

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 parameters 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 parameters and technical standards will be reviewed for revision or renewal, as appropriate, on their fifth anniversary or sooner, if indicated.

Each practice parameter 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 and approval. The practice parameters 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 parameter and technical standard by those entities not providing these services is not authorized.

Revised 2020 (Resolution 44)*

ACR–ASNR–SPR PRACTICE PARAMETER FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY (CT) OF THE HEAD

PREAMBLE

This document is an educational tool designed to assist practitioners in providing appropriate radiologic care for patients. Practice Parameters and Technical Standards are not inflexible rules or requirements of practice and are not intended, nor should they be used, to establish a legal standard of care¹. For these reasons and those set forth below, the American College of Radiology and our collaborating medical specialty societies caution against the use of these documents 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 practitioner in light of all the circumstances presented. Thus, an approach that differs from the guidance in this document, 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 this document when, in the reasonable judgment of the practitioner, such course of action is indicated by the condition of the patient, limitations of available resources, or advances in knowledge or technology subsequent to publication of this document. However, a practitioner who employs an approach substantially different from the guidance in this document 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 the guidance in this document 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 this document is to assist practitioners in achieving this objective.

¹ *Iowa Medical Society and Iowa Society of Anesthesiologists v. Iowa Board of Nursing* 831 N.W.2d 826 (Iowa 2013) Iowa Supreme Court refuses to find that the *ACR Technical Standard for Management of the Use of Radiation in Fluoroscopic Procedures* (Revised 2008) sets a national standard for who may perform fluoroscopic procedures in light of the standard's stated purpose that ACR standards are educational tools and not intended to establish a legal standard of care. See also, *Stanley v. McCarver*, 63 P.3d 1076 (Ariz. App. 2003) where in a concurring opinion the Court stated that "published standards or guidelines of specialty medical organizations are useful in determining the duty owed or the standard of care applicable in a given situation" even though ACR standards themselves do not establish the standard of care.

I. INTRODUCTION

This practice parameter was revised collaboratively by the American College of Radiology (ACR), the American Society of Neuroradiology (ASNR), and the Society for Pediatric Radiology (SPR).

Computed tomography (CT) is a technology that produces cross-sectional images of the body using x-rays. CT is utilized extensively in imaging of the head. This practice parameter outlines the principles for performing high-quality CT imaging of the head in pediatric and adult patients. There should be an effort to minimize radiation exposure, particularly in children. An alternate modality should be considered when possible.

CT of the head is superior to magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) for the evaluation of osseous structures, acute intracranial hemorrhage, and the detection of calcification, which can be important for the identification of an abnormality or for refinement of a differential diagnosis. CT of the brain is sufficient and diagnostic in many clinical circumstances, such as in acute trauma, nontraumatic intracranial hemorrhage, evaluation of shunt malfunction, and selected postoperative follow-up. However, CT is less useful for certain conditions such as neoplastic, infectious, or inflammatory conditions affecting the cranial nerves, brain parenchyma, and meninges. In combination with the clinical history and physical examination findings, CT of the brain is a useful screening tool for indications such as acute mental status change, seizure, acute neurologic deficit, acute headache, and nonacute headache with neurologic findings. CT is useful as a screening modality for the presence of neoplasm and mass effect to which the addition of intravenous (IV) contrast may provide added sensitivity in selected circumstances. For further information see the [ACR Manual on Contrast Media](#) [1].

II. INDICATIONS

Indications for CT of the brain include, but are not limited to, the following:

A. Primary Indications

1. Acute head trauma [2-6]
2. Suspected acute intracranial hemorrhage [7-9]
3. Follow-up for known intracranial hemorrhages
4. Detection or evaluation of calcification [10]
5. Postoperative evaluation following intracranial surgery [11]
6. Mental status change [12], including drug toxicity [12-15]
7. Headache [16,17]
8. Acute neurologic deficits [18], including cranial nerve dysfunction [19-21] and ataxia [22]
9. Intracranial infection [23-27]
10. Hydrocephalus [28,29], including shunt malfunctions or shunt revisions in the adult population [28]
11. Congenital skull and brain lesions (such as, but not limited to, craniosynostosis, macrocephaly, and microcephaly) [7,30,31]
12. Suspected mass or tumor [32-36], including brain herniation syndromes [3,4] and increased intracranial pressure [4,5]
13. CT guidance, image integration, and 3-D planning [37-45]
14. Skull lesions (such as, but not limited to, fibrous dysplasia, Paget disease, histiocytosis, osteolytic lesions, and skeletal tumors)
15. Abusive head trauma and postmortem forensic investigations [15,46-49]
16. Seizures [50-54]

B. Secondary Indications (when MRI is unavailable or contraindicated, or if the supervising physician determines CT to be appropriate [54])

1. Epilepsy [50-54]
2. Neurodegenerative disease [55-58]
3. Developmental delay [29,59]
4. Evaluating psychiatric disorder [60]

For the pregnant or potentially pregnant patient, see the [ACR–SPR Practice Parameter for Imaging Pregnant or Potentially Pregnant Adolescents and Women with Ionizing Radiation](#) [61].

III. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

See the [ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Diagnostic Computed Tomography \(CT\)](#) [62].

