Revised 2018 (Resolution 7)*

ACR–SCBT-MR–SPR–STR PRACTICE PARAMETER FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF THORACIC COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY (CT)

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 care[1]. 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, ___ N.W.2d ___ (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 Society of Computed Body Tomography and Magnetic Resonance (SCBT-MR), the Society for Pediatric Radiology (SPR), and the Society of Thoracic Radiology (STR).

Computed tomography (CT) is a frequently used imaging modality for the diagnosis and evaluation of many thoracic diseases. Optimal performance of thoracic CT requires knowledge of normal anatomy, anatomic variants, pathophysiology, CT techniques, and the associated risks. This practice parameter outlines the principles for performing high-quality thoracic CT in adults and children.

The goal of thoracic CT is to demonstrate normal and pathologic anatomy and physiology within the chest.

II. INDICATIONS AND CONTRAINDICATIONS

A. Thoracic CT may be a complementary examination to other imaging studies such as chest radiography (see the ACR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Chest Radiography) or a stand-alone procedure. Indications for the use of thoracic CT include, but are not limited to [1]:

1. Evaluation of abnormalities discovered on other imaging modalities, including chest radiography [2]
2. Screening for lung cancer [3]
3. Staging and follow-up of lung cancer and other primary thoracic malignancies, and detection and evaluation of metastatic disease [4-7]
4. Evaluation of cardiothoracic manifestations of known extrathoracic diseases [8-11]
5. Evaluation of known or suspected thoracic cardiovascular abnormalities (congenital or acquired), including aortic stenosis, aortic aneurysms, and dissection [12-14]
6. Evaluation of suspected acute or chronic pulmonary emboli [15-24]
7. Evaluation of suspected pulmonary arterial hypertension [25]
8. Evaluation and follow-up of pulmonary parenchymal and airway disease [28-35]
9. Evaluation of blunt and penetrating trauma [36,37]
10. Performance of CT-guided interventional procedures [40-43]
11. Evaluation of the chest wall [44-46]
12. Evaluation of pleural disease [47,48]
13. Evaluation of the mediastinum
14. Treatment planning for surgical or radiation therapy [49,50]
15. Evaluation of medical complications in the intensive care unit or other settings [51,52]
16. Evaluation of postoperative patients and surgical complications [38,39,53]
17. Identification and location of devices within the lungs and cardiovascular system

B. For more details regarding the use of low-dose CT in screening for lung cancer, see the ACR–STR Practice Parameter for the Performance and Reporting of Lung Cancer Screening Thoracic Computed Tomography (CT) [54].

C. For more details regarding the use of CT in assessing a variety of pulmonary diseases, see the ACR–STR Practice Parameter for the Performance of High-Resolution Computed Tomography (HRCT) of the Lungs in Adults [55].

D. There are no absolute contraindications to thoracic CT. As with all procedures, the relative benefits and risks of the procedure should be evaluated prior to the performance of thoracic CT, with or without the administration of intravenous iodinated contrast or oral contrast media. (See the ACR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Use of Intravascular Contrast Media and the ACR Manual on Contrast Media [56,57].) Appropriate precautions should be taken to minimize patient risks, including radiation exposure [58,59]. Iterative reconstruction algorithms and automatic exposure control techniques including tube current modulation and automatic kV selection, if available, are valuable for this purpose [60-62].

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](#) [63].

III.   QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

See the [ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Diagnostic Computed Tomography (CT)](#) [64].

IV.   SPECIFICATIONS OF THE EXAMINATION

A. The written or electronic request for a thoracic CT examination 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. (ACR Resolution 35, adopted in 2006 – revised in 2016, Resolution 12-b)

B. A typical CT of the thorax should include axial images from the lung apices to the posterior costophrenic sulci usually reconstructed at ≤5 mm slice thickness with both soft tissue and a high spatial frequency (lung or bone) reconstruction algorithm. ≤2.5 mm slice thickness is preferable unless volumetric reconstructions are also routinely created. Volumetric images can be reconstructed using <2 mm slice thickness with a high spatial frequency reconstruction algorithm. Sagittal and coronal reconstructions at <5 mm are recommended. Contiguous or overlapping transverse maximum intensity projection images with <10 mm slab thickness may be valuable to assess for lung nodules. Computer-aided detection may be helpful for identifying lung nodules and/or pulmonary emboli.

