

The American College of Radiology, with more than 30,000 members, is the principal organization of radiologists, radiation oncologists, and clinical medical physicists in the United States. The College is a nonprofit professional society whose primary purposes are to advance the science of radiology, improve radiologic services to the patient, study the socioeconomic aspects of the practice of radiology, and encourage continuing education for radiologists, radiation oncologists, medical physicists, and persons practicing in allied professional fields.

The American College of Radiology will periodically define new practice guidelines and technical standards for radiologic practice to help advance the science of radiology and to improve the quality of service to patients throughout the United States. Existing practice guidelines and technical standards will be reviewed for revision or renewal, as appropriate, on their fifth anniversary or sooner, if indicated.

Each practice guideline and technical standard, representing a policy statement by the College, has undergone a thorough consensus process in which it has been subjected to extensive review, requiring the approval of the Commission on Quality and Safety as well as the ACR Board of Chancellors, the ACR Council Steering Committee, and the ACR Council. The practice guidelines and technical standards recognize that the safe and effective use of diagnostic and therapeutic radiology requires specific training, skills, and techniques, as described in each document. Reproduction or modification of the published practice guideline and technical standard by those entities not providing these services is not authorized.

2001 (Res. 9)
Revised 2006 (Res. 12,17,35)
Effective 10/01/06

ACR PRACTICE GUIDELINE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY (CT) OF THE EXTRACRANIAL HEAD AND NECK IN ADULTS AND CHILDREN

PREAMBLE

These guidelines are an educational tool designed to assist practitioners in providing appropriate radiologic care for patients. They are not inflexible rules or requirements of practice and are not intended, nor should they be used, to establish a legal standard of care. For these reasons and those set forth below, the American College of Radiology cautions against the use of these guidelines in litigation in which the clinical decisions of a practitioner are called into question.

The ultimate judgment regarding the propriety of any specific procedure or course of action must be made by the physician or medical physicist in light of all the circumstances presented. Thus, an approach that differs from the guidelines, standing alone, does not necessarily imply that the approach was below the standard of care. To the contrary, a conscientious practitioner may responsibly adopt a course of action different from that set forth in the guidelines when, in the reasonable judgment of the practitioner, such course of action is indicated by the condition of the patient, limitations on available resources, or advances in knowledge or technology subsequent to publication of the guidelines. However, a practitioner who employs an approach substantially different from these guidelines is advised to document in the patient record information sufficient to explain the approach taken.

The practice of medicine involves not only the science, but also the art of dealing with the prevention, diagnosis, alleviation, and treatment of disease. The variety and

complexity of human conditions make it impossible to always reach the most appropriate diagnosis or to predict with certainty a particular response to treatment. Therefore, it should be recognized that adherence to these guidelines will not assure an accurate diagnosis or a successful outcome. All that should be expected is that the practitioner will follow a reasonable course of action based on current knowledge, available resources, and the needs of the patient to deliver effective and safe medical care. The sole purpose of these guidelines is to assist practitioners in achieving this objective.

I. INTRODUCTION

Computed tomography (CT) is a radiologic modality for evaluating a variety of disorders involving the extracranial head and neck. CT should be performed only for a valid medical reason and with the minimum radiation dose necessary to achieve an optimal study. Additional or specialized examinations may be required. While it is not possible to detect all abnormalities using CT, adherence to the following guidelines will increase the probability of their detection.

II. INDICATIONS

A. Indications for CT of the soft tissues of the extracranial head and neck include, but are not limited to:

1. Congenital anomalies.
2. Benign and malignant neoplasms.
3. Infections and inflammatory processes.
4. Trauma.

5. Vascular malformations.
6. Evaluation of palpable masses.
7. Radiation therapy treatment planning.
8. Follow-up after surgery, chemotherapy, or radiation therapy.
9. Hemorrhage/epistaxis.
10. Thyroid conditions.