IV. SPECIFICATIONS OF THE EXAMINATION

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

Documentation that satisfies medical necessity includes 1) signs and symptoms and/or 2) relevant history (including known diagnoses). The provision of 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. (ACR Resolution 35 adopted in 2006 – revised in 2016, Resolution 12-b)

The supervising physician must have adequate understanding of the indications, risks, and benefits of the examination, as well as alternative imaging procedures. The physician performing CT interpretation must have a clear understanding and knowledge of the anatomy and pathophysiology relevant to the examination.

A. General Considerations

CT protocols for brain imaging should be designed to answer the specific clinical question. The supervising physician should be familiar with the indications for each examination, relevant patient history, and potential adverse reactions to contrast media. The supervising physician should be familiar with how individual CT settings affect radiation dose and image quality, including field of view (FOV), collimation, pitch, automated exposure control, and image reconstruction algorithms such as iterative reconstruction [63]. The goal of CT scanning is to obtain diagnostic information from images of sufficient quality. Protocols should be optimized to deliver the lowest dose required to achieve appropriate image quality and should be reviewed and updated as needed in light of new clinically applicable developments [64-72].

B. Brain Imaging

CT brain imaging is performed for the evaluation of a variety of pathologies that require appropriate techniques for acquisition and viewing. CT brain imaging may be performed with a sequential single-slice technique, multislice helical (spiral) protocol, or multidetector multislice algorithm [73,74]. Use of these techniques is dependent on clinical indication, scanner capability, and image quality requirements. For CT of the brain, contiguous or overlapping axial slices should be acquired with a slice thickness of no greater than 5 mm. In addition to directly acquired axial images, reformatted images in coronal, sagittal, true axial, or other more complex planes may be constructed from the axial data set to answer specific clinical questions. Additionally, axial reconstructed images should be presented with at least two different kernels, utilizing both a brain/soft tissue and bone kernel. Brain images should be reviewed at dedicated workstations and with window settings appropriate for demonstrating brain, bone, and soft-tissue abnormalities as well as hemorrhage.

For further information, see the American Association of Physicists in Medicine Routine (AAPM) Adult Head (Brain) Protocols [75].

C. Contrast Studies

Certain indications require administration of IV contrast media or intrathecal contrast (eg, cisternography) during imaging of the brain. Contrast enhancement should be performed using appropriate injection protocols and be in accordance with the [ACR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Use of Intravascular Contrast Media](#) [76]. Cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) contrast administration requires the use of nonionic agents appropriate for intrathecal use and should be performed using appropriate protocols as outlined in the [ACR–ASNR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Myelography and Cisternography](#) [77].

D. Advanced Applications

Postprocessing by either physicians, radiologic technologists, or appropriately trained staff is recommended. Furthermore, images may be manipulated to allow selective visualization of specific tissues, such as in CT perfusion, CT volumetry, CT angiography/venography, multimodality image fusion, and mapping techniques. Such applications are better performed with helical, volume, or dual-energy data sets rather than routine axial sequential data [37,43,66,78-94]. Also see the [ACR–ASNR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Computed Tomography \(CT\) Perfusion in Neuroradiologic Imaging](#) [95] and the [ACR–ASNR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance and Interpretation of Cervicocerebral Computed Tomography Angiography \(CTA\)](#) [96]. Pre- and postcontrast imaging is not recommended in pediatric patients for most indications.

V. DOCUMENTATION

Reporting should be in accordance with the [ACR Practice Parameter for Communication of Diagnostic Imaging Findings](#) [97].

VI. EQUIPMENT SPECIFICATIONS

For specific issues regarding CT quality control, see the [ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Diagnostic Computed Tomography \(CT\)](#) [62].

Equipment monitoring should be in accordance with the [ACR–AAPM Technical Standard for Diagnostic Medical Physics Performance Monitoring of Computed Tomography \(CT\) Equipment](#) [98].

A. Performance Standards

To achieve acceptable clinical CT scans of the brain, the CT scanner should meet or exceed the following specifications:

1. Scan times: per slice or image not more than 2 seconds
2. Slice thickness: acquired slice thickness should be 2 mm or less, whereas reconstructed slice thickness should be 5 mm or less
3. Interscan delay: no more than 4 seconds; however, this may be longer if intravascular contrast media is not used (not applicable with helical scanners)
4. Limiting spatial resolution: must be measured to verify that it meets the unit manufacturer's specifications. Limiting spatial resolution should be >10 lp/cm for a display field of view <24 cm.
5. Table pitch: no greater than 2 for most CT scanners, pitch may be increased for dual-energy scanners for sole evaluation of bone anatomy (craniofacial)
6. For advanced applications (eg, perfusion imaging or CT angiography (CTA)), cine-capable scanners are preferable with tube rotation ≤ 1 second and continuous cine imaging ≥ 60 seconds. See the [ACR–ASNR–](#)

B. Patient monitoring equipment and facilities for cardiopulmonary resuscitation, including vital signs monitoring equipment and support equipment, should be immediately available.

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. The equipment, medications, and other emergency support must also be appropriate for the range of ages or sizes in the patient populations.

Radiologists, technologists, and staff members should be able to assist with procedures, patient monitoring, and patient support. A written policy should be in place for dealing with emergencies, such as cardiopulmonary arrest.

