American College of Radiology
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®

Clinical Condition: **Neck Mass/Adenopathy**

Variant 1: **Adult presenting with a nonpulsatile solitary neck mass (afebrile).**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CT neck with contrast	9		☢ ☢ ☢
MRI neck without and with contrast	8	See statement regarding contrast in text under "Anticipated Exceptions."	O
MRI neck without contrast	7		O
CT neck without contrast	6	May be appropriate initially if mass relationship to thyroid gland is uncertain.	☢ ☢ ☢
CT neck without and with contrast	5	For selected cases if sialolith is suspected.	☢ ☢ ☢
US neck	4		O
MRA neck with contrast	3		O
CTA neck	3		☢ ☢ ☢
FDG-PET neck	2	Not for primary diagnosis.	☢ ☢ ☢ ☢
Arteriography cervicocerebral	1		☢ ☢ ☢
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			***Relative Radiation Level**

Variant 2: **Adult presenting with a solitary neck mass (febrile).**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CT neck with contrast	9		☢ ☢ ☢
MRI neck without and with contrast	8	See statement regarding contrast in text under "Anticipated Exceptions."	O
CT neck without and with contrast	7		☢ ☢ ☢
CT neck without contrast	6	May be appropriate initially if mass relationship to thyroid gland is uncertain.	☢ ☢ ☢
MRI neck without contrast	5		O
US neck	4		O
MRA neck with contrast	3		O
CTA neck	3		☢ ☢ ☢
FDG-PET neck	2	Not for primary diagnosis.	☢ ☢ ☢ ☢
Arteriography cervicocerebral	1		☢ ☢ ☢
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			***Relative Radiation Level**

Clinical Condition: **Neck Mass/Adenopathy**

Variant 3: **Adult presenting with a pulsatile neck mass.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CT neck with contrast	9		☢ ☢ ☢
CTA neck	9	May be done at same time as CT neck.	☢ ☢ ☢
MRI neck without and with contrast	8	See statement regarding contrast in text under "Anticipated Exceptions."	O
MRA neck with contrast	8	May be done at same time as MRI of neck. See statement regarding contrast in text under "Anticipated Exceptions."	O
CT neck without and with contrast	7		☢ ☢ ☢
US neck	6		O
MRI neck without contrast	5		O
CT neck without contrast	4		☢ ☢ ☢
Arteriography cervicocerebral	4	Useful if preoperative embolization of glomus tumor is planned.	☢ ☢ ☢
FDG-PET neck	2		☢ ☢ ☢ ☢
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			***Relative Radiation Level**

Variant 4: **Adult presenting with multiple neck masses.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CT neck with contrast	9		☢ ☢ ☢
MRI neck without and with contrast	8	See statement regarding contrast in text under "Anticipated Exceptions."	O
MRI neck without contrast	7		O
CT neck without contrast	6		☢ ☢ ☢
CT neck without and with contrast	5		☢ ☢ ☢
FDG-PET neck	4		☢ ☢ ☢ ☢
US neck	4	To further characterize nodes in anticipation of biopsy.	O
CTA neck	3		☢ ☢ ☢
MRA neck with contrast	3		O
Arteriography cervicocerebral	1		☢ ☢ ☢
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			***Relative Radiation Level**

Clinical Condition: **Neck Mass/Adenopathy**

Variant 5: **Adult with a history of treatment for cancer presenting with a neck mass.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CT neck with contrast	9	Complementary with FDG-PET.	☢☢☢
FDG-PET neck	9	Complementary with CT of neck with contrast.	☢☢☢☢
MRI neck without and with contrast	8	See statement regarding contrast in text under "Anticipated Exceptions."	O
CT neck without and with contrast	7		☢☢☢
CT neck without contrast	6		☢☢☢
MRI neck without contrast	5		O
US neck	4	Used for localization for biopsy.	O
CTA neck	3		☢☢☢
MRA neck with contrast	3		O
Arteriography cervicocerebral	1		☢☢☢
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			***Relative Radiation Level**