B. Indications for CT of the paranasal sinuses include, but are not limited to:

1. Congenital anomalies.
2. Fibro-osseous disease.
3. Sinonasal neoplasm, including benign or malignant lesions and soft tissue or bone involvement.
4. Facial trauma.
5. Acute and chronic inflammation.
6. Follow-up after surgery, chemotherapy, or radiation therapy.
7. Radiation therapy treatment planning.
8. Hemorrhage/epistaxis.

C. Indications for CT of the orbits include, but are not limited to:

1. Congenital anomalies.
2. Proptosis.
3. Fibro-osseous disease.
4. Orbital and ocular neoplasms.
5. Trauma.
6. Infections and inflammation.
7. Thyroid orbitopathy.
8. Follow-up after surgery, chemotherapy, or radiation therapy.
9. Radiation therapy treatment planning.
10. Foreign body.
11. Diplopia.
12. Loss of vision.
13. Complications of sinusitis and sinus surgeries.

D. Indications for CT of the temporal bone include, but are not limited to:

1. Conductive or sensorineural hearing loss.
2. Neoplasms.
3. Trauma.
4. Acute or chronic otomastoid inflammatory disease.
5. Preoperative evaluation prior to mastoidectomy.
6. Preoperative evaluation for cochlear implant.
7. Suspected inner ear disease.
8. Radiation therapy treatment planning.
9. Follow-up after surgery, chemotherapy, or radiation therapy.
10. Congenital defects.

All imaging facilities should have policies and procedures to reasonably attempt to identify pregnant patients prior to the performance of any examinations involving ionizing radiation. If the patient is known to be pregnant, the potential radiation risk to the fetus and clinical benefits of the procedure should be considered before proceeding with the study. (1995, 2005 - ACR Resolution 1a)

III. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

See the [ACR Practice Guideline for Performing and Interpreting Computed Tomography \(CT\)](#).

IV. SPECIFICATIONS OF THE EXAMINATION

The written or electronic request for CT of the head and neck should provide sufficient information to demonstrate the medical necessity of the examination and allow for its proper performance and interpretation.

Documentation that satisfies medical necessity includes 1) signs and symptoms and/or 2) relevant history (including known diagnoses). Additional information regarding the specific reason for the examination or a provisional diagnosis would be helpful and may at times be needed to allow for the proper performance and interpretation of the examination.

The request for the examination must be originated by a physician or other appropriately licensed health care provider. The accompanying clinical information should be provided by a physician or other appropriately licensed health care provider familiar with the patient's clinical problem or question and consistent with the state scope of practice requirements. (2006 - ACR Resolution 35)

Head and neck CT protocols require close attention and development by the supervising physician, according to specified indications. Protocols should be reviewed periodically in order for the examinations to be optimized. The supervising physician should be familiar with the indications for each examination, relevant patient history, potential adverse reactions to contrast media, exposure factors, window and level center settings, field of view, collimation, slice intervals, and reconstruction algorithms.

With multidetector helical CT scanners, high-quality images should be reconstructed in multiple planes from a single data set, obviating the need for separate coronal and axial acquisitions and thereby minimizing radiation exposure. When the area of interest involves scans through the orbital region, attempts should be made to minimize radiation dose to the lens.

A. Neck CT

The patient should lie on the table in the supine position with the neck slightly extended. The study should be performed with the patient breathing quietly. Contiguous or overlapping sections should be obtained through the area of interest. The slice thickness should not exceed the lesser of 3 mm or the acquisition slice thickness. However, in pediatric patients a thicker slice of ≤ 5 mm may be appropriate if dose reduction is desired. The gantry angle should be parallel to the hard palate. In patients with dental amalgam, the gantry angle may initially be parallel to the hard palate and then be angled to avoid streak artifact from the dental amalgam during image acquisition. The second angle should approximate the plane of the hyoid bone. All studies should be reconstructed in soft tissue algorithm. Additional reconstruction with a suitable edge-enhancing algorithm or technique to improve bone depiction may be obtained in patients with a history of infection, tumor, or trauma. Intravenous contrast is recommended in patients without contraindications. A noncontrast study may be performed to evaluate for salivary stones or for patients undergoing radioiodine therapy for thyroid cancer. If the examination is performed for a vocal cord tumor, axial sections should be parallel to the vocal cords or hyoid bone.

