

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

Clinical Condition: **Claudication**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	<u>RRL*</u>
Physiologic noninvasive tests	9		None
INV arteriography lower extremity	8	If noninvasive tests are abnormal.	Low
MRA lower extremity	8		None
CTA lower extremity	6		Med
US lower extremity arterial duplex Doppler with color	6		None
US lower extremity Doppler spectral only	5		None
X-ray lumbosacral spine	3		Med
US echocardiography transthoracic	2		None
US lower extremity duplex Doppler	2		None
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.

CLAUDICATION

Expert Panel on Vascular Imaging: David Sacks, MD¹; Michael A. Bettmann, MD²; Thomas Casciani, MD³; Antoinette S. Gomes, MD⁴; Julius Grollman, MD⁵; Stephen R. Holtzman, MD⁶; Joseph F. Polak, MD, MPH⁷; William Stanford, MD⁸; Michael Jaff, MD⁹; Gregory L. Moneta, MD.¹⁰

Summary of Literature Review

Claudication is a symptom complex characterized by pain and weakness in an active muscle group, reproducibly precipitated by similar amounts of exercise and promptly relieved by rest. Claudication is the most common manifestation of peripheral arterial disease, but other disease entities can cause a similar clinical picture. Non-arterial etiologies have been reported as the cause of symptoms in 20%-38% of patients being evaluated for claudication. The most common non-arterial cause is neurogenic disease (especially spinal stenosis), but other diseases such as compartment syndromes, pelvic tumors, and chronic venous occlusion have also been associated with symptoms similar to claudication. In addition, most patients with peripheral arterial occlusive disease are asymptomatic; as few as 6%-20% of such patients will have symptoms of claudication.

Estimates of the prevalence of claudication in the general population range from less than 1% to almost 8% depending on the age, gender, geographic location of the population and the diagnostic criteria used. The presence of vascular disease in patients with symptoms of claudication is reliably established by a variety of noninvasive hemodynamic tests. In patients who do not have demonstrable arterial disease, imaging studies of other systems such as the lumbar spine or soft tissues of the pelvis may be indicated. If the presence of peripheral vascular disease is confirmed, additional studies may be indicated to screen for other commonly associated diseases that may have an important impact on patient survival, such as coronary artery disease.

Since the presence and severity of arterial obstructions are reliably established using noninvasive hemodynamic tests such as the ankle brachial index (ABI), toe brachial index (TBI), segmental pressures, or pulse volume recordings (PVR), imaging studies are reserved for circumstances that warrant consideration for invasive therapy. The

indications for surgical or interventional procedures in patients with claudication are controversial, and thus specific indications for imaging studies remain ill-defined. Some factors that influence this decision include 1) the natural history of limb and patient survival, 2) the patient's tolerance of symptoms and resulting changes in lifestyle, 3) the effectiveness of medical or exercise therapy, 4) the potential risks of invasive tests and treatments, and 5) the short-term and long-term outcomes of surgery or interventional procedures. Based on natural history studies, the risk of amputation in patients suffering from claudication is approximately 1% per year. Since most of these studies were performed before the era of noninvasive testing, many patients who did not actually have vascular disease were probably included, thereby possibly underestimating the frequency of serious complications. Modern natural history studies, using noninvasive hemodynamic tests to confirm the presence of vascular disease, show that progression of symptoms occurs in 25%-60% of surviving patients within 5 years of presentation. Because the risks associated with interventional procedures are low compared with surgery, image-guided interventional studies may be indicated for less severe disease than if surgery were the only option for treatment.

Noninvasive Hemodynamic Studies

In combination with the history and physical examination of patients, noninvasive hemodynamic studies have become an important tool for the evaluation of peripheral vascular disease. Their importance is related to their ability to provide an objective test for the presence or absence of peripheral vascular disease. They also provide a valuable means of quantifying the severity of vascular disease and are useful in documenting the functional significance of arterial lesions demonstrated by angiography.