Variant 6: **Child (up to age 14) presenting with a solitary neck mass or multiple neck masses (afebrile).**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
US neck	9		O
CT neck with contrast	8		☢☢☢
MRI neck without and with contrast	7	See statement regarding contrast in text under "Anticipated Exceptions."	O
MRI neck without contrast	6		O
CT neck without contrast	5		☢☢☢
CT neck without and with contrast	4		☢☢☢☢
CTA neck	2		☢☢☢
MRA neck with contrast	2		O
Arteriography cervicocerebral	1		☢☢☢
FDG-PET neck	1		☢☢☢☢
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			***Relative Radiation Level**

Clinical Condition: **Neck Mass/Adenopathy**

Variant 7: **Child (up to age 14) presenting with a solitary neck mass (febrile).**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
US neck	9	For palpable neck mass, except retropharyngeal, where CT would be preferred.	O
CT neck with contrast	8		☢☢☢
MRI neck without and with contrast	7	See statement regarding contrast in text under "Anticipated Exceptions."	O
MRI neck without contrast	6		O
CT neck without contrast	5		☢☢☢
CT neck without and with contrast	4		☢☢☢☢
CTA neck	2		☢☢☢
MRA neck with contrast	2		O
Arteriography cervicocerebral	1		☢☢☢
FDG-PET neck	1		☢☢☢☢
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			***Relative Radiation Level**

Expert Panel on Neurologic Imaging: Suresh Kumar Mukherji, MD[1]; Franz J. Wippold II, MD[2]; Rebecca S. Cornelius, MD[3]; James A. Brunberg, MD[4]; Patricia C. Davis, MD[5]; Robert L. De La Paz, MD[6]; Pr. Didier Dormont[7]; Linda Gray, MD[8]; John E. Jordan, MD[9]; Brian Nussenbaum, MD[10]; David J. Seidenwurm, MD[11]; Michael A. Sloan, MD, MS[12]; Patrick A. Turski, MD[13]; Robert D. Zimmerman, MD[14]; Brian D. Coley, MD.[15]

Summary of Literature Review

Initial Diagnosis

Imaging may be requested in a patient who presents with a palpable neck mass. The clinical presentation may be variable, as the patient may be an adult or child, the mass may be painful, or the patient may be febrile. The type of initial imaging study that has been recommended has varied over the past 20 years with the development and maturation of new imaging modalities.

Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Computed Tomography

In adults, a neck mass is likely to be either neoplastic or inflammatory [1-5]. In older patients with a smoking history, the diagnosis is often malignancy [6]. In adults who present with a fever, the etiology is often inflammation [7-9]. Both computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) can accurately diagnosis both disease entities [10-12]. Multidetector CT (MDCT) now appears to be the preferred initial modality for evaluating a patient with a palpable neck mass [13]. Both modalities can be used for initial diagnosis of a primary head and neck malignancy and for staging of cervical lymph nodes [14-18]. However, the rapid image acquisition of MDCT reduces physiologic motion and produces a higher consistent image quality compared with MRI [19-21]. MRI and CT are complementary studies, and MRI is superior to CT for soft-tissue characterization. MRI is also superior to CT for detecting perineural spread, which is important for initial staging for a variety of skull base tumors.

Use of Contrast

Intravenous contrast is recommended for routine cross-sectional imaging in adults or children presenting with a neck mass with no contraindications [22]. Contrast is helpful for assessing tumor margins and is essential for detecting neck abscesses, especially those that are intramuscular [23-25]. Intravenous contrast is also helpful for distinguishing vessels from lymph nodes and determining if the mass is hypervascular, as many "pulsatile" neck masses (especially those in level 2 or 3) are lymph nodes overlying the carotid rather than true vascular masses. Contrast can obscure visualization of sialoliths and noncontrast CT is recommended in patients presenting with a neck mass felt to be due to an obstructing sialolith. MRI may be helpful in patients with nonmineralized sialoliths. Iodine-based contrast may be avoided in patients with thyroid cancer history or when metastatic thyroid cancer is suspected.

