

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

Clinical Condition: **Imaging After Total Hip Arthroplasty**

Variant 1: **Follow-up of the asymptomatic patient with a THA.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
X-ray hip	9		Med
X-ray radiostereogrammetry hip	1		Med
CT hip	1		Med
DXA total hip	1		Min
NUC bone/gallium scan	1		High
NUC bone scan targeted	1		Med
QCT hip	1		Low
MRI hip	1		None
Rating Scale: 1=Least appropriate, 9=Most appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Variant 2: **Evaluating patients with a painful primary THA–suspected loosening and/or wear.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
X-ray hip	9		Med
CT hip	5	For planning, if osteolysis is suspected or assessment of bone stock is needed. May be useful to see subtle wear. With multidetector, thin section CT, this study is providing more information.	Med
INV arthrography and aspiration hip	5	Arthrography may be done to evaluate loosening. Injection of anesthetic may be helpful to localize the source of pain.	IP
NUC bone/gallium scan	2		High
QCT hip	1		Low
MRI hip	1	Recent data suggests it may be helpful in certain cases.	None
DXA total hip	1		Min
X-ray radiostereogrammetry hip	1		Med
NUC bone scan targeted	No Consensus	May help determine if one or both components are loose or if other abnormalities are present. Varies by institution.	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:**Imaging After Total Hip Arthroplasty****Variant 3:****Evaluating patients with a painful primary THA–suspected infection.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	<u>RRL*</u>
X-ray hip	9		Med
INV arthrography and aspiration hip	9	Should be first exam following radiographs. Other studies may be helpful but not indicated routinely. Arthrography may document collections.	IP
NUC bone scan targeted	3	Sensitive but not specific enough to be used as the sole procedure.	Med
NUC bone/gallium scan	3	If bone scan is abnormal, gallium can follow to suggest infection.	High
NUC indium-111 WBC scan	3	WBC scan can be done without bone scan to diagnose infection, or can follow bone scan.	Med
NUC ciprofloxacin (infection) imaging	3		Med
CT hip	1	Usually not indicated. Only if soft tissue abscesses suspected.	Med
MRI hip	1	Currently being investigated.	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.

IMAGING AFTER TOTAL HIP ARTHROPLASTY

Expert Panel on Musculoskeletal Imaging: Barbara N. Weissman, MD¹; Murray K. Dalinka, MD²; Naomi Alazraki, MD³; Richard H. Daffner, MD⁴; Arthur A. DeSmet, MD⁵; George Y. El-Khoury, MD⁶; John B. Kneeland, MD⁷; B.J. Manaster, MD, PhD⁸; Helene Pavlov, MD⁹; David A. Rubin, MD¹⁰; Lynne S. Steinbach, MD¹¹; Robert H. Haralson III, MD.¹²

Summary of Literature Review

Symptoms

Ninety percent of patients have good or excellent results after total hip arthroplasty (THA) [1]. Those with persistent postoperative pain after cemented prostheses may have had the incorrect diagnosis made originally, have infection, or, less commonly, have heterotopic bone formation. Studies of patients with uncemented prostheses indicate that pain occurring after an asymptomatic period suggests possible loosening. While patients with loosening or infection usually (but not always) have pain [2], those with particle disease and resulting osteolysis may be asymptomatic [3].

Imaging Techniques

Radiographs shortly after surgery are recommended as a baseline for future evaluation and are particularly important after revision surgery [4]. The schedule for obtaining radiographs is uncertain and depends on the presence or absence of symptoms. The NIH consensus panel indicates that “appropriate x-ray examination” is required throughout life with periodic examination, perhaps at 5-year intervals, after the first 5 years [5]. In a review of 18,486 primary total hip arthroplasties in patients with osteoarthritis, Roder et al [6] found radiological follow-up in order to monitor component loosening to be unnecessary in asymptomatic patients in the first five postoperative years. In asymptomatic patients with bone ingrowth prostheses, radiography may also be useful to gauge fixation early in the postoperative course [7]. They are also helpful in identifying bone loss from aggressive granulomatous disease, although the sensitivity of radiographs in detecting osteolysis is limited. Since this complication occurs most often several years postoperatively, Tigges et al [3] recommend radiographs in asymptomatic patients beginning 3 years after surgery.