C. During most examinations, scans should be obtained at suspended full inspiration. However, in infants, imaging during quiet free-breathing may be preferable to breath-hold under anesthesia, if rapid (eg, <1 second) acquisition is possible. Cine imaging may be appropriate for evaluating certain disease states such as tracheomalacia [65,66]. Expiratory scans should be included to evaluate for abnormalities such as air-trapping and/or tracheobronchomalacia when suspected. Respiratory-gated CT may be helpful in certain applications such as radiation therapy planning. ECG-synchronizing is valuable for aortic and cardiac imaging. Imaging should be obtained through the entire area of interest [67]. The field of view should be optimized for each patient. Scout topogram images should be transmitted to the PACS for review. A "full field of view" reconstruction may reveal abnormalities (eg, skin) not visible on other series.

D. The examination may be conducted with and/or without intravenous iodinated contrast media as clinically indicated. In children, one scan (single phase) is often enough. (See section VIII, Image Gently®)

E. Anatomically appropriate window and level settings should be used to view the lung parenchyma, mediastinum, vasculature, chest wall, skeletal structures, any visible portions of the lower neck and upper abdomen, and implanted metallic devices. Review on a PACS (picture archiving and communication system) workstation facilitates evaluation of many studies, particularly those with large data sets. Multiplanar viewing is encouraged to facilitate the display of anatomy and pathology, and sliding-slab maximum-intensity projections (MIPs) are encouraged for detecting lung nodules [68,69]. 3-D visualization and/or measurement software may be helpful in certain circumstances.

F.   Although many of the operations of a CT scanner are automated, a number of technical parameters remain operator-dependent. Because these parameters can significantly affect the diagnostic quality of a CT examination, the supervising physician must be familiar with the following:
1.   Radiation exposure factors (mAs, kVp specifically weight based suggested parameters for children) [70,71]
2.   Beam collimation
3.   Acquisition mode, eg, sequential, spiral, or single-shot
4.   Reconstructed section thickness
5.   Table increment and pitch
6.   Acquisition and reconstruction field of view
7.   Window settings (width and center)
8.   Reconstruction algorithm, filter, or kernel
9.   Image reconstruction interval or increment
10. Detector configuration
11. Automatic exposure control (angular and longitudinal tube current modulation) and image quality reference parameter
12. Radiation dose report
13. Reformatted images (MPR, curvilinear, MIP, MinIP, and 3-D surface or volume rendered)
14. Reconstruction techniques such as filtered backprojection or iterative reconstruction
15. Prospective ECG-triggering or retrospective ECG-gating, which is helpful to reduce cardiac or aortic motion artifacts and to visualize cardiovascular structures

G.   Optimizing CT examination technique requires the supervising physician to select an appropriate CT protocol based on careful review of the patient history (including risk factors that might increase the likelihood of adverse reactions to contrast media) and clinical indications, as well as relevant prior imaging studies when available. This optimization process includes determining if the thoracic CT examination is clinically appropriate.

H.   Protocols may be prepared according to region of interest and clinical indication. Techniques should be selected that provide image quality consistent with the diagnostic needs of the examination at optimal radiation dose levels to answer the clinical question(s) posed. For each area of interest or indication, the protocol should indicate the following:

1.   If gastrointestinal contrast material is used, the volume, type, route of administration (oral or via nasogastric or other tube), and the time intervals during which it should be delivered.
2.   If intravenous contrast material is used, the type, volume, rate of administration, and time delay between administration and scan initiation. Bolus tracking or a timing bolus should be used whenever indicated to optimize results.
3.   Detector configuration
4.   Pitch (table increment and feed)
5.   Section thickness
6.   Reconstruction interval or increment
7.   Reconstruction kernel, algorithm, or filter
8.   kVp and effective mAs per section as appropriate for adult or pediatric patients. With tube current modulation, a prescribed image quality with maximum and minimum mAs as appropriate for adult or pediatric patients.
9.   Noise index, noise standard deviation, quality reference mAs, or reference image (image quality reference parameter for automatic tube current modulation), type of reconstruction (filtered back projection versus iterative reconstruction).
10. Superior and inferior extent of the region of interest to be imaged
11. Field of view
12. Protocols for sending images to PACS (eg, section thickness and plane of reformations such as coronal, sagittal, and other oblique projections), and the Medical Image Processing System as needed.
13. 2-D and 3-D reconstructions and measurements where appropriate to further delineate known or suspected abnormalities.