Positron Emission Tomography

The role of positron emission tomography (PET) combined with CT for assessing neck masses is evolving [26-31]. Some investigators feel that it is superior to CT alone for evaluating primary site tumor margins [32,33]. It is also superior to CT alone for staging cervical lymph nodes [34]. However, it cannot detect lymph node micrometastases [35-37]. Currently PET/CT is not routinely recommended for initial staging of all patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCCA) [38,39].

Ultrasound

The use of ultrasound (US) for the initial diagnosis of neck masses in adults and children is steadily increasing. In fact, the overall use of neck US in the United States has generally lagged its use in Europe and Southeast Asia, due in part to greater accessibility of cross-sectional modalities such as CT and MRI here [40,41]. US is useful in differentiating between solid cystic neck lesions in both adults and children and is also helpful in discriminating between high-flow and low-flow vascular malformations [42-44]. US is also very helpful for image-guided biopsies of nonpalpable or small lesions that are relatively superficial and for biopsies of indeterminate soft tissue in the treated neck. Studies have shown that US fine-needle aspiration of lymph nodes can be useful in staging the N0 neck [45,46]. The positive predictive value of this technique is high; however, concern has been raised regarding its negative predictive value and its inability to exclude micrometastases. Some studies have suggested that color Doppler US can distinguish between metastatic and inflammatory neck nodes [47-49]. Although these results are promising, the results appear to be user dependent.

[1]Principal Author, University of Michigan Health System, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
[2]Panel Chair, Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology, Saint Louis, Missouri.
[3]Panel Vice-chair, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
[4]University of California Davis Medical Center, Sacramento, California.
[5]Northwest Radiology Consultants, Atlanta, Georgia.
[6]Columbia University Medical Center, New York, New York.
[7]Hôpital de la Salpêtrière, Assistance-Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, France.
[8]Greenville Radiology, Greenville, Sorth Carolina.
[9]Advanced Imaging of South Bay, Inc., Torrance, California.
[10]Washington University School of Medicine, Saint Louis, Missouri, American Academy of Otolaryngology.
[11]Radiological Associates of Sacramento, Sacramento, Californis.
[12]University of South Florida College of Medicine, Tampa, Florida, American Academy of Neurology.
[13]University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.
[14]New York Hospital-Cornell University Medical Center, New York, New York.
[15]Pediatric Imaging Panel Vice-chair, Nationwide Children's Hospital, Columbus, Ohio.

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

Angiography

The role of conventional angiography for initial diagnosis is very limited. The initial imaging modality for evaluating a pulsatile neck mass (glomus tumor, aneurysm) is CT angiography, which now appears to be preferred to MR angiography for these indications [50]. Conventional angiography is used for planning endovascular treatment (tumor embolization, balloon test occlusion, etc) or for further characterization of vascular neck lesions.

Neck Masses in Children

In children who present with neck masses, once must also consider congenital etiologies in addition to neoplasia and inflammation [51]. Because of the risk of sedation and radiation dose, there is some debate as to the recommended imaging study in a child with a neck mass. In children suspected of having a congenital abnormality, US is often performed as it is sufficient for distinguishing a cystic from a solid mass. Color-flow Doppler US is also helpful for characterizing flow in solid lesions [48,52]. Either CT or MRI can be performed in children suspected of a having a malignancy or a deep neck abscess that may require surgical drainage. Although it does emit radiation, MDCT tends to be preferred over MRI due to the lower sedation requirements resulting from shorter examination time.

Post-treatment

CT and MRI are beneficial in patients previously treated for HNSCCA [53-58]. Both modalities can evaluate the extent of locoregional recurrence and evaluate for synchronous lesions in the neck [59,60]. MRI is superior to CT for characterizing soft-tissue and detecting perineural spread. However, due to the length of the examination, MRI is more likely to be degraded by motion artifact in patients treated for advanced disease who have developed severe post-treatment mucositis and have difficulty with pooling of secretions. New physiologic techniques such as diffusion weighted MRI, MR spectroscopy, and MR and CT perfusion have shown promise in attempting to differentiate recurrent tumor from post-treatment changes [61-66]. However, the results are preliminary, and further investigations are required.