VII. RADIATION SAFETY IN IMAGING

Radiologists, medical physicists, registered radiologist assistants, radiologic technologists, and all supervising physicians have a responsibility for safety in the workplace by keeping radiation exposure to staff, and to society as a whole, “as low as reasonably achievable” (ALARA) and to assure that radiation doses to individual patients are appropriate, taking into account the possible risk from radiation exposure and the diagnostic image quality necessary to achieve the clinical objective. All personnel that work with ionizing radiation must understand the key principles of occupational and public radiation protection (justification, optimization of protection and application of dose limits) and the principles of proper management of radiation dose to patients (justification, optimization and the use of dose reference levels) http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/Pub1578_web-57265295.pdf.

Facilities and their responsible staff should consult with the radiation safety officer to ensure that there are policies and procedures for the safe handling and administration of radiopharmaceuticals and that they are adhered to in accordance with ALARA. These policies and procedures must comply with all applicable radiation safety regulations and conditions of licensure imposed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and by state and/or other regulatory agencies. Quantities of radiopharmaceuticals should be tailored to the individual patient by prescription or protocol.

Nationally developed guidelines, such as the ACR’s [Appropriateness Criteria](#)[®], should be used to help choose the most appropriate imaging procedures to prevent unwarranted radiation exposure.

Additional information regarding patient radiation safety in imaging is available at the Image Gently[®] for children (www.imagegently.org) and Image Wisely[®] for adults (www.imagewisely.org) websites. These advocacy and awareness campaigns provide free educational materials for all stakeholders involved in imaging (patients, technologists, referring providers, medical physicists, and radiologists).

Radiation exposures or other dose indices should be measured and patient radiation dose estimated for representative examinations and types of patients by a Qualified Medical Physicist in accordance with the applicable ACR technical standards. Regular auditing of patient dose indices should be performed by comparing the facility’s dose information with national benchmarks, such as the ACR Dose Index Registry, the NCRP Report No. 172, Reference Levels and Achievable Doses in Medical and Dental Imaging: Recommendations for the United States or the Conference of Radiation Control Program Director’s National Evaluation of X-ray Trends. (ACR Resolution 17 adopted in 2006 – revised in 2009, 2013, Resolution 52)

When possible, CT imaging of the head should consider the following to minimize radiation dose and maintain image quality:

1. Center the patient in the gantry [99]
2. Remove nonnecessary objects from the patient
3. Use of iterative reconstruction technique, if available

Dose-minimization CT techniques should be used for imaging scenarios in which comprehensive information is not required, such as in the evaluation of shunt placement/malfunction, routine paranasal sinus evaluation, and craniosynostosis in the pediatric population [100].

Diagnostic Reference Levels (DRL) and Achievable Doses (AD) are national benchmarks for radiation protection and optimization that provide a comparison for facilities in order to review techniques and determine whether acceptable image quality can be achieved at lower doses. Published levels are available [101]. For further information, see the [ACR–AAPM–SPR Practice Parameter for Diagnostic Reference Levels and Achievable Doses in Medical X-Ray Imaging](#) [102].

Attention to dose is particularly important but also particularly challenging in the pediatric population, when age and size specific protocols should be considered [103]. MRI may be an alternative to CT in monitoring the size of intracranial fluid collections, such as the ventricles in shunted hydrocephalus, size of arachnoid cysts, or size of nonacute subdural collections. Rapid-MRI to include susceptibility and diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) sequences has not yet been proven in the literature to be an equivalent examination to CT for the detection of acute intracranial hemorrhage or exclusion of a skull fracture in the acute clinical setting. MRI is useful in detecting areas of parenchymal brain injury that may not be apparent on CT [104].

The use of shields for radiation protection of superficial organs, such as the lens of the eye or the thyroid gland, is controversial. The goal of shielding is to limit unnecessary irradiation to nontarget, radiosensitive organs, and bismuth shields, which have been shown to reduce anterior surface dose, are available. However, shielding has several disadvantages, not the least of which is unpredictable results when combined with automated exposure control features. Alternative methods, such as a global reduction in dose together with iterative reconstruction to reduce image noise, as mentioned above in Section IV.A, can achieve the same goal. For further information, see the [AAPM Position Statement on the Use of Bismuth Shielding for the Purpose of Dose Reduction in CT Scanning](#) [105].

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

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 appearing under the heading *ACR Position Statement on Quality Control and Improvement, Safety, Infection Control and Patient Education* on the ACR website (<https://www.acr.org/Advocacy-and-Economics/ACR-Position-Statements/Quality-Control-and-Improvement>).

In addition to CT radiation safety and quality control, appropriateness studies, and utilization review, a facilitating best practices for CT brain imaging should also be considered and encouraged as part of a comprehensive continuous quality improvement program [46,106-114].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This practice parameter was revised according to the process described under the heading *The Process for Developing ACR Practice Parameters and Technical Standards* on the ACR website (<https://www.acr.org/Clinical-Resources/Practice-Parameters-and-Technical-Standards>) by the Committee on Practice Parameters – Neuroradiology of the ACR Commission on Neuroradiology and the Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology of the ACR Commission on Pediatric Radiology in collaboration with the ASNR and the SPR.