For studies specifically performed to evaluate for vocal cord palsy, the inferior extent of the CT examination must include the right subclavian artery (right vocal palsy) or aortopulmonary window (left vocal cord palsy). Very thin sections (1.0-1.5 mm) with overlapping reconstructions limited to the larynx may be helpful for evaluating patients for vocal cord neoplasms. Scans obtained during phonation or Valsalva maneuver may be useful in assessing laryngeal function.

B. Sinus CT

The standard study may be performed in the coronal plane, or reconstructed in the coronal plane from a multidetector axial data set. Axial and/or sagittal images may prove useful to the radiologist or the referring clinician, and can be also reconstructed. In the absence of a multidetector unit, direct coronal images, or both axial and coronal images may be performed, if requested. Intravenous contrast should be used to evaluate neoplasms. Contrast is not required for evaluating facial trauma or for routine evaluation of patients with sinusitis. Contrast may be helpful to evaluate patients with sinus infection who have periorbital or facial swelling and have a clinical suspicion of abscess or complications of sinonasal infection. Studies should be reconstructed in a bone algorithm or another edge-sharpening algorithm.

1. Coronal studies

The patient should be placed in the prone position when performing direct coronal imaging to evaluate the ostiomeatal unit (OMU). An attempt should be made to have the gantry angle perpendicular to the plane of the hard palate. Contiguous or overlapping sections should be obtained from the opening of the nasal cavity to the sella. The slice thickness should not exceed 3 mm. Sedated small children may be scanned in the supine head-back position to obtain coronal images.

For patients who cannot undergo direct coronal imaging, coronal reformations may be performed from thin section axial images using multidetector scanners. The recommended scan thickness should be between 1.0-1.5 mm.

2. Axial studies

The patient should be supine for direct axial imaging or for routine multidetector scanner acquisitions. Contiguous or overlapping sections should be obtained from the top of the frontal sinus and continue inferiorly through the hard palate. The slice thickness should not exceed 3 mm.

C. Orbital CT

The standard examination should consist of image acquisition in the axial plane, and reconstructed coronal planes, when utilizing a multidetector scanner. Direct coronal and axial images can be performed in the absence of this ability or for problem solving in the case of subtle fracture. In the absence of any contraindications, intravenous contrast should be administered when evaluating neoplasms, inflammatory disorders, and vascular lesions. Precontrast imaging is necessary when attempting to identify calcium in entities such as retinoblastoma. Studies should be reconstructed in soft tissue and bone algorithm. Head back or coronal images with or without Valsalva maneuvers may elucidate some vascular lesions.

1. Coronal imaging

The patient should be placed in the prone position for direct coronal plane acquisition. The gantry angle should be perpendicular to the infraorbital-meatal line, while avoiding metallic dental work. If the patient cannot tolerate prone positioning, the coronal images may be attempted with maximal extension of the neck and gantry reangling. Contiguous or overlapping

sections should be obtained from the orbital rim to the sella. The slice thickness should not exceed 3 mm. When evaluating for small foreign bodies, slice thickness should not exceed 1.5 mm. Multiplanar reformatted coronal views from direct axial imaging may be used with multidetector scanners.

2. Axial imaging

The patient should be placed in the supine position. The gantry angle should be in a plane parallel to the infraorbital-meatal line selected. Contiguous or overlapping sections should be obtained from the top of the frontal sinus and continue inferiorly through the hard palate. The slice thickness should not exceed 3 mm. When evaluating for small foreign bodies, slice thickness should not exceed 1.5 mm.