The current literature suggests that PET/CT may be superior to CT or MRI for detecting recurrent tumor [67-72]. It has the advantage of detecting recurrent HNSCCA based on correlation of anatomic distortion with physiologic abnormality [73]. The sensitivity and specificity of PET/CT for detecting recurrent HNSCCA are in the range of 70%-100%. However, one must be aware of the range of physiologic activity following treatment to avoid false-positive results [74]. Although PET/CT is commonly used to evaluate post-treatment HNSCCA patients, there is no consensus regarding the proper timing of serial post-treatment surveillance studies. The imaging study that is ordered should depend on the clinical indication of the patient and an understanding of the information that the imaging study can provide.

Summary

- CT and MRI are complementary methods for evaluating a patient with a palpable neck mass.
- MDCT is emerging as the preferred modality for the initial diagnostic imaging workup.
- Although PET/CT is not routinely recommended for initial staging of patients with HNSCCA, it may be useful in staging and problem solving in these patients.
- US is increasingly demonstrating usefulness in differentiating solid and cystic neoplasms, in assessing vascular lesions, and in facilitating biopsies.
- CT, MRI, and PET/CT are useful in evaluating the post-treatment cancer patient.

Anticipated Exceptions

Nephrogenic systemic fibrosis (NSF) is a disorder with a scleroderma-like presentation and a spectrum of manifestations that can range from limited clinical sequelae to fatality. It appears to be related to both underlying severe renal dysfunction and the administration of gadolinium-based contrast agents. It has occurred primarily in patients on dialysis, rarely in patients with very limited glomerular filtration rate (GFR) (ie, <30 mL/min/1.73m^2), and almost never in other patients. There is growing literature regarding NSF. Although some controversy and lack of clarity remain, there is a consensus that it is advisable to avoid all gadolinium-based contrast agents in dialysis-dependent patients unless the possible benefits clearly outweigh the risk, and to limit the type and amount in patients with estimated GFR rates <30 mL/min/1.73m^2. For more information, please see the ACR *Manual on Contrast Media* [75].

Relative Radiation Level Information

Potential adverse health effects associated with radiation exposure are an important factor to consider when selecting the appropriate imaging procedure. Because there is a wide range of radiation exposures associated with different diagnostic procedures, a relative radiation level (RRL) indication has been included for each imaging examination. The RRLs are based on effective dose, which is a radiation dose quantity that is used to estimate population total radiation risk associated with an imaging procedure. Patients in the pediatric age group are at inherently higher risk from exposure, both because of organ sensitivity and longer life expectancy (relevant to the long latency that appears to accompany radiation exposure). For these reasons, the RRL dose estimate ranges for pediatric examinations are lower as compared to those specified for adults (see Table below). Additional information regarding radiation dose assessment for imaging examinations can be found in the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Radiation Dose Assessment Introduction document.

Relative Radiation Level Designations		
Relative Radiation Level*	**Adult Effective Dose Estimate Range**	**Pediatric Effective Dose Estimate Range**
O	0 mSv	0 mSv
☢	<0.1 mSv	<0.03 mSv
☢ ☢	0.1-1 mSv	0.03-0.3 mSv
☢ ☢ ☢	1-10 mSv	0.3-3 mSv
☢ ☢ ☢ ☢	10-30 mSv	3-10 mSv
☢ ☢ ☢ ☢ ☢	30-100 mSv	10-30 mSv
*RRL assignments for some of the examinations cannot be made, because the actual patient doses in these procedures vary as a function of a number of factors (eg, region of the body exposed to ionizing radiation, the imaging guidance that is used). The RRLs for these examinations are designated as NS (not specified).		