Collaborative Committee – members represent their societies in the initial and final revision of this practice parameter

ACR

Kristine A. Blackham, MD, Chair
John E. Jordan, MD, FACR
Sumit Pruthi, MBBS

ASNR

Amanda S. Corey, MD, FACR
Susan Palasis, MD
Arastoo Vossough, MD, PhD

SPR

Timothy N. Booth, MD
Rupa Radhakrishnan, MBBS, MS

Committee on Practice Parameters – Neuroradiology

(ACR Committee responsible for sponsoring the draft through the process)

Steven W. Hetts, MD, Chair
Sameer A. Ansari, MD, PhD
Kristine A. Blackham, MD
Brian A. Conley, MD
Gerald Drocton, MD
Kavita K. Erickson, MD
Adam E. Flanders, MD

John E. Jordan, MD, MPP, FACR
Jacqueline C. Junn, MD
Robert J. McDonald, MD
Alexander M. McKinney, IV, MD
Lubdha M. Shah, MD
Raymond K. Tu, MD, FACR
Max Wintermark, MD

Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology

(ACR Committee responsible for sponsoring the draft through the process)

Beverly Newman, MB, BCh, BSc, FACR, Chair
Terry L. Levin, MD, FACR, Vice Chair
John B. Amodio, MD, FACR
Tara M. Catanzano, MB, BCh
Harris L. Cohen, MD, FACR
Kassa Darge, MD, PhD
Dorothy L. Gilbertson-Dahdal, MD
Lauren P. Golding, MD
Safwan S. Halabi, MD

Jason Higgins, DO
Jane Sun Kim, MD
Jessica Kurian, MD
Matthew P. Lungren, MD, MPH
Helen R. Nadel, MD
Erica Poletto, MD
Richard B. Towbin, MD, FACR
Andrew T. Trout, MD
Esben S. Vogelius, MD

Alexander M. Norbash, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Neuroradiology

Richard A. Barth, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Pediatric Radiology

Jacqueline Anne Bello, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Quality and Safety

Mary S. Newell, MD, FACR, Chair, Committee on Practice Parameters and Technical Standards

Comments Reconciliation Committee

Catherine J. Everett, MD, MBA, Chair
Elaine R. Lewis, MD, FACR, Co-Chair
Richard A. Barth, MD, FACR
Jacqueline Anne Bello, MD, FACR
Kristine A. Blackham, MD
Timothy N. Booth, MD
Amanda S. Corey, MD, FACR
Richard Duszak Jr., MD, FACR
Steven W. Hetts, MD
John E. Jordan, MD, FACR
David A. Joyner, MD

Paul A. Larson, MD, FACR
Terry L. Levin, MD, FACR
Neel Madan, MD
Mary S. Newell, MD, FACR
Beverly Newman, MB, BCh, BSc, FACR
Alexander M. Norbash, MD, FACR
Susan Palasis, MD
Sumit Pruthi, MBBS
Rupa Radhakrishnan, MBBS, MS
Michael I. Rothman, MD, FACR
Achint K. Singh, MD

REFERENCES

1. American College of Radiology. ACR Manual on Contrast Media. Available at: <https://www.acr.org/Clinical-Resources/Contrast-Manual>. Accessed September 3, 2019.
2. Harden SP, Dey C, Gawne-Cain ML. Cranial CT of the unconscious adult patient. *Clin Radiol* 2007;62:404-15.
3. Hijaz TA, Cento EA, Walker MT. Imaging of head trauma. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2011;49:81-103.
4. Jacobs B, Beems T, van der Vliet TM, Diaz-Arrastia RR, Borm GF, Vos PE. Computed tomography and outcome in moderate and severe traumatic brain injury: hematoma volume and midline shift revisited. *J Neurotrauma* 2011;28:203-15.
5. Miller MT, Pasquale M, Kurek S, et al. Initial head computed tomographic scan characteristics have a linear relationship with initial intracranial pressure after trauma. *J Trauma* 2004;56:967-72; discussion 72-3.
6. Schachar JL, Zampolin RL, Miller TS, Farinhas JM, Freeman K, Taragin BH. External validation of the New Orleans Criteria (NOC), the Canadian CT Head Rule (CCHR) and the National Emergency X-Radiography Utilization Study II (NEXUS II) for CT scanning in pediatric patients with minor head injury in a non-trauma center. *Pediatr Radiol* 2011;41:971-9.
7. Mohan S, Rogan EA, Batty R, et al. CT of the neonatal head. *Clin Radiol* 2013;68:1155-66.
8. Perry JJ, Stiell IG, Sivilotti ML, et al. Clinical decision rules to rule out subarachnoid hemorrhage for acute headache. *JAMA* 2013;310:1248-55.
9. Perry JJ, Sivilotti ML, Sutherland J, et al. Validation of the Ottawa Subarachnoid Hemorrhage Rule in patients with acute headache. *CMAJ* 2017;189:E1379-E85.
10. Akpinar E. The tram-track sign: cortical calcifications. *Radiology* 2004;231:515-6.
11. Jung JM, Lee JY, Phi JH, et al. Value of routine immediate postoperative brain computerized tomography in pediatric neurosurgical patients. *Childs Nerv Syst* 2012;28:673-9.
12. Tamrazi B, Almast J. Your brain on drugs: imaging of drug-related changes in the central nervous system. *Radiographics* 2012;32:701-19.
13. Martin-Santos R, Fagundo AB, Crippa JA, et al. Neuroimaging in cannabis use: a systematic review of the literature. *Psychol Med* 2010;40:383-98.
14. Taheri MS, Moghaddam HH, Moharamzad Y, Dadgari S, Nahvi V. The value of brain CT findings in acute methanol toxicity. *Eur J Radiol* 2010;73:211-4.
15. Winklhofer S, Surer E, Ampanozi G, et al. Post-mortem whole body computed tomography of opioid (heroin and methadone) fatalities: frequent findings and comparison to autopsy. *Eur Radiol* 2014.
16. Buethe J, Nazarian J, Kalisz K, Wintermark M. Neuroimaging Wisely. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2016;37:2182-88.
17. Patterson BW, Pang PS, AlKhawam L, et al. The Association Between Use of Brain CT for Atraumatic Headache and 30-Day Emergency Department Revisitation. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2016;207:W117-W24.
18. Kawano H, Hirano T, Nakajima M, Inatomi Y, Yonehara T. Diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging may underestimate acute ischemic lesions: cautions on neglecting a computed tomography-diffusion-weighted imaging discrepancy. *Stroke* 2013;44:1056-61.
19. Giesemann AM, Kontorinis G, Jan Z, Lenarz T, Lanfermann H, Goetz F. The vestibulocochlear nerve: aplasia and hypoplasia in combination with inner ear malformations. *Eur Radiol* 2012;22:519-24.
20. Joshi VM, Navlekar SK, Kishore GR, Reddy KJ, Kumar EC. CT and MR imaging of the inner ear and brain in children with congenital sensorineural hearing loss. *Radiographics* 2012;32:683-98.
21. Miyasaka M, Nosaka S, Morimoto N, Taiji H, Masaki H. CT and MR imaging for pediatric cochlear implantation: emphasis on the relationship between the cochlear nerve canal and the cochlear nerve. *Pediatr Radiol* 2010;40:1509-16.
22. Kaczmarczyk K, Wit A, Krawczyk M, Zaborski J, Gajewski J. Associations between gait patterns, brain lesion factors and functional recovery in stroke patients. *Gait Posture* 2012;35:214-7.
23. Mullins ME. Emergent neuroimaging of intracranial infection/inflammation. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2011;49:47-62.