14. For every CT examination, the information in the radiation dose report (CTDI and dose length product) should be retained in the radiological record (such as the PACS, in a radiation dose monitoring software tool, and/or the radiology report) for reference.

These protocols should be reviewed and updated annually, and dated copies should be available to appropriate physicians, radiologic technologists, medical physicists, and administrative personnel at the facility.

I. For all patients, particularly pediatric patients and small adults, efforts should be directed to:

1. Minimize radiation dose when diagnostically feasible by using automatic exposure control techniques that adjust for patient size or by using low mA or kV settings as well as using iterative reconstruction algorithms and tightly restricting the scan range to the body region of clinical concern. X-ray tube current modulation should be considered for retrospectively ECG-gated scans.

   While bismuth shields have been shown to reduce radiation doses, there are several disadvantages associated with their use, especially when used with automatic exposure control (tube current modulation). Other techniques exist that can provide the same level of anterior dose reduction at equivalent or superior image quality without these disadvantages. The AAPM recommends that these alternatives to bismuth shielding be carefully considered and implemented when possible (see the AAPM Position Statement on the Use of Bismuth Shielding for the Purpose of Dose Reduction in CT Scanning at https://www.aapm.org/publicgeneral/BismuthShielding.pdf [72]).

2. Minimize motion artifact with short scan times (balanced against any changes in mA in order to maintain appropriate mAs) and using appropriate sedation.

J. When sedation is used, it should be administered in accordance with the ACR–SIR Practice Parameter for Sedation/Analgesia [73].

K. The use of dual-energy technique to perform thoracic CT may be valuable in certain instances including assessment of acute and chronic pulmonary emboli, other vascular disorders, lung malignancy, and parenchymal disease [74].

V. DOCUMENTATION

Reporting should be in accordance with the ACR Practice Parameter for Communication of Diagnostic Imaging Findings [75].

VI. EQUIPMENT SPECIFICATIONS

A. Performance Guidelines

To achieve acceptable clinical CT scans of the thorax, a CT scanner should meet or exceed the following capabilities:

1. Multidetector acquisition
2. Scan rotation time: ≤1 sec
3. Acquired slice thickness: ≤2 mm
4. Limiting spatial resolution: ≥8 lp/cm for ≥32-cm display field of view (DFOV) and ≥10 lp/cm for <24-cm DFOV
5. Capable of performing a low-dose lung CT of <3 mSv for standard size patient.

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

C. Images should be available on a PACS workstation for review by the radiologist. Remote viewing of images should also be available to authorized health care providers. Equipment should be capable of providing a digital means of conveying the data set.

VII. EQUIPMENT QUALITY CONTROL

The quality control program for CT equipment should be designed to minimize patient, personnel, and public radiation risks and to maximize the quality of the diagnostic information. The program should be supervised by a Qualified Medical Physicist. Each imaging facility should have documented policies and procedures that include:

1. A list of tests to be performed and the frequency of performance.
2. A list identifying which individual or group will perform the tests.
3. A written description of the procedure that will be used for each test, including the technique factors to be employed, the equipment to be used for testing, the acceptability limits of each test, and sample records from each test.
4. Periodic tests for CT technologists to ensure that they understand CT principles and are complying with dose reduction protocols for multidetector CT imaging.

VIII. 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.

Nationally developed guidelines, such as the ACR Appropriateness Criteria®, should be used to help choose the most appropriate imaging procedures to prevent unwarranted radiation exposure.

Facilities should have and adhere to policies and procedures that require varying ionizing radiation examination protocols (plain radiography, fluoroscopy, interventional radiology, CT) to take into account patient body habitus (such as patient dimensions, weight, or body mass index) to optimize the relationship between minimal radiation dose and adequate image quality. Automated dose reduction technologies available on imaging equipment should be used whenever appropriate. If such technology is not available, appropriate manual techniques should be used.

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).

A Qualified Medical Physicist and radiologist together should verify that any dose reduction devices or utilities maintain acceptable image quality while actually reducing radiation dose.