There is no consensus regarding which test is most valuable or accurate, because there may be considerable variability depending on clinical circumstances. For instance, patients with stiff, noncompliant arteries (often associated with diabetes) are difficult to study using tests such as the ABI or segmental pressures that depend on measurements of arterial pressure. In these patients the TBI or PVR may be more helpful. Most laboratories use a combination of tests that increases overall sensitivity and accuracy. The simplicity, reliability, and noninvasive nature of these tests have led to their routine use in screening patients with appropriate symptoms and physical findings. The presence of a normal ABI both at rest and following exercise in a patient with compressible vessels effectively excludes atherosclerotic occlusive disease as a cause of leg claudication and obviates the need for additional arterial imaging. However, the ABI

¹Principal Author, West Reading Radiology Associates, West Reading, Pa; ²Panel Chair, Wake Forest University School of Medicine Radiology, Winston-Salem, NC; ³Indiana University Hospital, Indianapolis, Ind; ⁴UCLA School of Medicine, Los Angeles, Calif; ⁵Little Company of Mary Hospital, Torrance, Calif; ⁶Cardiology consultant, San Luis Obispo, Calif; ⁷New England Medical Center, Boston, Mass; ⁸University of Iowa Hospital & Clinics, Iowa City, Iowa; ⁹Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Mass, American College of Cardiology; ¹⁰Oregon Health Sciences University, Portland, Ore, Society for Vascular Surgery.

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.

will not evaluate for hypogastric arterial occlusions that may produce buttock claudication. The main limitation of noninvasive testing is that proving the presence of vascular disease does not necessarily exclude the possibility that symptoms are nonetheless caused by neurologic disease. Careful correlation with clinical evaluation is necessary and, in certain cases, tests to rule out neurologic disease (eg, spine or pelvic MRI) may be indicated.

Contrast Angiography

Once the decision has been made that invasive therapy is indicated, an accurate and complete assessment of the peripheral arteries is essential for adequate planning of the procedure. In most circumstances a complete survey of the arterial system from the abdominal aorta to the pedal arch is helpful. The gold standard for imaging the peripheral arteries is multiprojection contrast angiography. Oblique views are usually necessary for a complete study because of the overlapping of branching vessels, the anteroposterior course of the pelvic vessels, and the tendency of atherosclerotic plaque to develop on the posterior arterial wall. The development of digital subtraction has enhanced the ability of contrast angiography to visualize poorly opacifying distal vessels, and permits multiple views while minimizing the amount of contrast injected.

Although contrast angiography remains the diagnostic standard for peripheral vascular disease, it does have shortcomings that limit its usefulness. The main diagnostic limitation of angiography is inconsistent correlation between the hemodynamic or functional effects and the morphology of the arterial lesions. Several studies have reported this poor correlation, but in some of these studies the problem may be accentuated by less than optimal angiographic technique (eg, single projection, nonselective injections).

Other factors are also involved, however, such as diffusely diseased arteries that make it difficult to estimate stenosis severity (no normal arterial segments are available for comparison). In addition, serial lesions, luminal irregularity, and the degree of collateral development may produce effects on the blood flow that are difficult to quantify angiographically. The other main drawback of contrast angiography is the low but not insignificant incidence of complications, due to arterial catheterization or injection of contrast material. Currently, with improved noninvasive imaging, contrast angiography's role in patients with claudication is limited to situations in which a therapeutic intervention is expected to be undertaken.

Noninvasive Imaging

Duplex ultrasound

Duplex ultrasound (US) of the extremities can be used to diagnose the anatomic location and degree of stenosis.

Although duplex US includes images, in either black and white or color format, the primary clinically relevant information derived from duplex studies has been validated from analysis of the velocity of blood flow.

The sensitivity and specificity for the diagnosis of stenoses greater than 50% diameter from the iliac arteries to the popliteal arteries are each approximately 90%-95%. Accuracy of the duplex exam depends on the ability of the technique to visualize the vessel adequately. The use of color improves accuracy. Accuracy is diminished in examinations of the iliac arteries if bowel gas or tortuosity obscures the iliac vessels. Dense calcification can also obscure flow, particularly if flow is slow. The examination requires a highly skilled sonographer and can require over an hour to perform.