Supporting Document(s)

- ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Overview
- Procedure Contrast Information
- Evidence Table

References

1. Choi JW, Kim SS, Kim EY, Heran M. Peripheral T-cell lymphoma in the neck: CT findings of lymph node involvement. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2006; 27(5):1079-1082.
2. Kim HJ, Lee HK, Seo JJ, et al. MR imaging of solitary fibrous tumors in the head and neck. *Korean J Radiol* 2005; 6(3):136-142.
3. Kim ST, Kim HJ, Park SW, Baek CH, Byun HS, Kim YM. Nodular fasciitis in the head and neck: CT and MR imaging findings. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2005; 26(10):2617-2623.
4. Lanka B, Turner M, Orton C, Carrington BM. Cross-sectional imaging in non-melanoma skin cancer of the head and neck. *Clin Radiol* 2005; 60(8):869-877.
5. Smith JL, 2nd, Hsu JM, Chang J. Predicting deep neck space abscess using computed tomography. *Am J Otolaryngol* 2006; 27(4):244-247.
6. Kataoka M, Ueda H, Koyama T, et al. Contrast-enhanced volumetric interpolated breath-hold examination compared with spin-echo T1-weighted imaging of head and neck tumors. *AJR* 2005; 184(1):313-319.
7. Katsura K, Hayashi T. Non-neoplastic process after neck dissection demonstrated on enhanced CT in patients with head and neck cancer. *Dentomaxillofac Radiol* 2005; 34(5):297-303.
8. Petrou M, Mukherji SK. Extracranial head and neck neoplasms: role of imaging. *Cancer Treat Res* 2008; 143:93-117.
9. Thanos L, Mylona S, Kalioras V, Pomoni M, Batakis N. Potentially life-threatening neck abscesses: therapeutic management under CT-guided drainage. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol* 2005; 28(2):196-199.
10. Isoda H, Imai M, Inagawa S, Miura K, Sakahara H. Magnetic resonance imaging findings of angiosarcoma of the scalp. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2005; 29(6):858-862.
11. Michaely HJ, Herrmann KA, Dietrich O, Reiser MF, Schoenberg SO. Quantitative and qualitative characterization of vascularization and hemodynamics in head and neck tumors with a 3D magnetic resonance time-resolved echo-shared angiographic technique (TREAT)--initial results. *Eur Radiol* 2007; 17(4):1101-1110.
12. Sadick M, Sadick H, Hormann K, Duber C, Diehl SJ. Cross-sectional imaging combined with 3D-MR angiography (3D-MRA): diagnostic tool for preoperative vascular assessment of head and neck tumors. *Onkologie* 2005; 28(10):477-481.
13. Rumboldt Z, Al-Okaili R, Deveikis JP. Perfusion CT for head and neck tumors: pilot study. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2005; 26(5):1178-1185.
14. Chen B, Yin SK, Zhuang QX, Cheng YS. CT and MR imaging for detecting neoplastic invasion of esophageal inlet. *World J Gastroenterol* 2005; 11(3):377-381.
15. Hudgins PA, Kingdom TT, Weissler MC, Mukherji SK. Selective neck dissection: CT and MR imaging findings. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2005; 26(5):1174-1177.
16. King AD, Ahuja AT, Yeung DK, et al. Malignant cervical lymphadenopathy: diagnostic accuracy of diffusion-weighted MR imaging. *Radiology* 2007; 245(3):806-813.
17. Schreyer AG, Scheibl K, Zorger N, et al. Detection rate and efficiency of lymph node assessment with axial and coronal image reading based on 16 row multislice CT of the neck. *Rofo* 2005; 177(10):1430-1435.