Dose estimates for typical examinations should be compared to reference levels described in the ACR–AAPM Practice Parameter for Diagnostic Reference Levels in Medical X-Ray Imaging [76].

IX.   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 *Position Statement on QC & Improvement, Safety, Infection Control, and Patient Education* on the ACR website (https://www.acr.org/Clinical-Resources/Practice-Parameters-and-Technical-Standards).

For specific issues regarding CT quality control, see the ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Computed Tomography (CT) [64].

Equipment performance monitoring should be in accordance with the ACR–AAPM Technical Standard for Diagnostic Medical Physics Performance Monitoring of Computed Tomography (CT) Equipment [77].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

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

ACR
Charles S. White, MD, FACR, Chair
Cristopher A. Meyer, MD, FACR
Beverley Newman, MB, BCh, BSc, FACR
Shawn D. Teague, MD, FACR

SCBT-MR
Ella A. Kazerooni, MD, FACR
Geoffrey D. Rubin, MD, MBA, FACR

SPR
Monica S. Epelman, MD
Maryam G. Mahani, MD
Evan J. Zucker, MD

STR
Paul P. Cronin, MB, BCh, BAO, FACR

Committee on Body Imaging (Thoracic)
(ACR Committee responsible for sponsoring the draft through the process)

Lynn Broderick, MD, FACR, Chair
William C. Black, MD
Daniel W. Brown, MD
Stuart L. Cohen, MD
Andetta R. Hunsaker, MD
Negar Knowles, MD

Elizabeth Lee, MD
Ann N. Leung, MD
Cristopher A. Meyer, MD, FACR
Reginald F. Munden, MD, DMD, MBA, FACR
Shawn D. Teague, MD, FACR
Charles S. White, MD, FACR

REFERENCES

1. American College of Radiology. ACR–SPR–STR practice parameter for the performance of chest radiography. 2017; Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/ChestRad.pdf. Accessed December 22, 2016.
2. Marshall GB, Farnquist BA, MacGregor JH, Burrowes PW. Signs in thoracic imaging. *J Thorac Imaging.* 2006;21(1):76-90.
3. National Lung Screening Trial Research T, Aberle DR, Adams AM, et al. Reduced lung-cancer mortality with low-dose computed tomographic screening. *N Engl J Med.* 2011;365(5):395-409.
4. Aberle DR, Adams AM, Berg CD, et al. Reduced lung-cancer mortality with low-dose computed tomographic screening. *N Engl J Med.* 2011;365(5):395-409.
5. Galvin JR, Franks TJ. Smoking-related lung disease. *J Thorac Imaging.* 2009;24(4):274-284.
6. Poeppel TD, Krause BJ, Heusner TA, Boy C, Bockisch A, Antoch G. PET/CT for the staging and follow-up of patients with malignancies. *Eur J Radiol.* 2009;70(3):382-392.
7. UyBico SJ, Wu CC, Suh RD, Le NH, Brown K, Krishnam MS. Lung cancer staging essentials: the new TNM staging system and potential imaging pitfalls. *Radiographics.* 2010;30(5):1163-1181.
8. Garcia-Pena P, Boixadera H, Barber I, Toran N, Lucaya J, Enriquez G. Thoracic findings of systemic diseases at high-resolution CT in children. *Radiographics.* 2011;31(2):465-482.
9. Lynch DA. Lung disease related to collagen vascular disease. *J Thorac Imaging.* 2009;24(4):299-309.
10. Mayberry JP, Primack SL, Muller NL. Thoracic manifestations of systemic autoimmune diseases: radiographic and high-resolution CT findings. *Radiographics.* 2000;20(6):1623-1635.