24. Bhalla A, Suri V, Singh P, Varma S, Khandelwal N. Imaging in adult patients with acute febrile encephalopathy: what is better computerized tomography or magnetic resonance imaging. *Indian J Med Sci* 2011;65:193-202.
25. Dung NM, Turtle L, Chong WK, et al. An evaluation of the usefulness of neuroimaging for the diagnosis of Japanese encephalitis. *J Neurol* 2009;256:2052-60.
26. Garcia HH, Gonzalez AE, Rodriguez S, et al. Neurocysticercosis: unraveling the nature of the single cysticercal granuloma. *Neurology* 2010;75:654-8.
27. Rath TJ, Hughes M, Arabi M, Shah GV. Imaging of cerebritis, encephalitis, and brain abscess. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2012;22:585-607.
28. Toma AK, Holl E, Kitchen ND, Watkins LD. Evans' index revisited: the need for an alternative in normal pressure hydrocephalus. *Neurosurgery* 2011;68:939-44.
29. Sivaganesan A, Krishnamurthy R, Sahni D, Viswanathan C. Neuroimaging of ventriculoperitoneal shunt complications in children. *Pediatr Radiol* 2012;42:1029-46.
30. Abdel-Salam GM, Zaki MS, Saleem SN, Gaber KR. Microcephaly, malformation of brain development and intracranial calcification in sibs: pseudo-TORCH or a new syndrome. *Am J Med Genet A* 2008;146A:2929-36.
31. Rao P, Bekhit E, Ramanauskas F, Kumbla S. CT head in children. *Eur J Radiol* 2013;82:1050-8.
32. Chen Q, Chen XZ, Wang JM, Li SW, Jiang T, Dai JP. Intracranial meningeal hemangiopericytomas in children and adolescents: CT and MR imaging findings. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2012;33:195-9.
33. Eran A, Ozturk A, Aygun N, Izbudak I. Medulloblastoma: atypical CT and MRI findings in children. *Pediatr Radiol* 2010;40:1254-62.
34. Han L, Qiu Y, Xie C, et al. Atypical teratoid/rhabdoid tumors in adult patients: CT and MR imaging features. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2011;32:103-8.
35. Prabhakar R, Haresh KP, Ganesh T, Joshi RC, Julka PK, Rath GK. Comparison of computed tomography and magnetic resonance based target volume in brain tumors. *J Cancer Res Ther* 2007;3:121-3.
36. Skogen K, Ganeshan B, Good C, Critchley G, Miles K. Measurements of heterogeneity in gliomas on computed tomography relationship to tumour grade. *J Neurooncol* 2013;111:213-9.
37. D'Haese PF, Pallavaram S, Konrad PE, Neimat J, Fitzpatrick JM, Dawant BM. Clinical accuracy of a customized stereotactic platform for deep brain stimulation after accounting for brain shift. *Stereotact Funct Neurosurg* 2010;88:81-7.
38. Hebb AO, Miller KJ. Semi-automatic stereotactic coordinate identification algorithm for routine localization of Deep Brain Stimulation electrodes. *J Neurosci Methods* 2010;187:114-9.
39. Holloway K, Docef A. A quantitative assessment of the accuracy and reliability of O-arm images for deep brain stimulation surgery. *Neurosurgery* 2013;72:47-57.
40. Lefranc M, Le Gars D. Robotic implantation of deep brain stimulation leads, assisted by intra-operative, flat-panel CT. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 2012;154:2069-74.
41. Marsh JC, Giolda BT, Herskovic AM, Wendt JA, Turian JV. Sparing of the hippocampus and limbic circuit during whole brain radiation therapy: A dosimetric study using helical tomotherapy. *J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol* 2010;54:375-82.
42. Meshkini A, Shahzadi S, Zali A, Parsa K, Afrough A, Hamdi A. Computed tomography-guided stereotactic biopsy of intracranial lesions in pediatric patients. *Childs Nerv Syst* 2011;27:2145-8.
43. Pallavaram S, Dawant BM, Remple MS, et al. Effect of brain shift on the creation of functional atlases for deep brain stimulation surgery. *Int J Comput Assist Radiol Surg* 2010;5:221-8.
44. Ruijters D, Homan R, Mielekamp P, van de Haar P, Babic D. Validation of 3D multimodality roadmapping in interventional neuroradiology. *Phys Med Biol* 2011;56:5335-54.
45. Uhl E, Zausinger S, Morhard D, et al. Intraoperative computed tomography with integrated navigation system in a multidisciplinary operating suite. *Neurosurgery* 2009;64:231-9; discussion 39-40.
46. Barnes PD. Imaging of nonaccidental injury and the mimics: issues and controversies in the era of evidence-based medicine. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2011;49:205-29.
47. Levy AD, Harcke HT, Mallak CT. Postmortem imaging: MDCT features of postmortem change and decomposition. *Am J Forensic Med Pathol* 2010;31:12-7.
48. Tartaglione T, Filograna L, Roiati S, Guglielmi G, Colosimo C, Bonomo L. Importance of 3D-CT imaging in single-bullet cranioencephalic gunshot wounds. *Radiol Med* 2012;117:461-70.