Duplex US can be used for pre-intervention decision making, although duplex may be inferior to angiography for evaluation of tibial arteries for distal bypass. It is the standard technique for post-revascularization surveillance of vein graft patency leading to improved long-term graft patency. Duplex US surveillance of synthetic grafts is of questionable value. Duplex US following angioplasty is widely performed to detect recurrent stenoses but has not yet been demonstrated to improve patient outcomes.

Magnetic resonance angiography

Magnetic resonance angiography (MRA) techniques continue to evolve and improve. Techniques employed include two-dimensional time of flight, three-dimensional imaging, contrast enhancement with gadolinium, subtraction, cardiac gating, and bolus chase. These techniques may be used in combination, as each has advantages and disadvantages. The clinical use of these techniques for peripheral vascular disease has met with considerable success. The sensitivity and specificity for detection of stenoses >50% diameter compared to catheter angiography is 90%-100%. Compared to color duplex US, MRA is more accurate for detecting significant stenoses and for preoperative planning. Studies have demonstrated that MRA can be effectively used to plan interventional or surgical procedures, eliminating the necessity for conventional angiography. For post-operative and post-angioplasty surveillance, small studies have shown MRA to be helpful in detecting recurrent disease, but improved outcomes for such surveillance have not been documented.

Some technical problems persist regarding the use of MRA for peripheral vascular disease. These may include marginal image quality related to low signal/noise ratio, limited spatial resolution, motion artifacts, long acquisition times, unreliable visualization of lesions with high flow and turbulence (excessive signal loss at regions of high-grade stenoses), nonvisualization of patent vessel segments with reversed blood flow, the need to exclude patients with pacemakers or other metallic implants, and

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.

loss of signal in arterial segments within metal stents or adjacent to metallic clips or prosthetic joints. Some of these problems have been addressed successfully with the use of newer imaging sequences and the addition of MR contrast agents.

MRA has not yet replaced catheter angiography as the gold standard, but it has replaced angiography in some institutions as a pre-intervention planning study. As contrast agents and MR imaging sequences improve, MRA is likely to entirely supplant catheter angiography as a pure diagnostic tool.

Computed tomography angiography

Spiral or helical CT angiography (CTA) is increasingly used for peripheral vascular disease. Multidetector CT scanners with up to 64 slices obtained simultaneously allows scanning from the aorta to the feet in less than 1 minute. CTA has the advantage of offering three-dimensional images with lower radiation dose than catheter angiography and with no need for an arterial puncture. Iodinated contrast material is necessary, but in doses comparable to or less than contrast angiography. The intravenous injection of contrast during CTA fills all collateral vessels and opacifies arteries distal to occlusions that may be occult by catheter angiography. CTA images tissues surrounding the opacified lumen of the artery and has demonstrated that some popliteal stenoses and occlusions are due to aneurysms, popliteal entrapment, and cystic adventitial disease that are not detected with catheter angiography. Spatial resolution, although excellent overall, is lower than that of catheter angiography. In general, however, this is not an important clinical consideration.

Results of relatively small series of patients studied with CTA have been excellent. Compared to catheter angiography the sensitivity and specificity of CTA for detection of stenoses >50% diameter is 90%-100%. However, diagnostic certainty is lower with CTA compared to catheter angiography, leading to more recommendations for additional imaging. Accuracy in patients with bypass grafts is excellent compared to duplex US.

At this time, studies of CTA are fewer and smaller than those of MRA in evaluating peripheral arteries. However, CTA has potential advantages compared to MRA. Patients with pacemakers or defibrillators, who are excluded from MRI, may be safely imaged with CTA. Metal clips, stents, and prostheses usually do not cause significant CTA artifacts. CTA has higher resolution and can provide images of calcification in the vessel wall. As with MRA, extensive calcification may obscure the opacified lumen with CTA. Scan times are significantly faster with CTA than MRA. Claustrophobia is far less of a problem.

Summary

Multiple clinical and technical factors are involved in determining the proper timing and technique for imaging the lower extremity arterial system in patients with claudication. The purpose of imaging studies is to define the location and extent of vascular lesions before a percutaneous or surgical revascularization procedure. The clinical success of these vascular procedures depends to a large extent on accurate and complete visualization of the entire lower extremity arterial system, or at least of the entire symptomatic extremity and the pelvic vasculature.