All symptomatic patients should undergo radiography [3]. Availability of old radiographs to compare to new ones facilitates the diagnosis of subtle changes such as may occur in loosening or in particle disease, or of rapid changes such as may occur with infection [6].

Roentgen stereophotogrammetric analysis

Roentgen stereophotogrammetric analysis (radiostereometry) is a technique that utilizes three component position. First, opaque reference markers are placed in the bone near the prosthesis (usually at the time of surgery). Second, two radiographs are obtained simultaneously using two radiographic tubes that are angled to each other. Third, a calibration cage is placed beneath the table [8]. Sophisticated mathematical analysis is then performed [9]. Karrholm et al [10] investigated the accuracy of this technique by performing duplicate measurements. The 99% confidence limits were 0.16 mm for proximal to distal translation, 0.3 degree for anterior posterior rotation, 0.8 degree or rotation about the longitudinal axis (anteversion-retroversion), and 0.34 degree for varus/valgus tilt. Radiostereometry has been used for the early detection of component migration and prosthetic wear. Because of its complexity, however, this test remains largely a research method [8].

Dynamic computed tomography

Dynamic computed tomography (CT) is performed by obtaining CT slices through the collar of the prosthesis and the femoral condyles with the leg in maximum internal and external rotation. Change in relative position has been shown in one series to correlate with loosening at surgery [11].

Bone scintigraphy

Bone scintigraphic appearances after total hip arthroplasty are varied, reflecting the stress on the adjacent bone as well as any complications that occur. Study of asymptomatic cemented total hip prostheses by Utz et al [12] indicated that persistent increased uptake could be seen at the tip of the femoral stem in about 10% of patients at 1 to 3 years after surgery; at the greater trochanter in 20% and at the acetabulum in 12% at 2 years. The femoral shaft uptake decreased by 9 months after surgery. These authors recommend that a baseline bone scan be obtained between 9 and 12 months after surgery.

Normal bone scan appearances after uncemented total hip replacements depend on the type of prosthetic components used [13]. Oswald et al [14] examined 25 asymptomatic prostheses serially for two years after THA and found that bone phase images showed uptake at the tip of each prosthesis at some time during the study. Increased blood flow or focal blood pool activity should

¹Principal Author, Brigham & Women's Hospital, Boston, Mass; ²Panel Chair, University of Pennsylvania Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa; ³VA Medical Center, Emory University, Atlanta, Ga; ⁴Allegheny General Hospital, Pittsburgh, Pa; ⁵University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis; ⁶University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics, Iowa City, Iowa; ⁷University of Pennsylvania Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa; ⁸University of Colorado Health Science Center, Denver, Colo; ⁹Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY; ¹⁰Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology, St. Louis, Mo; ¹¹University of California, San Francisco, Calif; 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.

suggest a complication. Uptake at the area distal to the tip or along the lateral tip increased in some cases in the 12 to 24 month follow-up. Indium-111 white blood cell (WBC) scanning also showed increased activity at the tip of the prosthesis in 80% of uncomplicated uncemented prostheses. These authors noted that baseline three-phase bone scans and In-111 WBC scans are of value.

Evaluation of Patient with Suspected Infection

Infection occurs in 1%-2% of primary total hip arthroplasties and is even more frequent after revision procedures [15]. Approximately one third of infections develop in the first 3 months, another one third within the first year, and another one third more than 1 year after surgery [16]. Loosening occurring within the first 2 years after surgery suggests infection [2]. Infection of failed hip prostheses may be underestimated since organisms may reside in a biofilm [17,18]. As summarized by Spangehl et al [15], no test is perfectly sensitive and specific for the diagnosis. This includes radiography. Tigges et al [19] evaluated radiographs of 20 infected THAs and found half to be normal.

Computed tomography

Prospective evaluation of patients with painful total hip arthroplasties using helical CT has shown that periosteal new bone formation was always associated with infection (100% specificity) but had only 16% sensitivity. Soft tissue findings were more accurate. Fluid collections in muscles and perimuscular fat had a 100% positive predictive value and the absence of joint distension a 96% negative predictive value [20].