18. Sumi M, Kimura Y, Sumi T, Nakamura T. Diagnostic performance of MRI relative to CT for metastatic nodes of head and neck squamous cell carcinomas. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2007; 26(6):1626-1633.
19. Bisdas S, Konstantinou GN, Lee PS, et al. Dynamic contrast-enhanced CT of head and neck tumors: perfusion measurements using a distributed-parameter tracer kinetic model. Initial results and comparison with deconvolution-based analysis. *Phys Med Biol* 2007; 52(20):6181-6196.
20. Street E, Hadjiiski L, Sahiner B, et al. Automated volume analysis of head and neck lesions on CT scans using 3D level set segmentation. *Med Phys* 2007; 34(11):4399-4408.
21. Zima A, Carlos R, Gandhi D, Case I, Teknos T, Mukherji SK. Can pretreatment CT perfusion predict response of advanced squamous cell carcinoma of the upper aerodigestive tract treated with induction chemotherapy? *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2007; 28(2):328-334.
22. Flor N, Sardanelli F, Soldi S, et al. Unknown internal carotid artery atherosclerotic stenoses detected with biphasic multidetector computed tomography for head and neck cancer. *Eur Radiol* 2006; 16(4):866-871.
23. Bartz BH, Case IC, Srinivasan A, Mukherji SK. Delayed MDCT imaging results in increased enhancement in patients with head and neck neoplasms. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2006; 30(6):972-974.
24. Tseng YC, Hsu HL, Lee TH, Chen CJ. Venous reflux on carotid computed tomography angiography: relationship with left-arm injection. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2007; 31(3):360-364.
25. Yoon DY, You SY, Choi CS, et al. Multi-detector row CT of the head and neck: comparison of different volumes of contrast material with and without a saline chaser. *Neuroradiology* 2006; 48(12):935-942.
26. Buus S, Grau C, Munk OL, et al. Individual radiation response of parotid glands investigated by dynamic 11C-methionine PET. *Radiother Oncol* 2006; 78(3):262-269.
27. Carranza-Pelegrina D, Lomena-Caballero F, Soler-Peter M, Berini-Aytes L, Gay-Escoda C. The diagnostic possibilities of positron emission tomography (PET): applications in oral and maxillofacial buccal oncology. *Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal* 2005; 10(4):331-342.
28. Connell CA, Corry J, Milner AD, et al. Clinical impact of, and prognostic stratification by, F-18 FDG PET/CT in head and neck mucosal squamous cell carcinoma. *Head Neck* 2007; 29(11):986-995.
29. Gedikbasi A, Gul A, Sargin A, Ceylan Y. Cystic hygroma and lymphangioma: associated findings, perinatal outcome and prognostic factors in live-born infants. *Arch Gynecol Obstet* 2007; 276(5):491-498.
30. Rischin D, Hicks RJ, Fisher R, et al. Prognostic significance of [18F]-misonidazole positron emission tomography-detected tumor hypoxia in patients with advanced head and neck cancer randomly assigned to chemoradiation with or without tirapazamine: a substudy of Trans-Tasman Radiation Oncology Group Study 98.02. *J Clin Oncol* 2006; 24(13):2098-2104.
31. Troost EG, Vogel WV, Merkx MA, et al. 18F-FLT PET does not discriminate between reactive and metastatic lymph nodes in primary head and neck cancer patients. *J Nucl Med* 2007; 48(5):726-735.
32. Riegel AC, Berson AM, Destian S, et al. Variability of gross tumor volume delineation in head-and-neck cancer using CT and PET/CT fusion. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2006; 65(3):726-732.