49. American College of Radiology. Appropriateness Criteria Head Trauma. Available at: https://acsearch.acr.org/list?_ga=2.180636839.1626114966.1559757889-776476691.1557404508. Accessed June 5, 2019.
50. Gelfand JM, Wintermark M, Josephson SA. Cerebral perfusion-CT patterns following seizure. *Eur J Neurol* 2010;17:594-601.
51. Hess CP, Barkovich AJ. Seizures: emergency neuroimaging. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2010;20:619-37.
52. Hsieh DT, Chang T, Tsuchida TN, et al. New-onset afebrile seizures in infants: role of neuroimaging. *Neurology* 2010;74:150-6.
53. Nair PP, Kalita J, Misra UK. Role of cranial imaging in epileptic status. *Eur J Radiol* 2009;70:475-80.
54. Phuttharak W, Sawanyawisuth K, Kawiungsanon A, Tiamkao S. The appropriate neuroimaging study in persons with epilepsy. *Neurol Sci* 2011;32:969-71.
55. Harder S, Gourgaris A, Frangou E, et al. Clinical and neuroimaging findings of Cree leukodystrophy: a retrospective case series. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2010;31:1418-23.
56. Koob M, Laugel V, Durand M, et al. Neuroimaging in Cockayne syndrome. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2010;31:1623-30.
57. Tang Z, Pi X, Chen F, et al. Fifty percent reduced-dose cerebral CT perfusion imaging of Alzheimer's disease: regional blood flow abnormalities. *Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Dement* 2012;27:267-74.
58. Olesen PJ, Guo X, Gustafson D, et al. A population-based study on the influence of brain atrophy on 20-year survival after age 85. *Neurology* 2011;76:879-86.
59. Shevell M, Ashwal S, Donley D, et al. Practice parameter: evaluation of the child with global developmental delay: report of the Quality Standards Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology and The Practice Committee of the Child Neurology Society. *Neurology* 2003;60:367-80.
60. Khandanpour N, Hoggard N, Connolly DJ. The role of MRI and CT of the brain in first episodes of psychosis. *Clin Radiol* 2013;68:245-50.
61. American College of Radiology. ACR–SPR practice parameter for imaging pregnant or potentially pregnant adolescents and women with ionizing radiation Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Pregnant-Pts.pdf?la=en>. Accessed January 23, 2019.
62. American College of Radiology. ACR practice parameter for performing and interpreting diagnostic computed tomography (CT) Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CT-Perf-Interpret.pdf?la=en>. Accessed January 23, 2019.
63. O'Hora L, Foley SJ. Iterative reconstruction and automatic tube voltage selection reduce clinical CT radiation doses and image noise. *Radiography (Lond)* 2018;24:28-32.
64. Brady Z, Ramanauskas F, Cain TM, Johnston PN. Assessment of paediatric CT dose indicators for the purpose of optimisation. *Br J Radiol* 2012;85:1488-98.
65. Diekmann S, Siebert E, Juran R, et al. Dose exposure of patients undergoing comprehensive stroke imaging by multidetector-row CT: comparison of 320-detector row and 64-detector row CT scanners. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2010;31:1003-9.
66. Hoang JK, Wang C, Frush DP, et al. Estimation of radiation exposure for brain perfusion CT: standard protocol compared with deviations in protocol. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2013;201:W730-4.
67. Mahesh M, Scatarige JC, Cooper J, Fishman EK. Dose and pitch relationship for a particular multislice CT scanner. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2001;177:1273-5.
68. Perisinakis K, Seimenis I, Tzedakis A, Papadakis AE, Damilakis J. The effect of head size, shape, miscentering, and bowtie filter on peak patient tissue doses from modern brain perfusion 256-slice CT: how can we minimize the risk for deterministic effects? *Med Phys* 2013;40:011911.
69. Reimann AJ, Davison C, Bjarnason T, et al. Organ-based computed tomographic (CT) radiation dose reduction to the lenses: impact on image quality for CT of the head. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2012;36:334-8.
70. Vorona GA, Zuccoli G, Sutcavage T, Clayton BL, Ceschin RC, Panigrahy A. The use of adaptive statistical iterative reconstruction in pediatric head CT: a feasibility study. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2013;34:205-11.
71. Yamauchi-Kawara C, Fujii K, Aoyama T, Yamauchi M, Koyama S. Radiation dose evaluation in multidetector-row CT imaging for acute stroke with an anthropomorphic phantom. *Br J Radiol* 2010;83:1029-41.