Ultrasonography

Ultrasonographic findings may suggest infection after THA. Van Holsbeeck et al [21] found that a thick capsule (3.2 mm bone capsule distance) was 100% sensitive for the diagnosis but not entirely specific (74%). The combination of intra-articular effusion with extraarticular extension was indicative of infection.

Joint aspiration

Joint aspiration, although not perfect, is “perhaps the most useful investigative tool for definitive confirmation of the presence or absence of infection [15].” The sensitivity of preoperative aspiration ranges from 50%-93% and the specificity from 82%-97%. Thus, both false positive and false negative studies occur. Debate remains regarding the indications for arthrography, Somme et al [22] indicate that aspiration may be particularly useful when there is no clinical suspicion of infection, while Spangehl et al [23] suggest aspiration when there is an elevated erythrocyte sedimentation rate or C-reactive protein or clinical suspicion remains.

Magnetic resonance imaging

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) has demonstrated a peripherally enhancing juxta-articular fluid collection

connecting to the implant in a patient with periprosthetic infection [24].

Technetium-99m bone scan

Technetium-99m bone scans are thought to be sensitive but not specific for postoperative infection [15]. Aliabadi et al [25] noted that a positive bone scan strongly suggests loosening or infection, while a negative scan does not exclude these abnormalities. Chik et al [26] found that a negative bone scan makes infection very unlikely. The pattern of bone scan uptake is probably unreliable in differentiating infection from loosening [25].

Gallium-67 citrate

Gallium-67 citrate accumulates in areas of infection but also in areas of new bone formation. Mechanisms of gallium uptake include granulocyte uptake, direct bacterial uptake, and lactoferrin binding and binding to bacterial siderophores [27]. False negative scans may occur in patients treated with antibiotics [25]. A positive gallium scan is very likely to indicate infection, but a normal scan does not exclude infection (sensitivity 37%, specificity 100%) [25,28,29].

Indium-111-labeled white blood cells

Indium-111-labeled white blood cells (WBCs) may accumulate at the site of a number of inflammatory processes, including acute osteomyelitis, acute exacerbations of chronic osteomyelitis, septic arthritis, abscesses, and rheumatoid arthritis, but also in heterotopic bone, Paget disease, and other disorders. The sensitivity of the indium WBC scans for infection decreases as the chronicity of the infection increases. Sensitivities for the diagnosis of infection after total joint replacement range from 50%-100% and specificities from 45%-100% [11].

In addition to Indium-111, leukocytes may be labeled with Tc-99m stannous colloid [26]. Tc-99m-labeled leukocyte scanning is less expensive than Indium-111-labeled leukocyte scintigraphy and has better imaging characteristics and greater availability [26]. Tc-99m stannous colloid labels both granulocytes and monocytes, which should offer improved detection of chronic infections such as those associated with total joint replacement [26]. The addition of marrow imaging to leukocyte scanning has improved accuracy to 90% [16]. Delayed Tc-99m leukocyte imaging may be helpful [30].

Spangehl et al [15] note that until additional studies are done, the routine use of Indium-111-labeled immunoglobulin-G cannot be recommended.

Tc 99-m-labeled antibiotic (ciprofloxacin) has been used to evaluate orthopedic infections [28]. This agent should be specific for infection as opposed to other inflammatory processes, although mild uptake in noninfective inflammation and foreign body reaction does occur [28]. Antibiotic treatment may interfere with uptake of this agent [28]. Yapar et al [28] found a sensitivity of 85%,

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.

specificity of 92%, and accuracy of 88% in orthopedic infections (including 18 total hip replacements). This was compared to 78%, 100%, and 90%, respectively, [28] for the bone gallium combination. The ciprofloxacin scanning procedure enables studies to be performed at 1 and 4 hours and with improved resolution in contrast to the delay for gallium and Indium-111 labeled WBC scanning. Ciprofloxacin is not taken up in normal bone marrow, and its uptake is independent of the white blood cell count.

Evaluation of Patient with Suspected Loosening and/or Wear

Late aseptic loosening is the most common reason for implant failure [2]. Roder et al [6] evaluated 18,486 primary cemented, uncemented, and combined total hip arthroplasties performed for osteoarthritis followed at least 10 years. The prevalence of acetabular loosening ranged from 0.6%-13.9% and of femoral loosening from 1.7%-12.5% [6].