D. Temporal Bone

The standard examination should consist of image acquisition in the axial and coronal planes, or with coronal reconstruction of a high-quality multidetector axial acquisition. Intravenous contrast may be helpful when evaluating patients with acute mastoiditis in order to evaluate patency of the adjacent transverse sinus. In the absence of any contraindications, contrast should be used when there is concern for a tumor. All studies should be reconstructed in bone algorithm. Right and left sides may be separately reconstructed using magnified small field of view. Additional reformations of a high-quality multidetector acquisition in the Poschl (parallel to the plane of the superior semicircular canal) and Stenvers (perpendicular to the plane of the superior semicircular canal) planes may provide additional useful information, particularly in the evaluation of superior semicircular canal dehiscence.

1. Coronal imaging

The patient should be placed in the prone position for direct coronal plane acquisition. The gantry angle should be perpendicular to the infraorbital-meatal line. Contiguous or overlapping sections should be obtained from approximately 6 mm anterior to the bony portion of the external auditory canal (EAC) to approximately 6 mm posterior to the bony portion of the EAC, or through the entirety of air cells in the affected mastoid. The slice thickness should not exceed 1.5 mm. Multiplanar reformatted coronal views from direct axial imaging may be used if the patient cannot tolerate direct coronal examination.

2. Axial imaging

The patient should be placed in the supine position for the axial plane. The gantry angle should be parallel to the infraorbital-meatal line. Contiguous or overlapping sections should be obtained from approximately 6 mm above the bony portion of the EAC to approximately 6 mm below the bony portion of the EAC, or through the entirety of air cells in the affected mastoid. Reconstruction of the posterior fossa using soft tissue algorithms may be performed if deemed necessary by the radiologist or referring physician. The slice thickness should not exceed 1.5 mm.

V. DOCUMENTATION

Reporting should be in accordance with the [ACR Practice Guideline for Communication of Diagnostic Imaging Findings](#).

VI. EQUIPMENT SPECIFICATIONS

A. Performance Guidelines

For patient imaging, the CT scanner should meet or exceed the following specifications:

1. Scan times: minimum, not more than 2 seconds.
2. Slice thickness: minimum, not more than 1.5 mm.
3. Interscan delay: minimum, not more than 4 seconds (may be longer if intravascular contrast material is not used).
4. Limiting spatial resolution: must be measured to verify that it meets the unit manufacturer's specifications.
5. Table pitch: no greater than 2:1 for single-row-detector helical scanners.

B. Appropriate emergency equipment and medications must be immediately available to treat adverse reactions associated with administered medications. The equipment and medications should be monitored for inventory and drug expiration dates on a regular basis.

C. A capability for softcopy workstation is desirable.

VII. RADIATION SAFETY IN IMAGING

Radiologists, medical physicists, radiologic technologists, and all supervising physicians have a responsibility to minimize radiation dose to individual patients, to staff, and to society as a whole, while maintaining the necessary diagnostic image quality. This is the concept "As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA)."

Facilities, in consultation with the medical physicist, should have in place and should adhere to policies and procedures, in accordance with ALARA, to vary examination protocols to take into account patient body habitus, such as height and/or weight, body mass index or lateral width. The dose reduction devices that are available on imaging equipment should be active or manual techniques should be used to moderate the exposure while maintaining the necessary diagnostic image quality. Patient radiation doses should be periodically measured by a medical physicist in accordance with the appropriate ACR Technical Standard. (2006 - ACR Resolution 17)

VIII. QUALITY CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT, SAFETY, INFECTION CONTROL, AND PATIENT EDUCATION CONCERNS

Policies and procedures related to quality, patient education, infection control, and safety should be developed and implemented in accordance with the ACR Policy on Quality Control and Improvement, Safety, Infection Control, and Patient Education Concerns appearing elsewhere in the ACR Practice Guidelines and Technical Standards book.

In all patients, the lowest possible exposure factors should be chosen that would produce images of diagnostic quality. This is particularly true in pediatric patients. Whenever possible, multiplanar reconstruction should be used to avoid repeated direct scans.

