

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 2015 (Resolution 2)*

ACR–SAR–SPR PRACTICE PARAMETER FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING (MRI) OF THE ABDOMEN (Excluding the Liver)

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 cautions 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 physician or medical physicist 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 this Practice Parameter 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 Practice Parameters 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

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.

and safe medical care. The sole purpose of this Practice Parameter is to assist practitioners in achieving this objective.

I. INTRODUCTION

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the abdomen is a proven and useful tool for the evaluation, assessment of severity, and follow-up of diseases of the abdomen. It should be performed only for a valid medical reason. MRI of the abdomen is an evolving technology involving a variety of pulse sequences and protocols that are continuously being modified and improved. Detailed imaging protocols are not presented here to avoid promoting obsolete methodology. This document pertains to the MRI assessment of the abdomen, excluding the liver. For practice parameters pertaining to the liver, see the [ACR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\) of the Liver](#) [1].

The choice of MRI of the abdomen requires an analysis of the strengths of MRI as well as its suitability for the particular patient and particular clinical situation. For characterization of suspected lesions requiring a technique that offers a high degree of soft-tissue contrast (lesion characterization), to provide a multiplanar evaluation of a lesion not well-depicted on other imaging modalities, to provide intravenous contrast-enhanced abdominal imaging in patients who have a contraindication to iodinated contrast media, including allergy or renal dysfunction, and to perform cross-sectional abdominal imaging without ionizing radiation, MRI might be the procedure of choice provided that the patient does not have a contraindication (See section IV below.).

II. INDICATIONS

Indications for MRI of the abdomen (excluding the liver) include, but are not limited to, the following:

A. Pancreas

1. Detection and preoperative assessment of pancreatic neoplasms
2. Characterization of indeterminate lesions and/or unexplained enlargement detected with other imaging modalities
3. Identification of causes of pancreatic duct obstruction, including calculi, stricture, or mass
4. Detection and characterization of pancreatic duct anomalies
5. Evaluation of pancreatic or peripancreatic fluid collections or fistulae
6. Evaluation of chronic pancreatitis including assessment of pancreatic exocrine function; evaluation of complicated acute pancreatitis and associated complications
7. Postoperative/treatment follow-up after pancreatic surgery

B. Spleen

1. Characterization of indeterminate lesions detected with other imaging modalities
2. Detection and characterization of suspected diffuse abnormalities of the spleen
3. Evaluation of suspected accessory splenic tissue

C. Kidneys, Ureters, and Retroperitoneum

1. Detection of renal tumors
2. Characterization of indeterminate lesions detected with other imaging modalities
3. Preoperative assessment of renal neoplasms to include evaluation of the arterial supply, renal vein, and inferior vena cava
4. Evaluation of the urinary tract for abnormalities of anatomy or physiology (MR urography)
5. Postprocedure surveillance after renal tumor ablation or surgical extirpation via partial or complete nephrectomy
6. Evaluation of ureteral abnormalities
7. Evaluation of suspected retroperitoneal fibrosis and other benign lesions
8. Characterization and staging of retroperitoneal malignant neoplasms
9. Evaluation or follow-up of lymphadenopathy
10. Surveillance imaging of the upper urinary tract in patients with urothelial carcinoma
11. Characterization of complex congenital anomalies

12. Identification of causes of urinary tract obstruction

D. Adrenal Glands

1. Detection of suspected pheochromocytoma and functioning adrenal adenoma
2. Characterization of indeterminate lesions detected with other imaging modalities
3. Staging of malignant adrenal neoplasms
4. Detection and characterization of congenital anomalies

E. Vascular (See the [ACR–NASCI–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Body Magnetic Resonance Angiography \(MRA\)](#) [2]).

