl V, Knahr K. Core decompression in early stages of femoral head osteonecrosis--an MRI-controlled study. *Int Orthop* 2002; 26(1):31-35.
- Camp JF, Colwell CW Jr. Core decompression of the femoral head for osteonecrosis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1986; 68(9):1313-1319.

- Seiler JG III, Christie MJ, Homra L. Correlation of the findings of magnetic resonance imaging with those of bone biopsy in patients who have stage-I or II ischemic necrosis of the femoral head. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1989; 71(1):28-32.
- Mazieres B, Marin F, Chiron P, et al. Influence of the volume of osteonecrosis on the outcome of core decompression of the femoral head. *Ann Rheum Dis* 1997; 56(12):747-750.
- Yoshida T, Kanayama Y, Okamura M, et al. Long-term observation of avascular necrosis of the femoral head in systemic lupus erythematosus: an MRI study. *Clin Exp Rheumatol* 2002; 20(4):525-530.
- Theodorou DJ, Malizos KN, Beris AE, et al. Multimodal imaging quantitation of the lesion size in osteonecrosis of the femoral head. *Clin Orthop* 2001; (386):54-63.
- Resnick D, Niwayama G. Osteonecrosis: diagnostic techniques, specific situations, and complications. In Resnick D, Niwayama G, eds. *Diagnosis of Bone and Joint Disorders*. Philadelphia, Pa: WB Saunders; 1988:3238-3287.
- Glickstein MF, Burk DL Jr, Schiebler ML, et al. Avascular necrosis versus other diseases of the hip: sensitivity of MR imaging. *Radiology* 1988; 169(1):213-215.
- Shih TT, Su CT, Chiu LC, et al. Evaluation of hip disorders by radiography, radionuclide scanning and magnetic resonance imaging. *J Formos Med Assoc* 1993; 92(8):737-744.
- Meyer SJ, Vahey TN. Imaging algorithm for avascular necrosis of the hip. *Rheum Dis Clin North Am* 1991; 17(3):799-802.
- Hauzeur JP, Pasteels JL, Schoutens A, et al. The diagnostic value of magnetic resonance imaging in non-traumatic osteonecrosis of the femoral head. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1989; 71(5):641-649.
- Lee MJ, Corrigan J, Stack JP, Ennis JT. A comparison of modern imaging modalities in osteonecrosis of the femoral head. *Clin Radiol* 1990; 42(6):427-432.
- Magid D, Fishman EK, Scott WW Jr, et al. Femoral head avascular necrosis CT assessment with multiplanar reconstruction. *Radiology* 1985; 157(3):751-756.
- Thickman D, Axel L, Kressel HY, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging of avascular necrosis of the femoral head. *Skeletal Radiol* 1986; 15(2):133-140.
- Mitchell DG, Kressel HY, Arger PG, et al. Avascular necrosis of the femoral head: morphologic assessment by MR imaging, with CT correlation. *Radiology* 1986; 161(3):739-742.
- Stevens K, Tao C, Lee SU, et al. Subchondral fractures in osteonecrosis of the femoral head: comparison of radiography, CT, and MR imaging. *AJR* 2003; 180(2):363-368.
- Robinson HJ Jr, Hartleben PD, Lund G, Schreiman J. Evaluation of magnetic resonance imaging in the diagnosis of osteonecrosis of the femoral head. Accuracy compared with radiographs, core biopsy, and intraosseous pressure measurements. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1989; 71(5):650-663.
- Siddiqui AR, Kopecky KK, Wellman HN, et al. Prospective study of magnetic resonance imaging and SPECT bone scans in renal allograft recipients: evidence for a self-limited subclinical abnormality of the hip. *J Nucl Med* 1993; 34(3):381-386.
- Conklin JJ, Alderson PO, Zizic TM, et al. Comparison of bone scan and radiograph sensitivity in the detection of steroid-induced ischemic necrosis of bone. *Radiology* 1983; 147(1):221-226.
- Nagasawa K, Tsukamoto H, Tada Y, et al. Imaging study on the mode of development and changes in avascular necrosis of the femoral head in systemic lupus erythematosus: long-term observations. *Br J Rheumatol* 1994; 33(4):343-347.
- Beltran J, Herman LJ, Burk JM, et al. Femoral head avascular necrosis: MR imaging with clinical-pathologic and radionuclide correlation. *Radiology* 1988; 166(1):215-220.
- Kalunian KC, Hahn BH, Bassett L. Magnetic resonance imaging identifies early femoral head ischemic necrosis in patients receiving systemic glucocorticoid therapy. *J Rheumatol* 1989; 16(7):959-963.
- Markisz JA, Knowles RJ, Altchek DW, et al. Segmental patterns of avascular necrosis of the femoral heads: early detection with MR imaging. *Radiology* 1987; 162(3):717-720.

An ACR Committee on Appropriateness Criteria and its expert panels have developed criteria for determining appropriate imaging examinations for diagnosis and treatment of specified medical condition(s). These criteria are intended to guide radiologists, radiation oncologists and referring physicians in making decisions regarding radiologic imaging and treatment. Generally, the complexity and severity of a patient's clinical condition should dictate the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Only those exams generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.