Tc-99m-labeled antigranulocyte antibody Fab' fragments imaging is a more readily available, simpler examination [31] than Indium-111-labeled autologous leukocyte scanning and has replaced that examination in Europe [18]. A sensitivity of 91% and specificity of 47% have been found for the diagnosis of infected total hip arthroplasties [31].

Fluorine 18 fluorodeoxy glucose (FDG) positron emission tomography (PET) has been utilized in diagnosing of infection after joint replacement, but has performed similarly to three-phase bone scintigraphy [32].

Radiographs

Loosening is usually evaluated on radiographs. However, despite the presence of radiographic features indicating loosening, symptoms may be absent. As pointed out by Brand et al [33], there is discrepancy in the identification and quantification of lucent zones, which are important indicators of radiographic loosening.

Roentgen stereogrammetry allows the detection of small changes in component position. Karrholm et al [34] found that the magnitude of subsidence in the first 2 years is a risk factor for subsequent component revision. Thus, the risk of femoral revision at 5-7 years postoperative was greater than 50% if subsidence was 1.2 mm or more during the first two years; the relative risk of revision increased 5.2 times for each mm of subsidence. Mjoberg et al [35] defined loosening as migration (change in component position over time) demonstrated at roentgen stereogrammetry. Patients with migration showed signs of loosening on arthrography, scintigraphy, or at revision surgery, whereas those without migration detected with this technique did not demonstrate any evidence of loosening.

Dual energy x-ray absorptiometry

Dual energy x-ray absorptiometry (DXA) scanning of patients with loose prostheses indicated a decrease in bone mineral density (BMD) in every Gruen zone in comparison to the opposite unoperated hip [36]. While comparison to the opposite side may be suboptimal, the pattern of bone loss differed from that associated with normal remodeling around successful prostheses.

Arthrography

The role of arthrography in documenting loosening of cemented components has been extensively studied. Maus et al [37] used refined criteria, high injection pressure, and subtraction technique and found a sensitivity of 96% and a specificity of 92% for demonstrating femoral component loosening and a sensitivity of 97% and a specificity of 68% for acetabular component loosening. Optimal arthrographic technique is important to demonstrate loosening [37-39].

The efficacy of arthrography in defining loosening of uncemented components is less well studied and less certain. Swan et al [40] analyzed contrast arthrography in 12 uncemented femoral components and found a sensitivity of 50% and a specificity of 100% for loosening evaluated at surgery. Contrast arthrography in 31 uncemented femoral components by Oyen et al [41] showed a sensitivity of 59% and a specificity of 64%, lower than the results for cemented femoral components (sensitivity 76%, specificity 70%).

Anesthetic

Intra-articular injection of anesthetic that results in pain relief indicates an intra-articular cause for the symptoms. Maus et al [37] notes that pain relief suggests an intra-articular process, while the absence of pain relief is not helpful.

Bone scan

The absence of increased uptake on bone scan is thought to be strong evidence against prosthetic complication [16]. Aliabadi et al [25], however, found that even the combination of bone scan and radiography was only about 84% sensitive and 92% specific for loosening in patients without obvious radiographic loosening.

Intra-articular radionuclide

Injection of intra-articular radionuclide was first used for evaluation of femoral component loosening, but later procedural changes allowed both acetabular and femoral components to be evaluated. The procedure is usually coupled with a bone scan, and the isotope injection is performed at the time of contrast arthrography [40,41]. In one series of uncemented components, this study was 70% sensitive and 100% specific for femoral loosening with increased sensitivity over the contrast examination [40]. In the study by Oyen et al [41], the nuclear arthrogram performed better than or equal to the contrast arthrogram for evaluation of cemented and uncemented

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.

components. The combination of radionuclide and arthrographic procedures is advantageous. In a small series involving uncemented femoral stems, the sensitivity of combined exams was 90%, and the specificity was 100% when both studies were negative [40].

Magnetic resonance imaging

Initial investigations have suggested that MRI may also have a role in the evaluation of prosthetic complications. In one series, MRI documented femoral component loosening as low signal fluid collections parallel to the component on fast-spin-echo T1-weighted images [24].