Several noninvasive vascular imaging methods have been shown to be useful in certain clinical situations. All, however, currently have important practical limitations. Although the role of these techniques in evaluating patients with peripheral vascular disease continues to evolve, contrast angiography must still be considered the gold standard even though it is rarely necessary for diagnosing claudication or assessing the severity of arterial obstruction causing claudication. The noninvasive imaging modalities, supplemented by physical examination and history, usually provide all the information needed to confirm or exclude the presence of peripheral vascular disease as the cause of claudication. Further, they can provide sufficient information to accurately plan medical, surgical, or catheter-directed treatment. The choice of noninvasive imaging modality will depend on local expertise and experience.

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

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.

References

1. Rutherford RB, Lowenstein DH, Klein MF. Combining segmental systolic pressures and plethysmography to diagnose arterial occlusive disease of the legs. *Am J Surg* 1979; 138(2):211-218.
2. Van de Water JM, Laska ED, Ciniero WV. Patient and operation selectivity. *Ann Surg* 1979; 189(2):144-146.
3. Yao JS. New techniques in objective arterial evaluation. *Arch Surg* 1973; 106(4):600-604.
4. Goodreau JJ, Creasy JK, Flanigan DP, et al. Rational approach to the differentiation of vascular and neurogenic claudication. *Surgery* 1978; 84(6):749-757.
5. Laing S, Greenhalgh RM. The detection and progression of asymptomatic peripheral arterial disease. *Br J Surg* 1983; 70(10):628-630.
6. Marinelli MR, Beach KW, Glass MJ, et al. Noninvasive testing vs. clinical evaluation of arterial disease. *JAMA* 1979; 241(19):2031-2034.
7. Baker WH, String ST, Hayes AC, et al. Diagnosis of peripheral occlusive disease. *Arch Surg* 1978; 113(11):1308-1310.
8. Ouriel K, Zarins CK. Doppler ankle pressure. *Arch Surg* 1982; 117(10):1297-1300.
9. Handelsman H. Magnetic resonance angiography: vascular and flow imaging. *Health Technol Assess* 1994; (3):1-20.
10. Jager KA, Phillips DJ, Martin RL, et al. Noninvasive mapping of lower limb arterial lesions. *Ultrasound Med Biol* 1985; 11(3):515-521.
11. Leng GC, Whyman MR, Donnan PT, et al. Accuracy and reproducibility of duplex ultrasonography in grading femoropopliteal stenoses. *J Vasc Surg* 1993; 17(3):510-517.
12. Fletcher JP, Kershaw LZ, Chan A, et al. Noninvasive imaging of the superficial femoral artery using ultrasound duplex scanning. *J Card Surg* 1990; 31(3):364-367.
13. Whyman MR, Gillespie I, Ruckley CV, et al. Screening patients with claudication from femoropopliteal disease before angioplasty using Doppler color flow imaging. *Br J Surg* 1992; 79(9):907-909.
14. Kohler TR, Nance DR, Cramer MM, et al. Duplex scanning for diagnosis of aortoiliac and femoropopliteal disease: a prospective study. *Circulation* 1987; 76(5):1074-1080.
15. Udoff EJ, Barth KH, Harrington DP, et al. Hemodynamic significance of iliac artery stenosis: pressure measurements during angiography. *Radiology* 1979; 132(2):289-293.
16. Bruins H, Strijbosch L, Greep JM. Interobserver variability in single-plane aortography. *Surgery* 1981; 90(3):497-503.
17. Beales JS, Adcock FA, Frawley JS, et al. The radiological assessment of disease of the profunda femoris artery. *Br J Radiol* 1974; 41:854-859.
18. Thiele BL, Strandness DE Jr. Accuracy of angiographic quantification of peripheral atherosclerosis. *Prog Cardiovasc Dis* 1983; 26(3):223-236.
19. Crummy AB, Rankin RS, Turnipseed WD, et al. Biplane arteriography in ischemia of the lower extremity. *Radiology* 1978; 126(1):111-115.
20. Lawrence JA, Ducksoo K, et al. Lower extremity spiral CT angiography versus catheter angiography. *Radiology* 1995; 194(3):903-911.
21. Meijer WT, Hoes AW, Rutgers D, et al. Peripheral arterial disease in the elderly: the Rotterdam study. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol* 1998; 18(2):185-192.
22. Criqui MH, Fronek A, Barrett-Connor E, et al. The prevalence of peripheral arterial disease in a defined population. *Circulation* 1985; 71(3):510-515.