For specific issues regarding CT quality control, see the [ACR Practice Guideline for Performing and Interpreting Computed Tomography \(CT\)](#).

Equipment monitoring should be in accordance with the [ACR Technical Standard for Medical Physics Performance Monitoring of Computed Tomography \(CT\) Equipment](#).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This guideline was revised according to the process described in the ACR Practice Guidelines and Technical Standards book by the Guidelines and Standards Committee of the Commission on Neuroradiology.

Principal Reviewer: Suresh K. Mukherji, MD

Guidelines and Standards Committee

Suresh K. Mukherji, MD, Chair
Sachin Gujar, MD
John E. Jordan, MD
Emanuel Kanal, MD
Jeffrey R. Petrella, MD

Eric J. Russell, MD
Sanjay K. Shetty, MD
Charles L. Truwit, MD
Patrick A. Turski, MD
John L. Ulmer, MD
Wade H. Wong, DO
R. Nick Bryan, MD, PhD, Chair, Commission

Comments Reconciliation Committee

Harry C. Knipp, MD, Co-Chair
David C. Kushner, MD, Co-Chair
R. Nick Bryan, MD, PhD
Ronald E. Cordell, MD
Paul A. Larson, MD
Stanley P. Laucks, Jr., MD, PhD
Lawrence A. Liebscher, MD
Suresh K. Mukherji, MD
David M. Yousem, MD, MBA

REFERENCES

1. Aalokken TM, Hagtvedt T, Dalen I, et al. Conventional sinus radiography compared with CT in the diagnosis of acute sinusitis. *Dentomaxillofac Radiol* 2003;32:60-62.
2. Babbel R, Harnsberger HR, Nelson B, et al. Optimization of techniques in screening CT of the sinuses. *AJNR* 1991;12:849-854.
3. Barrett BJ, Parfrey PS, McDonald JR, et al. Nonionic low-osmolality versus ionic high-osmolality contrast material for intravenous use in patients perceived to be at high risk: randomized trial. *Radiology* 1992;183:105-110.
4. Belden CJ, Weg N, Minor LB, et al. CT evaluation of bone dehiscence of the superior semicircular canal as a cause of sound and/or pressure-induced vertigo. *Radiology* 2003;226:337-343.
5. Belden CJ, Zinreich SJ. Orbital imaging techniques. *Semin Ultrasound CT MR* 1997;18:413-422.
6. Brink JA, Heiken JP, Balfé DM, et al. Spiral CT: decreased spatial resolution in vivo due to broadening of the section sensitivity profile. *Radiology* 1992;185:469-474.
7. Castillo M, Albernaz VS, Mukherji SK, et al. Imaging of Bezold's abscess. *AJR* 1998;171:1491-1495.
8. Chow JM, Mafee MF. Radiologic assessment preoperative to endoscopic sinus surgery. *Otolaryngol Clin North Am* 1989;22:691-701.
9. Czechowski J, Janeczek J, Kelly G, et al. Radiation dose to the lens in sequential and spiral CT of the facial bones and sinuses. *Eur Radiol* 2001;11:711-713.
10. Damilakis J, Prassopoulos P, Mazonakis M, et al. Tailored low dose three-dimensional CT of paranasal sinuses. *Clin Imaging* 1998;22:235-239.