72. Kilic K, Erbas G, Guryildirim M, et al. Quantitative and qualitative comparison of standard-dose and low-dose pediatric head computed tomography: a retrospective study assessing the effect of adaptive statistical iterative reconstruction. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2013;37:377-81.
73. Ertl-Wagner B, Eftimov L, Blume J, et al. Cranial CT with 64-, 16-, 4- and single-slice CT systems-comparison of image quality and posterior fossa artifacts in routine brain imaging with standard protocols. *Eur Radiol* 2008;18:1720-6.
74. Jones TR, Kaplan RT, Lane B, Atlas SW, Rubin GD. Single- versus multi-detector row CT of the brain: quality assessment. *Radiology* 2001;219:750-5.
75. American Association of Physicists in Medicine. Adult routine head CT protocols. Available at: <https://www.aapm.org/pubs/ctprotocols/documents/adultroutineheadct.pdf>. Accessed June 5, 2019.
76. American College of Radiology. ACR–SPR practice parameter for the use of intravascular contrast media Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/IVCM.pdf?la=en>. Accessed January 23, 2019.
77. American College of Radiology. ACR–ASNR–SPR practice parameter for the performance of myelography and cisternography. Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Myelog-Cisternog.pdf?la=en>. Accessed January 23, 2019.
78. Adeshina AM, Hashim R, Khalid NE, Abidin SZ. Multimodal 3-D reconstruction of human anatomical structures using SurLens Visualization System. *Interdiscip Sci* 2013;5:23-36.
79. Campbell BC, Christensen S, Levi CR, et al. Cerebral blood flow is the optimal CT perfusion parameter for assessing infarct core. *Stroke* 2011;42:3435-40.
80. Chen W, Belle A, Cockrell C, Ward KR, Najarian K. Automated midline shift and intracranial pressure estimation based on brain CT images. *J Vis Exp* 2013.
81. Friedman JA, Goerss SJ, Meyer FB, et al. Volumetric quantification of Fisher Grade 3 aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage: a novel method to predict symptomatic vasospasm on admission computerized tomography scans. *J Neurosurg* 2002;97:401-7.
82. Gupta V, Ambrosius W, Qian G, et al. Automatic segmentation of cerebrospinal fluid, white and gray matter in unenhanced computed tomography images. *Acad Radiol* 2010;17:1350-8.
83. Hanson EH, Roach CJ, Day KJ, et al. Assessment of the tracer delay effect in whole-brain computed tomography perfusion: results in patients without known neuroanatomic abnormalities. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2013;37:212-21.
84. Hoeffner EG, Quint DJ, Peterson B, Rosenthal E, Goodsitt M. Development of a protocol for coronal reconstruction of the maxillofacial region from axial helical CT data. *Br J Radiol* 2001;74:323-7.
85. Kamiya K, Kunitatsu A, Mori H, et al. Preliminary report on virtual monochromatic spectral imaging with fast kVp switching dual energy head CT: comparable image quality to that of 120-kVp CT without increasing the radiation dose. *Jpn J Radiol* 2013;31:293-8.
86. Kim JH, Nuyts J, Kuncic Z, Fulton R. The feasibility of head motion tracking in helical CT: a step toward motion correction. *Med Phys* 2013;40:041903.
87. Matsumoto M, Kodama N, Endo Y, et al. Dynamic 3D-CT angiography. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2007;28:299-304.
88. Milchenko M, Marcus D. Obscuring surface anatomy in volumetric imaging data. *Neuroinformatics* 2013;11:65-75.
89. Murayama K, Katada K, Nakane M, et al. Whole-brain perfusion CT performed with a prototype 256-detector row CT system: initial experience. *Radiology* 2009;250:202-11.
90. Nowinski WL, Puspitasari F, Volkau I, Orrison WW, Jr., Knopp MV. Quantification of the human cerebrovasculature: a 7Tesla and 320-row CT in vivo study. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2013;37:117-22.
91. Ono Y, Abe K, Suzuki K, et al. Usefulness of 4D-CTA in the detection of cerebral dural sinus occlusion or stenosis with collateral pathways. *Neuroradiol J* 2013;26:428-38.
92. Phan CM, Yoo AJ, Hirsch JA, Nogueira RG, Gupta R. Differentiation of hemorrhage from iodinated contrast in different intracranial compartments using dual-energy head CT. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2012;33:1088-94.
93. Qian X, Wang J, Guo S, Li Q. An active contour model for medical image segmentation with application to brain CT image. *Med Phys* 2013;40:021911.
94. Rorden C, Bonilha L, Fridriksson J, Bender B, Karnath HO. Age-specific CT and MRI templates for spatial normalization. *Neuroimage* 2012;61:957-65.