31. Halland AM, Klemp P, Botes D, et al. Avascular necrosis of the hip in systemic lupus erythematosus: the role of magnetic resonance imaging. *Br J Rheumatol* 1993; 32(11):972-976.
32. Bassett LW, Gold RH, Reicher M, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging in the early diagnosis of ischemic necrosis of the femoral head. *Clin Orthop* 1987; 214:237-248.
33. Kim KY, Lee SH, Moon DH, Nah HY. The diagnostic value of triple head single photon emission computed tomography (3H-SPECT) in avascular necrosis of the femoral head. *Int Orthop* 1993; 17(3):132-138.
34. Mitchell DG, Rao VM, Dalinka MK, et al. Femoral head avascular necrosis: correlation of MR imaging, radiographic staging, radionuclide imaging, and clinical findings. *Radiology* 1987; 162(3):709-715.
35. Wu Z, Yan X, Liu Z, et al. Avascular necrosis of the femoral head: MR imaging with radiological and histological correlation. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 1998; 111(7):599-602.
36. Scheiber C, Meyer ME, Dumitresco B, et al. The pitfalls of planar three-phase bone scintigraphy in nontraumatic hip avascular osteonecrosis. *Clin Nucl Med* 1999; 24(7):488-494.
37. Theodorou DJ, Malizos KN, Beris AE, et al. Multimodal imaging quantitation of the lesion size in osteonecrosis of the femoral head. *Clin Orthop* 2001; (386):54-63.
38. Ryu JS, Kim JS, Moon DH, et al. Bone SPECT is more sensitive than MRI in the detection of early osteonecrosis of the femoral head after renal transplantation. *J Nucl Med* 2002; 43(8):1006-1011.
39. Balakrishnan A, Schemitsch EH, Pearce D, McKee MD. Distinguishing transient osteoporosis of the hip from avascular necrosis. *Can J Surg* 2003; 46(3):187-192.
40. Malizos KN, Zibis AH, Dailiana Z, et al. MR imaging findings in transient osteoporosis of the hip. *Eur J Radiol* 2004; 50(3):238-244.
41. Kim YM, Oh HC, Kim HJ. The pattern of bone marrow oedema on MRI in osteonecrosis of the femoral head. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2000; 82(6):837-841.
42. Vande Berg BC, Malghem JJ, Lecouvet FE, et al. Idiopathic bone marrow edema lesions of the femoral head: predictive value of MR imaging findings. *Radiology* 1999; 212(2):527-535.
43. Genez BM, Wilson MR, Houk RW, et al. Early osteonecrosis of the femoral head: detection in high-risk patients with MR imaging. *Radiology* 1988; 168(2):521-524.
44. Tervonen O, Mueller DM, Matteson EL, et al. Clinically occult avascular necrosis of the hip: prevalence in an asymptomatic population at risk. *Radiology* 1992; 182(3):845-847.
45. May DA, Disler DG. Screening for avascular necrosis of the hip with rapid MRI: preliminary experience. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2000; 24(2):284-287.
46. Khanna AJ, Yoon TR, Mont MA, et al. Femoral head osteonecrosis: detection and grading by using a rapid MR imaging protocol. *Radiology* 2000; 217(1):188-192.
47. Le Parc JM, Andre T, Helenon O, et al. Osteonecrosis of the hip in renal transplant recipients: changes in functional status and magnetic resonance imaging findings over three years in three hundred five patients. *Rev Rhum Engl Ed* 1996; 63(6):413-420.
48. Watson RM, Roach NA, Dalinka MK. Avascular necrosis and bone marrow edema syndrome. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2004; 42(1):207-219. Review.
49. Takatori Y, Kokubo T, Ninomiya S, et al. Avascular necrosis of the femoral head: natural history and magnetic resonance imaging. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1993; 75(2):217-221.
50. Kokubo T, Takatori Y, Ninomiya S, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging and scintigraphy of avascular necrosis of the femoral head: prediction of subsequent segmental collapse. *Clin Orthop* 1992; 277:54-60.
51. Fordyce MJ, Solomon L. Early detection of avascular necrosis of the femoral head by MRI. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1993; 75(3):365-367.
52. Kopecky KK, Braunstein EM, Brandt KD, et al. Apparent avascular necrosis of the hip: appearance and spontaneous resolution of MR findings in renal allograft recipients. *Radiology* 1991; 179(2):523-527.
53. Laffargue P, Dahan E, Chagnaud C, et al. Early-stage avascular necrosis of the femoral head: MR imaging for prognosis in 31 cases with at least 2 years follow-up. *Radiology* 1993; 187(1):199-204.
54. Beltran J, Knight CT, Zuelzer WA, et al. Core decompression for avascular necrosis of the femoral head: correlation between long-term results and preoperative MR staging. *Radiology* 1990; 175(2):533-536.
55. Nishii T, Sugano N, Ohzono K, et al. Significance of lesion size and location in the prediction of collapse of osteonecrosis of the femoral head: a new three-dimensional quantification using magnetic resonance imaging. *J Orthop Res* 2002; 20(1):130-136.
56. Nadel SN, Debatin JF, Richardson WJ, et al. Detection of acute avascular necrosis of the femoral head in dogs: dynamic contrast-enhanced MR imaging vs spin-echo and STIR sequences. *AJR* 1992; 159:1255-1261.
57. Lang P, Mauz M, Schorner W, et al. Acute fracture of the femoral neck: assessment of femoral head perfusion with gadopentetate dimeglumine-enhanced MR imaging. *AJR* 1993; 160:335-341.
58. Kawasaki M, Hasegawa Y, Sakano S, et al. Prediction of osteonecrosis by magnetic resonance imaging after femoral neck fractures. *Clin Orthop* 2001; (385):157-164.
59. Sugano N, Nishii T, Shibuya T, et al. Contralateral hip in patients with unilateral nontraumatic osteonecrosis of the femoral head. *Clin Orthop* 1997; 334:85-90.

An ACR Committee on Appropriateness Criteria and its expert panels have developed criteria for determining appropriate imaging examinations for diagnosis and treatment of specified medical condition(s). These criteria are intended to guide radiologists, radiation oncologists and referring physicians in making decisions regarding radiologic imaging and treatment. Generally, the complexity and severity of a patient's clinical condition should dictate the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Only those exams generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.