11. Delorme S, Knopp MV, Kauczor HU, et al. An optimized examination protocol for contrast-enhanced cervical and mediastinal CT. *Clin Imaging* 1996;20:31-36.
12. Edward DP, Mafee MF, Garcia-Valenzuela E, et al. Coats' disease and persistent hyperplastic primary vitreous: role of MR imaging and CT. *Radiol Clin North Am* 1998;36:1119-1131.
13. Fatterpekar GM, Mukherji SK, Alley J, et al. Hypoplasia of the bony canal for the cochlear nerve in patients with congenital sensorineural hearing loss: initial observations. *Radiology* 2000;215:243-246.
14. Fatterpekar G, Mukherji SK, Lin Y, et al. Normal canals of the fundus of the internal auditory canal: CT evaluation. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 1999;23:776-780.
15. Franzese CB, Stringer SP. Economic analysis of the use of limited coronal computed tomography scans in the management of sinusitis. *Am J Rhinol* 2004;18:329-334.
16. Goodman GM, Martin DS, Klein J, et al. Comparison of a screening coronal CT versus a contiguous coronal CT for the evaluation of patients with presumptive sinusitis. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 1995;74:178-182.
17. Groell R, Willfurth P, Schaffler GJ, et al. Contrast-enhanced spiral CT of the head and neck: comparison of contrast material injection rates. *Am J Neuroradiol* 1999;20:1732-1736.
18. Hagtvedt T, Aalokken TM, Notthellen J, et al. A new low-dose CT examination compared with standard-dose CT in the diagnosis of acute sinusitis. *Eur Radiol* 2003;13:976-980.
19. Hein E, Rogalla P, Klingebiel R, et al. Low-dose CT of the paranasal sinuses with eye lens protection: effect on image quality and radiation dose. *Eur Radiol* 2002;12:1693-1696.
20. Hopper KD, Pierantozzi D, Potok PS, et al. The quality of 3D reconstructions from 1.0 and 1.5 pitch helical and conventional CT. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 1996;20:841-847.
21. Jones NS. CT of the paranasal sinuses: a review of the correlation with clinical, surgical and histopathological findings. *Clin Otolaryngol Allied Sci* 2002;27:11-17.
22. Kahn JB, Stewart MG, Diaz-Marchan PJ. Acute temporal bone trauma: utility of high-resolution computed tomography. *Am J Otol* 2000;21:743-752.
23. Kalender WA, Polacin A. Physical performance characteristics of spiral CT scanning. *Med Phys* 1991;18:910-915.
24. Kaufman LM, Mafee MF, Song CD. Retinoblastoma and simulating lesions: role of CT, MR imaging and use of Gd-DTPA contrast enhancement. *Radiol Clin North Am* 1998;36:1101-1117.
25. Kearney SE, Jones P, Meakin K, et al. CT scanning of the paranasal sinuses: the effect of reducing mAs. *Br J Radiology* 1997;70:1071-1074.
26. Lakits A, Prokesch R, Scholda C, et al. Orbital helical computed tomography in the diagnosis and management of eye trauma. *Ophthalmology* 1999;106:2330-2335.
27. Lakits A, Steiner E, Scholda C, et al. Evaluation of intraocular foreign bodies by spiral computed tomography and multiplanar reconstruction. *Ophthalmology* 1998;105:307-312.
28. Levin DC, Gardiner GA Jr., Karasick S, et al. Cost containment in the use of low-osmolar contrast agents: effect of guidelines, monitoring, and feedback mechanisms. *Radiology* 1993;189:753-757.
29. Mafee MF, Charletta D, Kumar A, et al. Large vestibular aqueduct and congenital sensorineural hearing loss. *Am J Neuroradiol* 1992;13:805-819.
30. Mafee MF, Inoue Y, Mafee RF. Ocular and orbital imaging. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 1996;6:291-318.
31. Maya MM, Heier LA. Orbital CT: current use in the MR era. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 1998;8:651-683.
32. Melhem ER, Oliverio PJ, Benson ML, et al. Optimal CT evaluation for functional endoscopic sinus surgery. *Am J Neuroradiol* 1996;17:181-188.
33. Mukherji SK, Castillo M, Huda W, et al. Comparison of dynamic and spiral CT for imaging the glottic larynx. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 1995;19:899-904.
34. Mukherji SK, Mancuso AA, Kotzur IM, et al. CT of the temporal bone: findings after mastoidectomy, ossicular reconstruction, and cochlear implantation. *AJR* 1994;163:1467-1471.
35. Mukherji SK, Pillsbury HR, Castillo M. Imaging squamous cell carcinomas of the upper aerodigestive tract: what clinicians need to know. *Radiology* 1997;205:629-646.
36. Polacin A, Kalender WA, Brink J, et al. Measurement of slice sensitivity profiles in spiral CT. *Med Phys* 1994;21:133-140.
37. Polacin A, Kalender WA, Marchal G. Evaluation of section sensitivity profiles and image noise in spiral CT. *Radiology* 1992;185:29-35.
38. Rowe-Jones J, Mackay I, Colquhoun I. Charing Cross CT protocol for endoscopic sinus surgery. *J Laryngol Otol* 1995;109:1057-1060.
39. Siddle KJ, Sim L. Radiation dose to the lens of the eye during computerized tomography examinations of the orbit, the pituitary fossa and the brain on a General Electric 9800 Quick CT scanner. *Australas Radiol* 1990;34:326-330.
40. Sievers KW, Greess H, Baum U, et al. Paranasal sinuses and nasopharynx CT and MRI. *Eur J Radiol* 2000;33:185-202.
41. Sohaib SA, Peppercorn PD, Horrocks JA, et al. The effect of decreasing mAs on image quality and patient dose in sinus CT. *Br J Radiol* 2001;74:157-161.
42. Spreer J, Krahe T, Jung G, et al. Spiral versus conventional CT in routine examinations of the neck. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 1995;19:905-910.