95. American College of Radiology. ACR–ASNR–SPR practice parameter for the performance of computed tomography (CT) perfusion in neuroradiologic imaging Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CT-Perfusion.pdf?la=en>. Accessed January 23, 2019.
96. American College of Radiology. ACR–ASNR–SPR practice parameter for the performance and interpretation of cervicocerebral computed tomography angiography (CTA) Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CervicoCerebralCTA.pdf?la=en>. Accessed January 23, 2019.
97. American College of Radiology. ACR practice parameter for communication of diagnostic imaging findings Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CommunicationDiag.pdf?la=en>. Accessed January 23, 2019.
98. American College of Radiology. ACR–AAPM technical standard for diagnostic medical physics performance monitoring of computed tomography (CT) equipment Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CT-Equip.pdf?la=en>. Accessed January 23, 2019.
99. Habibzadeh MA, Ay MR, Asl AR, Ghadiri H, Zaidi H. Impact of miscentering on patient dose and image noise in x-ray CT imaging: phantom and clinical studies. *Phys Med* 2012;28:191-9.
100. Trattner S, Pearson GDN, Chin C, et al. Standardization and optimization of CT protocols to achieve low dose. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2014;11:271-78.
101. Kanal KM, Butler PF, Sengupta D, Bhargavan-Chatfield M, Coombs LP, Morin RL. U.S. Diagnostic Reference Levels and Achievable Doses for 10 Adult CT Examinations. *Radiology* 2017;284:120-33.
102. American College of Radiology. ACR–AAPM–SPR practice parameter for diagnostic reference levels and achievable doses in medical x-ray imaging Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Diag-Ref-Levels.pdf?la=en>. Accessed June 5, 2019.
103. Al Mahrooqi KMS, Ng CKC, Sun Z. Pediatric Computed Tomography Dose Optimization Strategies: A Literature Review. *J Med Imaging Radiat Sci* 2015;46:241-49.
104. Ryan ME, Jaju A, Ciolino JD, Alden T. Rapid MRI evaluation of acute intracranial hemorrhage in pediatric head trauma. *Neuroradiology* 2016;58:793-9.
105. American Association of Physicists in Medicine. AAPM position statement on the use of bismuth shielding for the purpose of dose reduction in CT scanning. Available at: <https://www.aapm.org/publicgeneral/BismuthShielding.pdf>. Accessed July 17, 2019.
106. Jhaveri KS, Saini S, Levine LA, et al. Effect of multislice CT technology on scanner productivity. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2001;177:769-72.
107. Jordan MJ, Lightfoote JB, Jordan JE. Quality outcomes of reinterpretation of brain CT imaging studies by subspecialty experts in neuroradiology. *J Natl Med Assoc* 2006;98:1326-8.
108. Jordan YJ, Jordan JE, Lightfoote JB, Ragland KD. Quality outcomes of reinterpretation of brain CT studies by subspecialty experts in stroke imaging. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2012;199:1365-70.
109. Korn A, Fenchel M, Bender B, et al. Iterative reconstruction in head CT: image quality of routine and low-dose protocols in comparison with standard filtered back-projection. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2012;33:218-24.
110. Nelson DW, Nystrom H, MacCallum RM, et al. Extended analysis of early computed tomography scans of traumatic brain injured patients and relations to outcome. *J Neurotrauma* 2010;27:51-64.
111. Rapalino O, Kamalian S, Payabvash S, et al. Cranial CT with adaptive statistical iterative reconstruction: improved image quality with concomitant radiation dose reduction. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2012;33:609-15.
112. Ren Q, Dewan SK, Li M, et al. Comparison of adaptive statistical iterative and filtered back projection reconstruction techniques in brain CT. *Eur J Radiol* 2012;81:2597-601.
113. Tan JS, Tan KL, Lee JC, Wan CM, Leong JL, Chan LL. Comparison of eye lens dose on neuroimaging protocols between 16- and 64-section multidetector CT: achieving the lowest possible dose. *AJNR. American journal of neuroradiology* 2009;30:373-7.
114. You JJ, Gladstone J, Symons S, Rotstein D, Laupacis A, Bell CM. Patterns of care and outcomes after computed tomography scans for headache. *Am J Med* 2011;124:58-63 e1.

*Practice parameters and technical standards are published annually with an effective date of October 1 in the year in which amended, revised, or approved by the ACR Council. For practice parameters and technical standards published before 1999, the effective date was January 1 following the year in which the practice parameter or technical standard was amended, revised, or approved by the ACR Council.

Development Chronology for this Practice Parameter

2004 (Resolution 32)

Amended 2006 (Resolution 17, 35)

Revised 2009 (Resolution 27)

Revised 2010 (Resolution 12)

Amended 2014 (Resolution 39)

Revised 2015 (Resolution 20)

Revised 2020 (Resolution 44)