11. Rockall AG, Rickards D, Shaw PJ. Imaging of the pulmonary manifestations of systemic disease. *Postgrad Med J.* 2001;77(912):621-638.
12. Batra P, Bigoni B, Manning J, et al. Pitfalls in the diagnosis of thoracic aortic dissection at CT angiography. *Radiographics.* 2000;20(2):309-320.
13. Chao CP, Walker TG, Kalva SP. Natural history and CT appearances of aortic intramural hematoma. *Radiographics.* 2009;29(3):791-804.
14. McMahon MA, Squirrell CA. Multidetector CT of Aortic Dissection: A Pictorial Review. *Radiographics.* 2010;30(2):445-460.
15. Araoz PA, Haramati LB, Mayo JR, Barbosa EJ, Jr., Rybicki FJ, Colletti PM. Panel discussion: pulmonary embolism imaging and outcomes. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2012;198(6):1313-1319.
16. Leung AN, Bull TM, Jaeschke R, et al. An official American Thoracic Society/Society of Thoracic Radiology clinical practice guideline: evaluation of suspected pulmonary embolism in pregnancy. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2011;184(10):1200-1208.
17. Pahade JK, Litmanovich D, Pedrosa I, Romero J, Bankier AA, Boiselle PM. Quality initiatives: imaging pregnant patients with suspected pulmonary embolism: what the radiologist needs to know. *Radiographics.* 2009;29(3):639-654.
18. Schoepf UJ, Costello P. CT angiography for diagnosis of pulmonary embolism: state of the art. *Radiology.* 2004;230(2):329-337.
19. Schuster ME, Fishman JE, Copeland JF, Hatabu H, Boiselle PM. Pulmonary embolism in pregnant patients: a survey of practices and policies for CT pulmonary angiography. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2003;181(6):1495-1498.
20. Wittram C, Maher MM, Yoo AJ, Kalra MK, Shepard JA, McLoud TC. CT angiography of pulmonary embolism: diagnostic criteria and causes of misdiagnosis. *Radiographics.* 2004;24(5):1219-1238.
21. Castaner E, Gallardo X, Ballesteros E, et al. CT diagnosis of chronic pulmonary thromboembolism. *Radiographics.* 2009;29(1):31-50; discussion 50-33.
22. Ghaye B, Ghuysen A, Bruyere PJ, D'Orio V, Dondelinger RF. Can CT pulmonary angiography allow assessment of severity and prognosis in patients presenting with pulmonary embolism? What the radiologist needs to know. *Radiographics.* 2006;26(1):23-39; discussion 39-40.
23. Kang DK, Ramos-Duran L, Schoepf UJ, et al. Reproducibility of CT signs of right ventricular dysfunction in acute pulmonary embolism. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2010;194(6):1500-1506.
24. Wittram C, Kalra MK, Maher MM, Greenfield A, McLoud TC, Shepard JA. Acute and chronic pulmonary emboli: angiography-CT correlation. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2006;186(6 Suppl 2):S421-429.
25. Grosse C, Grosse A. CT findings in diseases associated with pulmonary hypertension: a current review. *Radiographics.* 2010;30(7):1753-1777.
26. Berrocal T, Madrid C, Novo S, Gutierrez J, Arjonilla A, Gomez-Leon N. Congenital anomalies of the tracheobronchial tree, lung, and mediastinum: embryology, radiology, and pathology. *Radiographics.* 2004;24(1):e17.
27. Biyyam DR, Chapman T, Ferguson MR, Deutsch G, Dighe MK. Congenital lung abnormalities: embryologic features, prenatal diagnosis, and postnatal radiologic-pathologic correlation. *Radiographics.* 2010;30(6):1721-1738.
28. Abbott GF, Rosado-de-Christenson ML, Rossi SE, Suster S. Imaging of small airways disease. *J Thorac Imaging.* 2009;24(4):285-298.
29. Hansell DM, Bankier AA, MacMahon H, McLoud TC, Muller NL, Remy J. Fleischner Society: glossary of terms for thoracic imaging. *Radiology.* 2008;246(3):697-722.
30. Kim KI, Kim CW, Lee MK, et al. Imaging of occupational lung disease. *Radiographics.* 2001;21(6):1371-1391.
31. Marchiori E, Franquet T, Gasparetto TD, Goncalves LP, Escuissato DL. Consolidation with diffuse or focal high attenuation: computed tomography findings. *J Thorac Imaging.* 2008;23(4):298-304.
32. Nguyen ET, Silva CI, Souza CA, Muller NL. Pulmonary complications of illicit drug use: differential diagnosis based on CT findings. *J Thorac Imaging.* 2007;22(2):199-206.
33. Pipavath SN, Schmidt RA, Takasugi JE, Godwin JD. Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: radiology-pathology correlation. *J Thorac Imaging.* 2009;24(3):171-180.
34. Silva CI, Muller NL. Idiopathic interstitial pneumonias. *J Thorac Imaging.* 2009;24(4):260-273.
35. Sirajuddin A, Kanne JP. Occupational lung disease. *J Thorac Imaging.* 2009;24(4):310-320.