F. Bile Ducts and Gallbladder

1. Detection, staging, and post-treatment follow-up of bile duct and gallbladder cancer
2. Detection of bile duct or gallbladder stones
3. Evaluation of bile duct dilation and/or narrowing
4. Evaluation of suspected congenital abnormalities of the gallbladder or bile ducts
5. Detection and anatomic delineation of bile leaks

G. Gastrointestinal Tract and Peritoneum

1. Preoperative assessment of gastric neoplasms
2. Detection of small-bowel neoplasms
3. Assessment of inflammatory disorders of the small or large bowel and mesenteries (including MR enterography); for MR enterography, see the [ACR-SAR-SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Magnetic Resonance \(MR\) Enterography](#).
4. Assessment of peritoneal adhesive disease
5. Detection and evaluation of primary and metastatic peritoneal or mesenteric neoplasms
6. Detection and characterization of intra-abdominal fluid collections, as well as follow-up after percutaneous or surgical drainage
7. Evaluation and follow-up of lymphadenopathy

H. Other

1. Imaging follow-up of abnormalities of the abdomen deemed indeterminate on initial MRI and for which surgery is not advised
2. Detection and characterization of extraperitoneal neoplasms other than above
3. Evaluation of the abdomen as an alternative to computed tomography (CT) when radiation exposure is an overriding concern in susceptible patients such as pregnant or pediatric patients or in patients with a contraindication to iodinated contrast agents
4. Assessment of treatment response to medical therapy of malignant neoplasms of the abdomen
5. Determining organ of origin of an indeterminate (benign or malignant) lesion in the abdomen, when the origin is not obvious from other imaging modalities
6. Identification and characterization of vascular malformations (See the [ACR–NASCI–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Body Magnetic Resonance Angiography \(MRA\)](#) [2].)
7. Evaluation of abdominal-wall abnormalities not adequately assessed by other imaging modalities
8. Assessment of traumatic injury of the abdomen when CT is contraindicated

III. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

See the [ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\)](#) [3].

IV. SAFETY GUIDELINES AND POSSIBLE CONTRAINDICATIONS

See the [ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\)](#) [3], the [ACR Guidance Document on MR Safe Practices](#) [4], and the [ACR Manual on Contrast Media](#) [5].

When considering MRI in pediatric patients, thought should be given to the need for sedation and its potential risks in the specific patient population. See the [ACR-SPR Practice Parameter for Performance and Interpretation of Pediatric Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\)](#) [6] and the [ACR-SIR Practice Parameter for Sedation/Analgesia](#) [7].

Peer-reviewed literature pertaining to MR safety should be reviewed on a regular basis [4,8].

V. SPECIFICATIONS OF THE EXAMINATION

The supervising physician must have complete understanding of the indications, risks, and benefits of the examination, as well as alternative imaging procedures. The physician must be familiar with potential hazards associated with MRI, including potential adverse reactions to contrast media. The physician should be familiar with relevant ancillary studies that the patient may have undergone. The physician performing MRI interpretation must have a clear understanding and knowledge of the anatomy and pathophysiology relevant to the MRI examination.

The written or electronic request for MRI of the abdomen 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's scope of practice requirements. (ACR Resolution 35, adopted in 2006)

The supervising physician must also understand the pulse sequences to be used and their effect on the appearance of the images, including the potential generation of image artifacts. Standard imaging protocols may be established and varied on a case-by-case basis when necessary. These protocols should be reviewed and updated periodically.

A. Patient Selection

The physician responsible for the examination should supervise patient selection and preparation and be available in person or by phone for consultation by the technologist performing the examination. Patients and any family members or others who will accompany the patient into the MRI suite must be screened and interviewed prior to the examination, to exclude individuals who may be at risk by exposure to the MR environment. All sites should have an established and documented screening mechanism for establishing MRI compatibility.

Certain indications require administration of intravenous (IV) contrast media. IV contrast enhancement should be performed using appropriate injection protocols and in accordance with the institution's policy on IV contrast use (See the [ACR-SPR Practice Parameter for the Use of Intravascular Contrast Media](#) [9]).

Patients suffering from anxiety or claustrophobia, or who are unable to cooperate or suspend respiration, may require sedation or additional assistance. Administration of sedation may be necessary to achieve a successful examination. If sedation is necessary, refer to the [ACR-SIR Practice Parameter for Sedation/Analgesia](#) [7].

B. Facility Requirements

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 in the patient population.

All sites should employ site-access restrictions, with clear demarcation of safety zones I–IV, utilizing signage and physical barriers as appropriate (See the [ACR Guidance Document on MR Safe Practices: 2013](#) [4]).