23. Fowkes FG. The measurement of atherosclerotic peripheral arterial disease in epidemiological surveys. *Int J Epidemiol* 1988; 17(2):248-254. Review.
24. Feigelson HS, Criqui MH, Fronek A, et al. Screening for peripheral arterial disease: the sensitivity, specificity, and predictive value of noninvasive tests in a defined population. *Am J Epidemiol* 1994; 140(6):526-34.
25. Eggin TK, O'Moore PV, Feinstein AR, Waltman AC. Complications of peripheral arteriography: a new system to identify patients at increased risk. *J Vasc Surg* 1995; 22(6):787-794.
26. de Vries SO, Hunink MG, Polak JF. Summary receiver operating characteristic curves as a technique for meta-analysis of the diagnostic performance of duplex ultrasonography in peripheral arterial disease. *Acad Radio* 1996; 3(4):361-369.
27. Allard L, Cloutier G, Durand LG, et al. Limitations of ultrasonic duplex scanning for diagnosing lower limb arterial stenoses in the presence of adjacent segment disease. *J Vasc Surg* 1994; 19(4):650-657.
28. Edwards JM, Coldwell DM, Goldman ML, Strandness DE Jr. The role of duplex scanning in the selection of patients for transluminal angioplasty. *J Vasc Surg* 1991; 13(1):69-74.
29. Larch E, Minar E, Ahmadi R, et al. Value of color duplex sonography for evaluation of tibioperoneal arteries in patients with femoropopliteal obstruction: a prospective comparison with anterograde intraarterial digital subtraction angiography. *J Vasc Surg* 1997; 25(4):629-636.
30. Lundell A, Lindblad B, Bergqvist D, Hansen F. Femoropopliteal-crural graft patency is improved by an intensive surveillance program: a prospective randomized study. *J Vasc Surg* 1995; 21(1):26-33; discussion 33-34.
31. Sacks D, Robinson ML, Summers TA, Marinelli DL. The value of duplex sonography after peripheral artery angioplasty in predicting subacute restenosis. *AJR* 1994; 162(1):179-183.
32. Spijkerboer AM, Nass PC, de Valois JC, et al. Iliac artery stenoses after percutaneous transluminal angioplasty: follow-up with duplex ultrasonography. *J Vasc Surg* 1996; 23(4):691-697.
33. Mewissen MW, Kinney EV, Bandyk DF, et al. The role of duplex scanning versus angiography in predicting outcome after balloon angioplasty in the femoropopliteal artery. *J Vasc Surg* 1992; 15(5):860-5; discussion 865-866.
34. Rofsky NM, Adelman MA. MR angiography in the evaluation of atherosclerotic peripheral vascular disease. *Radiology* 2000; 214(2):325-338. Review.
35. Baum RA, Rutter CM, Sunshine JH, et al. Multicenter trial to evaluate vascular magnetic resonance angiography of the lower extremity. American College of Radiology Rapid Technology Assessment Group. *JAMA* 1995; 274(11):875-880.
36. Nelemans PJ, Leiner T, de Vet HC, van Engelshoven JM. Peripheral arterial disease: meta-analysis of the diagnostic performance of MR angiography. *Radiology* 2000; 217(1):105-114.
37. Khilnani NM, Winchester PA, Prince MR, et al. Peripheral vascular disease: combined 3D bolus chase and dynamic 2D MR angiography compared with x-ray angiography for treatment planning. *Radiology* 2002; 224(1):63-74.
38. Visser K, Hunink MG. Peripheral arterial disease: gadolinium-enhanced MR angiography versus color-guided duplex US—a meta-analysis. *Radiology* 2000; 216(1):67-77.
39. Snidow JJ, Harris VJ, Trerotola SO, et al. Interpretations and treatment decisions based on MR angiography versus conventional rteriography in symptomatic lower extremity ischemia. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 1995; 6(4):595-603.
40. Cambria RP, Kaufman JA, L'Italien GJ, et al. Magnetic resonance angiography in the management of lower extremity arterial occlusive disease: a prospective study. *J Vasc Surg* 1997; 25(2):380-389.
41. Hoch JR, Tullis MJ, Kennell TW, et al. Use of magnetic resonance angiography for the preoperative evaluation of patients with infrainguinal arterial occlusive disease. *J Vasc Surg* 1996; 23(5):792-800; discussion 801.
42. Huber TS, Back MR, Ballinger RJ, et al. Utility of magnetic resonance arteriography for distal lower extremity revascularization. *J Vasc Surg* 1997; 26(3):415-423; discussion 423-424.
43. Dorenbeck U, Seitz J, Volk M, et al. Evaluation of arterial bypass grafts of the pelvic and lower extremities with gadolinium-