43. Suojanen JN, Mukherji SK, Dupuy DE, et al. Spiral CT in evaluation of head and neck lesions: work in progress. *Radiology* 1992;183:281-283.
44. Suojanen JS, Mukherji SK, Whippold FJ. Spiral CT of the larynx. *Am J Neuroradiol* 1994;15:1579-1582.
45. Wang R, Birchall IW, Hanson J. Reducing the concentration of contrast medium in dynamic computed tomography of the neck: consequences for image quality, side effects and cost. *Can Assoc Radiol J* 1995;46:27-31.
46. Weber AL, Mafee MF. Evaluation of the globe using computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging. *Isr J Med Sci* 1992;28:145-152.
47. White PS, Cowan IA, Robertson MS. Limited CT scanning techniques of the paranasal sinuses. *J Laryngol Otol* 1991;105:20-23.
48. Worley GA, Kotnis R, Jacomb-Hood J, et al. The effectiveness of guidelines in reducing inappropriate CT scans of the paranasal sinuses. *Rhinology* 2001;39:125-127.
49. Yoon DY, Chang KH, Han MH, et al. Re-evaluation of optimum dose of contrast medium for vascular enhancement in CT of the head and neck. *Neuroradiology* 1997;39: 30-34.
50. Younis RT, Anand VK, Davidson B. The role of computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging in patients with sinusitis with complications. *Laryngoscope* 2002;112:224-229.
51. Zammit-Maempel I, Chadwick CL, Willis SP. Radiation dose to the lens of eye and thyroid gland in paranasal sinus multislice CT. *Br J Radiol* 2003;76:418-420.
52. Zinreich S. Imaging of chronic sinusitis in adults: X-ray, computed tomography, and magnetic resonance imaging. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 1992;90:445-451.
53. Zinreich SJ. Paranasal sinus imaging. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 1990;103:863-868.
54. Zinreich S, Abidin M, Kennedy D. Cross-sectional imaging of the nasal cavity and paranasal sinuses: operative techniques. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 1990;1:93-99.
55. Zinreich SJ, Kennedy DW, Rosenbaum AE, et al. Paranasal sinuses: CT imaging requirements for endoscopic surgery. *Radiology* 1987;163:769-775.
56. Zinreich SJ, Miller NR, Aguayo JB, et al. Computed tomographic three-dimensional localization and compositional evaluation of intraocular and orbital foreign bodies. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1986;104:1477-1482.