33. Madani I, Duthoy W, Derie C, et al. Positron emission tomography-guided, focal-dose escalation using intensity-modulated radiotherapy for head and neck cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2007; 68(1):126-135.
34. Jeong HS, Baek CH, Son YI, et al. Use of integrated 18F-FDG PET/CT to improve the accuracy of initial cervical nodal evaluation in patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Head Neck* 2007; 29(3):203-210.
35. Akoglu E, Dutipek M, Bekis R, Degirmenci B, Ada E, Guneri A. Assessment of cervical lymph node metastasis with different imaging methods in patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *J Otolaryngol* 2005; 34(6):384-394.
36. Brouwer J, Senft A, de Bree R, et al. Screening for distant metastases in patients with head and neck cancer: is there a role for (18)FDG-PET? *Oral Oncol* 2006; 42(3):275-280.
37. Porceddu SV, Jarmolowski E, Hicks RJ, et al. Utility of positron emission tomography for the detection of disease in residual neck nodes after (chemo)radiotherapy in head and neck cancer. *Head Neck* 2005; 27(3):175-181.
38. Hafidh MA, Lacy PD, Hughes JP, Duffy G, Timon CV. Evaluation of the impact of addition of PET to CT and MR scanning in the staging of patients with head and neck carcinomas. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol* 2006; 263(9):853-859.
39. Schwartz DL, Ford E, Rajendran J, et al. FDG-PET/CT imaging for preradiotherapy staging of head-and-neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2005; 61(1):129-136.
40. Ahuja AT, King AD, Kew J, King W, Metreweli C. Head and neck lipomas: sonographic appearance. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 1998; 19(3):505-508.
41. King AD, Ahuja AT, King W, Metreweli C. Sonography of peripheral nerve tumors of the neck. *AJR* 1997; 169(6):1695-1698.
42. Ahuja AT, Richards P, Wong KT, Yuen EH, King AD. Accuracy of high-resolution sonography compared with magnetic resonance imaging in the diagnosis of head and neck venous vascular malformations. *Clin Radiol* 2003; 58(11):869-875.
43. Wong KT, Lee YY, King AD, Ahuja AT. Imaging of cystic or cyst-like neck masses. *Clin Radiol* 2008; 63(6):613-622.
44. Yang WT, Ahuja A, Metreweli C. Sonographic features of head and neck hemangiomas and vascular malformations: review of 23 patients. *J Ultrasound Med* 1997; 16(1):39-44.
45. van den Brekel MW. US-guided fine-needle aspiration cytology of neck nodes in patients with N0 disease. *Radiology* 1996; 201(2):580-581.
46. van den Brekel MW, Reitsma LC, Quak JJ, et al. Sonographically guided aspiration cytology of neck nodes for selection of treatment and follow-up in patients with N0 head and neck cancer. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 1999; 20(9):1727-1731.
47. Ahuja A, Ying M. Sonography of neck lymph nodes. Part II: abnormal lymph nodes. *Clin Radiol* 2003; 58(5):359-366.
48. Ahuja AT, Ying M, Ho SY, et al. Ultrasound of malignant cervical lymph nodes. *Cancer Imaging* 2008; 8:48-56.
49. Ying M, Ahuja A, Brook F. Accuracy of sonographic vascular features in differentiating different causes of cervical lymphadenopathy. *Ultrasound Med Biol* 2004; 30(4):441-447.
50. Ertl-Wagner BB, Bruening R, Blume J, et al. Relative value of sliding-thin-slab multiplanar reformations and sliding-thin-slab maximum intensity projections as reformatting techniques in multisection CT angiography of the cervicocranial vessels. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2006; 27(1):107-113.
51. Tanaka T, Morimoto Y, Takano H, et al. Three-dimensional identification of hemangiomas and feeding arteries in the head and neck region using combined phase-contrast MR angiography and fast asymmetric spin-echo sequences. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 2005; 100(5):609-613.
52. Scholbach T, Scholbach J, Krombach GA, Gagel B, Maneschi P, Di Martino E. New method of dynamic color doppler signal quantification in metastatic lymph nodes compared to direct polarographic measurements of tissue oxygenation. *Int J Cancer* 2005; 114(6):957-962.
53. Baghi M, Mack MG, Hambek M, et al. Usefulness of MRI volumetric evaluation in patients with squamous cell cancer of the head and neck treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy. *Head Neck* 2007; 29(2):104-108.
54. Lin D, Glastonbury CM, Rafaelian O, Eisele DW, Wang SJ. Management of advanced nodal disease following chemoradiation for head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: role of magnetic resonance imaging. *J Otolaryngol* 2007; 36(6):350-356.
55. Semiz Oysu A, Ayanoglu E, Kodalli N, Oysu C, Uneri C, Erzen C. Dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI in the differentiation of posttreatment fibrosis from recurrent carcinoma of the head and neck. *Clin Imaging* 2005; 29(5):307-312.