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.

- enhanced magnetic resonance angiography: comparison with digital subtraction angiography. *Invest Radiol* 2002; 37(2):60-64.
44. Davis CP, Schopke WD, Seifert B, et al. MR angiography of patients with peripheral arterial disease before and after transluminal angioplasty. *AJR* 1997; 168(4):1027-1034
 45. Herborn CU, Goyen M, Quick HH, et al. Whole-body 3D MR angiography of patients with peripheral arterial occlusive disease. *AJR* 2004; 182(6):1427-1434.
 46. Loewe C, Schoder M, Rand T, et al. Peripheral vascular occlusive disease: evaluation with contrast-enhanced moving-bed MR angiography versus digital subtraction angiography in 106 patients. *AJR* 2002; 179(4):1013-1021.
 47. Leiner T, Tordoir JH, Kessels AG, et al. Comparison of treatment plans for peripheral arterial disease made with multi-station contrast medium-enhanced magnetic resonance angiography and duplex ultrasound scanning. *J Vasc Surg* 2003; 37(6):1255-1262.
 48. Rubin GD, Shiau MC, Leung AN, et al. Aorta and iliac arteries: single versus multiple detector-row helical CT angiography. *Radiology* 2000; 215(3):670-676.
 49. Martin ML, Tay KH, Flak B, et al. Multidetector CT angiography of the aortoiliac system and lower extremities: a prospective comparison with digital subtraction angiography. *AJR* 2003; 180(4):1085-1091.
 50. Willmann JK, Wildermuth S, Pfammatter T, et al. Aortoiliac and renal arteries: prospective intraindividual comparison of contrast-enhanced three-dimensional MR angiography and multi-detector row CT angiography. *Radiology* 2003; 226(3):798-811. Epub 2003 Jan 31.
 51. Willmann JK, Mayer D, Banyai M, et al. Evaluation of peripheral arterial bypass grafts with multi-detector row CT angiography: comparison with duplex US and digital subtraction angiography. *Radiology* 2003; 229(2):465-474.
 52. Ofer A, Nitecki SS, Linn S, et al. Multidetector CT angiography of peripheral vascular disease: a prospective comparison with intraarterial digital subtraction angiography. *AJR* 2003; 180(3):719-724.
 53. Ota H, Takase K, Igarashi K, et al. MDCT compared with digital subtraction angiography for assessment of lower extremity arterial occlusive disease: importance of reviewing cross-sectional images. *AJR* 2004; 182(1):201-209.
 54. Rubin GD, Schmidt AJ, Logan LJ, Sofilos MC. Multi-detector row CT angiography of lower extremity arterial inflow and runoff: initial experience. *Radiology* 2001; 221(1):146-158.
 55. Catalano C, Fraioli F, Laghi A, et al. Infrarenal aortic and lower-extremity arterial disease: diagnostic performance of multi-detector row CT angiography. *Radiology* 2004; 231(2):555-563.
 56. Adriaensen ME, Kock MC, Stijnen T, et al. Peripheral arterial disease: therapeutic confidence of CT versus digital subtraction angiography and effects on additional imaging recommendations. *Radiology* 2004; 233(2):385-91. Epub 2004 Sep 09.

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.