36. Morgan TA, Steenburg SD, Siegel EL, Mirvis SE. Acute traumatic aortic injuries: posttherapy multidetector CT findings. *Radiographics.* 2010;30(4):851-867.
37. Thoongsuwan N, Kanne JP, Stern EJ. Spectrum of blunt chest injuries. *J Thorac Imaging.* 2005;20(2):89-97.
38. Chae EJ, Seo JB, Kim SY, et al. Radiographic and CT findings of thoracic complications after pneumonectomy. Radiographics. 2006;26(5):1449-1468.
39. Krishnam MS, Suh RD, Tomasian A, et al. Postoperative complications of lung transplantation: radiologic findings along a time continuum. Radiographics. 2007;27(4):957-974.
40. Ahrar K, Wallace M, Javadi S, Gupta S. Mediastinal, hilar, and pleural image-guided biopsy: current practice and techniques. *Semin Respir Crit Care Med.* 2008;29(4):350-360.
41. Benamore RE, Scott K, Richards CJ, Entwisle JJ. Image-guided pleural biopsy: diagnostic yield and complications. *Clin Radiol.* 2006;61(8):700-705.
42. Klein JS, Schultz S, Heffner JE. Interventional radiology of the chest: image-guided percutaneous drainage of pleural effusions, lung abscess, and pneumothorax. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1995;164(3):581-588.
43. Manhire A, Charig M, Clelland C, et al. Guidelines for radiologically guided lung biopsy. *Thorax.* 2003;58(11):920-936.
44. Jeung MY, Gangi A, Gasser B, et al. Imaging of chest wall disorders. *Radiographics.* 1999;19(3):617-637.
45. Levine BD, Motamedi K, Chow K, Gold RH, Seeger LL. CT of rib lesions. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2009;193(1):5-13.
46. Nam SJ, Kim S, Lim BJ, et al. Imaging of primary chest wall tumors with radiologic-pathologic correlation. *Radiographics.* 2011;31(3):749-770.
47. Benamore R, Warakaulle DR, Traill ZC. Imaging of pleural disease. *Imaging.* 2008:236-251.
48. Walker CM, Takasugi JE, Chung JH, et al. Tumorlike conditions of the pleura. *Radiographics.* 2012;32(4):971-985.
49. Aird EG, Conway J. CT simulation for radiotherapy treatment planning. *Br J Radiol.* 2002;75(900):937-949.
50. McElmurray J, Lu B, Duggan D, Diaz R, Delbeke D. The impact of 18F-FDG PET/CT imaging on radiation treatment planning for patients with non-small cell lung cancer. *J Nucl Med.* 2007.
51. Borjesson J, Latifi A, Friman O, Beckman MO, Oldner A, Labruto F. Accuracy of low-dose chest CT in intensive care patients. *Emerg Radiol.* 2011;18(1):17-21.
52. Rubinowitz A, Smitaman E, Mathur M, Siegel M. Thoracic Radiology in the ICU. *PCCSU.* 2010.
53. Heussel CP, Kauczor HU, Heussel G, Fischer B, Mildenberger P, Thelen M. Early detection of pneumonia in febrile neutropenic patients: use of thin-section CT. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1997;169(5):1347-1353.
54. American College of Radiology. ACR–STR practice parameter for the performance and reporting of lung cancer screening thoracic computed tomography (ct). 2014; Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CT-LungCaScr.pdf. Accessed January 25, 2017.
55. American College of Radiology. ACR–STR practice parameter for the performance of high-resolution computed tomography (hrct) of the lungs in adults. 2015; Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/HRCT-Lungs.pdf. Accessed December 22, 2016.
56. American College of Radiology. ACR–SPR practice parameter for the use of intravascular contrast media. 2012; Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/IVCM.pdf. Accessed December 22, 2016.
57. American College of Radiology. ACR manual on contrast media. 2016; Available at: https://www.acr.org/Clinical-Resources/Contrast-Manual. Accessed December 22, 2016.
58. The Society for Pediatric Radiology. Image Gently. Available at: http://www.imagegently.org/ Accessed March 28, 2017.
59. American College of Radiology. Image Wisely. Available at: http://www.imagewisely.org/ Accessed March 28, 2017.
60. American Association of Physicists in Medicine. AAPM ct lexicon. 2012; Available at: http://www.aapm.org/pubs/CTProtocols/documents/CTTerminologyLexicon.pdf Accessed May 1, 2017.
61. McCollough CH, Bruesewitz MR, Kofler JM, Jr. CT dose reduction and dose management tools: overview of available options. Radiographics. 2006;26(2):503-512.
62. Yu L, Li H, Fletcher JG, McCollough CH. Automatic selection of tube potential for radiation dose reduction in CT: a general strategy. Med Phys. 2010;37(1):234-243.