Evaluation of Patients with Suspected Stress Shielding

Bone loss associated with decreased stress occurs around both cemented and uncemented prostheses. Although these changes may be frequent, they may not affect the long-term results [42]. Cortical thinning, increased porosity, and decreased bone density are indicators of stress shielding on radiographs [7]. Radiographs, however, are insensitive indicators of bone loss. Engh et al [7] evaluated the ability of three orthopedic surgeons to agree on the presence of bone loss around prostheses under optimal radiographic conditions. “Excellent” agreement was not achieved until bone loss averaged 70%.

Dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry

Dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry has been used to assess periprosthetic bone density. Reproducibility is severely compromised if identical hip rotation is not achieved on follow up examinations [43]. Kilgus et al [44] found precision of the DXA exam to average 3.8% with a standard deviation of 1.2%. Kilgus et al [44] noted that bone loss was obvious on radiographs when about 35% of bone loss was present on DXA scanning.

Quantitative computed tomography

Quantitative computed tomography (QCT) has demonstrated changes in acetabular density with time after total hip replacement [45].

Particle Disease (Aggressive Granulomatous Disease)

Localized areas of bone resorption occur around total hip arthroplasties in response to the release of small particles [46]. The condition may occur in response to cement and/or polyethylene or metal particles. It is more frequent after uncemented total hip arthroplasties than cemented ones and is a more frequent complication than infection, dislocation, or extensive heterotopic bone formation [47]. Loosening may or may not accompany the condition.

Radiographs

Radiographs are typically the first method of identifying these areas of bone resorption [47-49-4]. Tallroth et al [49] found the area of the lesions to double in 2.2 years and the number of lesions to increase with time. However,

particularly in the acetabulum, considerable bone loss is necessary before lesions are identified with certainty.

Computed tomography

Improved CT scanning techniques enable better demonstration of bone adjacent to prostheses and may find a role for identifying granulomas. CT scans have helped determine the extent and location of clinically silent osteolysis [50]. Stulberg et al [51] suggest a baseline CT scan seven to ten years after THA; additional follow-up CTs may then be done.

Magnetic resonance imaging

On MRI, focal periprosthetic intraosseous masses of low T1 and heterogeneous, largely low to intermediate T2 signal have been described in cases of aggressive granulomatous disease [24]. Peripheral and some internal enhancement of these granulomas have been noted after intravenous gadolinium injection.

Summary

A large number of techniques are available for evaluating total hip arthroplasties. Radiographs, however, remain the standard imaging modality. Joint aspiration is the best available test for evaluation of joint infection. CT and MRI hold potential for assessing granulomatous disease.

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
*RRL assignments are not included for some examinations. The RRL assignments for the IP (in progress) exams will be available in future releases.	

References

- Harris WH, Sledge CB. Total hip and total knee replacement (1). *N Engl J Med* 1990; 323(11):725-731.

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.