56. Srinivasan A, Dvorak R, Perni K, Rohrer S, Mukherji SK. Differentiation of benign and malignant pathology in the head and neck using 3T apparent diffusion coefficient values: early experience. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2008; 29(1):40-44.
57. Srinivasan A, Dvorak R, Rohrer S, Mukherji SK. Initial experience of 3-tesla apparent diffusion coefficient values in characterizing squamous cell carcinomas of the head and neck. *Acta Radiol* 2008; 49(9):1079-1084.
58. Tomura N, Omachi K, Sakuma I, et al. Dynamic contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging in radiotherapeutic efficacy in the head and neck tumors. *Am J Otolaryngol* 2005; 26(3):163-167.
59. Hansen EK, Bucci MK, Quivey JM, Weinberg V, Xia P. Repeat CT imaging and replanning during the course of IMRT for head-and-neck cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2006; 64(2):355-362.
60. Liauw SL, Mancuso AA, Amdur RJ, et al. Postradiotherapy neck dissection for lymph node-positive head and neck cancer: the use of computed tomography to manage the neck. *J Clin Oncol* 2006; 24(9):1421-1427.
61. Abdel Razek AA, Kandeel AY, Soliman N, et al. Role of diffusion-weighted echo-planar MR imaging in differentiation of residual or recurrent head and neck tumors and posttreatment changes. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2007; 28(6):1146-1152.
62. Baghi M, Mack MG, Hambek M, et al. The efficacy of MRI with ultrasmall superparamagnetic iron oxide particles (USPIO) in head and neck cancers. *Anticancer Res* 2005; 25(5):3665-3670.
63. Baghi M, Mack MG, Wagenblast J, et al. Iron oxide particle-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging for detection of benign lymph nodes in the head and neck: how reliable are the results? *Anticancer Res* 2007; 27(5B):3571-3575.
64. Curvo-Semedo L, Diniz M, Migueis J, et al. USPIO-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging for nodal staging in patients with head and neck cancer. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2006; 24(1):123-131.
65. Maeda M, Kato H, Sakuma H, Maier SE, Takeda K. Usefulness of the apparent diffusion coefficient in line scan diffusion-weighted imaging for distinguishing between squamous cell carcinomas and malignant lymphomas of the head and neck. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2005; 26(5):1186-1192.
66. Yu Q, Yang J, Wang P, Shi H, Luo J. Preliminary assessment of benign maxillofacial and neck lesions with in vivo single-voxel 1H magnetic resonance spectroscopy. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 2007; 104(2):264-270.
67. Gandhi D, Falen S, McCartney W, et al. Value of 2-[18F]-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose imaging with dual-head gamma camera in coincidence mode: comparison with computed tomography/magnetic resonance imaging in patients with suspected recurrent head and neck cancers. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2005; 29(4):513-519.
68. Gourin CG, Williams HT, Seabolt WN, Herdman AV, Howington JW, Terris DJ. Utility of positron emission tomography-computed tomography in identification of residual nodal disease after chemoradiation for advanced head and neck cancer. *Laryngoscope* 2006; 116(5):705-710.
69. Lee JC, Kim JS, Lee JH, et al. F-18 FDG-PET as a routine surveillance tool for the detection of recurrent head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Oral Oncol* 2007; 43(7):686-692.
70. Nam SY, Lee SW, Im KC, et al. Early evaluation of the response to radiotherapy of patients with squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck using 18FDG-PET. *Oral Oncol* 2005; 41(4):390-395.
71. Perie S, Hugentobler A, Susini B, et al. Impact of FDG-PET to detect recurrence of head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2007; 137(4):647-653.
72. Shintani SA, Foote RL, Lowe VJ, Brown PD, Garces YI, Kasperbauer JL. Utility of PET/CT imaging performed early after surgical resection in the adjuvant treatment planning for head and neck cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2008; 70(2):322-329.
73. Yao M, Luo P, Hoffman HT, et al. Pathology and FDG PET correlation of residual lymph nodes in head and neck cancer after radiation treatment. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2007; 30(3):264-270.
74. Kim SY, Lee SW, Nam SY, et al. The Feasibility of 18F-FDG PET scans 1 month after completing radiotherapy of squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck. *J Nucl Med* 2007; 48(3):373-378.

75. American College of Radiology. *Manual on Contrast Media*. Available at: http://www.acr.org/SecondaryMainMenuCategories/quality_safety/contrast_manual.aspx.

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