63. American College of Radiology. ACR–SPR practice parameter for imaging pregnant or potentially pregnant adolescents and women with ionizing radiation. 2013; Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Pregnant-Pts.pdf. Accessed Decemeber 22, 2016.

64. American College of Radiology. ACR practice parameter for performing and interpreting diagnostic computed tomography (ct). 2011; Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CT-Perf-Interpret.pdf. Accessed December 22, 2016.

65. Greenberg SB. Dynamic pulmonary CT of children. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2012;199(2):435-440.

66. Goo HW. Free-breathing cine CT for the diagnosis of tracheomalacia in young children. *Pediatr Radiol.* 2013;43(8):922-928.

67. Liao EA, Quint LE, Goodsitt MM, Francis IR, Khalatbari S, Myles JD. Extra Z-axis coverage at CT imaging resulting in excess radiation dose: frequency, degree, and contributory factors. *J Comput Assist Tomogr.* 2011;35(1):50-56.

68. Gruden JF, Ouanounou S, Tigges S, Norris SD, Klausner TS. Incremental benefit of maximum-intensity-projection images on observer detection of small pulmonary nodules revealed by multidetector CT. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2002;179(1):149-157.

69. Kawel N, Seifert B, Luetolf M, Boehm T. Effect of slab thickness on the CT detection of pulmonary nodules: use of sliding thin-slab maximum intensity projection and volume rendering. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2009;192(5):1324-1329.

70. Nievelstein RA, van Dam IM, van der Molen AJ. Multidetector CT in children: current concepts and dose reduction strategies. *Pediatr Radiol.* 2010;40(8):1324-1344.

71. Strauss KJ, Goske MJ, Towbin AJ, et al. Pediatric Chest CT Diagnostic Reference Ranges: Development and Application. Radiology. 2017;284(1):219-227.

72. American Association of Physicists in Medicine. AAPM position statement on the use of bismuth shileding for the purpose of dose reduction in ct scanning. 2012; Available at: https://www.aapm.org/publicgeneral/BismuthShielding.pdf. Accessed December 22, 2016.

73. American College of Radiology. ACR–SIR practice parameter for sedation/analgesia. 2015; Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Sed-Analgesia.pdf. Accessed December 22, 2016.

74. Lu GM, Zhao Y, Zhang LJ, Schoepf UJ. Dual-energy CT of the lung. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2012;199(5 Suppl):S40-53.

75. American College of Radiology. ACR practice parameter for communication of diagnostic imaging findings. 2014; Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CommunicationDiag.pdf. Accessed December 22, 2016

76. American College of Radiology. ACR–AAPM practice parameter for diagnostic reference levels and achievable doses in medical x-ray imaging. 2013; Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Diag-Ref-Levels.pdf. Accessed December 22, 2016.

77. American College of Radiology. ACR–AAPM technical standard for diagnostic medical physics performance monitoring of computed tomography (ct) equipment. 2012; Available at: https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CT-Equip.pdf. Accessed December 22, 2016.

---

*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
1995 (Resolution 1)
Amended 1995 (Resolution 24, 53)
Revised 1998 (Resolution 4)
Revised 2003 (Resolution 8)
Amended 2006 (Resolution 17, 35)
Revised 2008 (Resolution 23)
Amended 2009 (Resolution 11)
Revised 2013 (Resolution 10)

Amended 2014 (Resolution 39)
Revised 2018 (Resolution 7)