2. Crawford RW, Murray DW. Total hip replacement: indications for surgery and risk factors for failure. *Ann Rheum Dis* 1997; 56(8):455-457.
3. Tigges S, Roberson JR, Cohen DE. Hip arthroplasty: the role of plain radiographs in outpatient management. *Radiology* 1995; 194(1):73-75.
4. Manaster BJ. Total hip arthroplasty: imaging evaluation. *J South Orthop Assoc.* 1998; 7(2):95-108.
5. NIH Consensus Statement. *Total Hip Replacement*; 1994; 12(5):1-31.
6. Roder C, Egli S, Aebi M, Busato A. The validity of clinical examination in the diagnosis of loosening of components in total hip arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2003; 85(1):37-44.
7. Engh CA Jr, McAuley JP, Sychterz CJ, et al. The accuracy and reproducibility of radiographic assessment of stress-shielding. A postmortem analysis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2000; 82-A(10):414-420.
8. Karrholm J, Herberts P, Hultmark P, et al. Radiostereometry of hip prostheses. Review of methodology and clinical results. *Clin Orthop* 1997; (344):94-110.
9. Baldursson H, Egund N, Hansson LI, Selvik G. Instability and wear of total hip prostheses determined with roentgen stereophotogrammetry. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 1979; 95(4):257-263.
10. Karrholm J, Hultmark P, Carlsson L, Malchau H. Subsidence of a non-polished stem in revisions of the hip using impaction allograft. Evaluation with radiostereometry and dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1999; 81(1):135-142.
11. Harris WH, Barrack RL. Contemporary algorithms for evaluation of the painful total hip replacement. *Orthop Rev* 1993; 22(5):531-539.
12. Utz JA, Lull RJ, Galvin EG. Asymptomatic total hip prosthesis: natural history determined using Tc-99m MDP bone scans. *Radiology* 1986; 161(2):509-512.
13. Rosenthal L. Hip and knee prostheses: evaluation of the natural history of periprosthetic bone changes. *Semin Nucl Med* 1997; 27(4):346-354.
14. Oswald SG, Van Nostrand D, Savory CG, Callaghan JJ. Three-phase bone scan and indium white blood cell scintigraphy following porous coated hip arthroplasty: a prospective study of the prosthetic hip. *J Nucl Med* 1989; 30(8):1321-1331.
15. Spangehl MJ, Younger AS, Masri BA, Duncan CP. Diagnosis of infection following total hip arthroplasty. *Instr Course Lect* 1998; 47:285-295.
16. Love C, Tomas MB, Marwin SE, et al. Role of nuclear medicine in diagnosis of the infected joint replacement. *Radiographics* 2001; 21(5):1229-1238.
17. Tunney MM, Patrick S, Gorman SP, et al. Improved detection of infection in hip replacements. A currently underestimated problem. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1998; 80(4):568-572.
18. Zimmerli W, Trampuz A, Ochsner PE. Prosthetic-joint infections. *N Engl J Med* 2004; 351(16):1645-54
19. Tigges S, Stiles RG, Roberson JR. Appearance of septic hip prostheses on plain radiographs. *AJR* 1994; 163(2):377-380.
20. Cyteval C, Hamm V, Sarrabere MP, et al. Painful infection at the site of hip prosthesis: CT imaging. *Radiology* 2002; 224(2):477-483.
21. van Holsbeeck MT, Eyler WR, Sherman LS, et al. Detection of infection in loosened hip prostheses: efficacy of sonography. *AJR* 1994; 163(2):381-384.
22. Somme D, Ziza JM, Desplaces N, et al. Contribution of routine joint aspiration to the diagnosis of infection before hip revision surgery. *Joint Bone Spine* 2003; 70(6):489-495.
23. Spangehl MJ, Masri BA, O'Connell JX, Duncan CP. Prospective analysis of preoperative and intraoperative investigations for the diagnosis of infection at the sites of two hundred and two revision total hip arthroplasties. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1999; 81(5):672-683.
24. White LM, Kim JK, Mehta M, et al. Complications of total hip arthroplasty: MR imaging-initial experience. *Radiology* 2000; 215(1):254-262.
25. Aliabadi P, Tumei SS, Weissman BN, McNeil BJ. Cemented total hip prosthesis: radiographic and scintigraphic evaluation. *Radiology* 1989; 173(1):203-206.
26. Chik KK, Magee MA, Bruce WJ, et al. Tc-99m stannous colloid-labeled leukocyte scintigraphy in the evaluation of the painful arthroplasty. *Clin Nucl Med* 1996; 21(11):838-843.
27. Tsan MF. Mechanism of gallium-67 accumulation in inflammatory lesions. *J Nucl Med* 1985; 26(1):88-92.
28. Yapar Z, Kibar M, Yapar AF, et al. The efficacy of technetium-99m ciprofloxacin (Infecton) imaging in suspected orthopaedic infection: a comparison with sequential bone/gallium imaging. *Eur J Nucl Med* 2001; 28(7):822-830.
29. Tehranzadeh J, Gubernick I, Blaha D. Prospective study of sequential technetium-99m phosphate and gallium imaging in painful hip prostheses (comparison of diagnostic modalities). *Clin Nucl Med* 1988; 13(4):229-236.
30. Larikka MJ, Ahonen AK, Junila JA, et al. Extended combined 99mTc-white blood cell and bone imaging improves the diagnostic accuracy in the detection of hip replacement infections. *Eur J Nucl Med* 2001; 28(3):288-293.
31. von Rothenburg T, Schoellhammer M, Schaffstein J, et al. Imaging of infected total arthroplasty with Tc-99m-labeled antigranulocyte antibody Fab'fragments. *Clin Nucl Med* 2004;29(9):548-551.
32. Stumpe KD, Notzli HP, Zanetti M, et al. FDG PET for differentiation of infection and aseptic loosening in total hip replacements: comparison with conventional radiography and three-phase bone scintigraphy. *Radiology* 2004; 231(2):333-341.
33. Brand RA, Pedersen DR, Yoder SA. How definition of "loosening" affects the incidence of loose total hip reconstructions. *Clin Orthop* 1986; (210):185-191.
34. Karrholm J, Borssen B, Lowenhielm G, Snorrason F. Does early micromotion of femoral stem prostheses matter? 4-7-year stereoradiographic follow-up of 84 cemented prostheses. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1994; 76(6):912-917.
35. Mjoberg B, Brismar J, Hansson LI, et al. Definition of endoprosthetic loosening. Comparison of arthrography, scintigraphy and roentgen stereophotogrammetry in prosthetic hips. *Acta Orthop Scand* 1985; 56(6):469-473.
36. Venesmaa P, Kroger H, Miettinen H, et al. Bone loss around failed femoral implant measured by dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry. *J Orthop Sci* 2000; 5(4):380-384.
37. Maus TP, Berquist TH, Bender CE, Rand JA. Arthrographic study of painful total hip arthroplasty: refined criteria. *Radiology* 1987; 162(3):721-727.
38. Hardy DC, Reinus WR, Totty WG, Keyser CK. Arthrography after total hip arthroplasty: utility of postambulation radiographs. *Skeletal Radiol* 1988; 17(1):20-23.
39. Hendrix RW, Wixson RL, Rana NA, Rogers LF. Arthrography after total hip arthroplasty: a modified technique used in the diagnosis of pain. *Radiology* 1983; 148(3):647-652.
40. Swan JS, Braunstein EM, Wellman HN, Capello W. Contrast and nuclear arthrography in loosening of the uncemented hip prosthesis. *Skeletal Radiol* 1991; 20(1):15-19.
41. Oyen WJ, Lemmens JA, Claessens RA, et al. Nuclear arthrography: combined scintigraphic and radiographic procedure for diagnosis of total hip prosthesis loosening. *J Nucl Med* 1996; 37(1):62-70.
42. Bugbee WD, Culpepper WJ 2nd, Engh CA Jr, Engh CA Sr. Long-term clinical consequences of stress-shielding after total hip arthroplasty without cement. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1997; 79(7):1007-1012.
43. Martini F, Leberer C, Mayer F, et al. Precision of the measurements of periprosthetic bone mineral density in hips with a custom-made femoral stem. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2000; 82(7):1065-1071.
44. Kilgus DJ, Shimaoka EE, Tipton JS, Eberle RW. Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry measurement of bone mineral density around porous-coated cementless femoral implants. Methods and preliminary results. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1993; 75(2):279-287.

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.

45. Wright JM, Pellicci PM, Salvati EA, et al. Bone density adjacent to press-fit acetabular components. A prospective analysis with quantitative computed tomography. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2001; 83-A(4):529-536.
46. Santavirta S, Kontinen YT, Bergroth V, et al. Aggressive granulomatous lesions associated with hip arthroplasty. Immunopathological studies. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1990; 72(2):252-258.
47. Goetz DD, Smith EJ, Harris WH. The prevalence of femoral osteolysis associated with components inserted with or without cement in total hip replacements. A retrospective matched-pair series. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1994; 76(8):1121-1129.
48. Tigges S, Stiles RG, Roberson JR. Complications of hip arthroplasty causing periprosthetic radiolucency on plain radiographs. *AJR* 1994; 162(6):1387-1391.
49. Tallroth K, Eskola A, Santavirta S, et al. Aggressive granulomatous lesions after hip arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 1989; 71(4):571-575.
50. Puri L, Wixson R, Stern S, et al. Use of helical computed tomography for the assessment of acetabular osteolysis after total hip arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2002; 84-A(4):609-614.
51. Stulberg D, Wixson R, Adams A, et al. Monitoring pelvic osteolysis following total hip replacement surgery: an algorithm for surveillance. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2002; 84-A Supp 12:116-122.

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.