C. Examination Technique

A phased array surface coil should be used unless precluded by patient body habitus or condition. In pediatric patients, coil selection will depend on patient size and the region being imaged. In small neonates, a surface coil should be considered, while infants and children may be imaged with a cardiac, torso, or body coil, depending on the size of the abdomen. The field of view should be selected to provide the highest resolution possible that includes the entire region or organ of interest, allows for an adequate signal-to-noise ratio, (SNR), and minimizes relevant artifacts. Multiple acquisitions with repositioning of the surface coil may be necessary when the region of interest exceeds the potential field of view of the surface coil. For most applications, evaluation of the abdomen should include T1-weighted and T2-weighted images. Acquisitions in multiple imaging planes may be beneficial in defining anatomic relationships. For most applications, slice thickness for acquisitions should not exceed 1 cm, with the interslice gap not exceeding 3 mm, although thinner slices and gaps are desirable. In children, slice thicknesses typically range from 3 mm to 8 mm depending on the size of the area to be imaged.

T1-weighted imaging may be performed using an echo train spin-echo (TSE or FSE) or gradient-echo sequence. T2-weighted images may be accomplished using one of the echo train spin-echo sequences (TSE or FSE) or a hybrid gradient and spin-echo (GRASE) technique [10]. Fat suppression is frequently beneficial and may be accomplished using short tau inversion recovery (STIR), chemically selective fat saturation, or spectral presaturation inversion recovery (SPIR), or other forms of fat suppression such as water excitation and chemical shift/Dixon-based techniques [11-13].

Although fast gradient-echo T1-weighted images can usually be acquired during breath-holding, the duration of conventional and fast spin-echo T2-weighted imaging may be too long for complete acquisition during breath-holding. Breath-hold techniques can be used for T2-weighted imaging if the scan time is reduced by a) long echo trains, b) partial-Fourier imaging, c) use of parallel imaging techniques, and/or d) dividing the volume of interest into several smaller volumes that can each be imaged in individual breath-holds. Strategies to reduce respiratory motion during free-breathing image acquisition include respiratory compensation (respiratory ordered phase encoding), respiratory triggering with respiratory bellows, the use of navigator pulses [14,15], and signal averaging. Familiarity with these methods is helpful when scanning young children or other patients, who may not be able to follow breath-hold commands, as well as sedated/anesthetized patients. Other advances that can reduce imaging times and/or correct for motion include the acquisition of k-space data in concentric rectangular strips [16].

Inclusion of at least one in-phase and out-of-phase gradient-echo sequence is useful for detecting intracellular lipid within certain adrenal (eg, adenoma) and renal (eg, clear-cell carcinoma) tumors and to confirm fatty infiltration of organs such as the pancreas [17-21]. The technique can also be useful for the detection of hemosiderin, such as can occur in renal masses, or other sources of susceptibility artifact [22]. A single dual-echo gradient-echo sequence is more effective than separate gradient-echo sequences that differ in echo times since the former will depict the exact same anatomy, without misregistration artifacts. It is essential that the out-of-phase TE is shorter than the in-phase TE, so that signal reduction on the out-of-phase TE will be unambiguous evidence of lipid content. Breath-held dual-echo sequences are generally preferable. These may be either T1-weighted or proton density-weighted sequences.

Three-dimensional (3-D) techniques are available for both T1-weighted and T2-weighted imaging. Numerous advantages over 2-D sequences include higher inherent SNR, higher in-plane and through-plane resolution, and homogenous fat suppression, most of which are better realized in T1-weighted imaging. Isotropic voxel dimensions allow multiplanar reconstructions that may obviate the need for additional acquisition in other planes. Several publications have illustrated the value of T2-weighted 3-D imaging for the depiction of complex anatomy and volumetric imaging [23-25].

Intravenous contrast enhancement with gadolinium chelates is beneficial to detect and characterize many intra-abdominal neoplasms, vascular abnormalities, and inflammatory processes. However, the use of gadolinium may be omitted when noncontrast images are sufficiently diagnostic if, in the opinion of the supervising physician, the administration of intravenous contrast is unlikely to be of further benefit to the patient or the risks of the administration outweigh the potential benefits. Intravenous contrast may also be omitted when there is a) no intravenous access, b) a history of prior allergic-type reaction to gadolinium chelates and the patient has not been premedicated, c) a relative contraindication to gadolinium chelates (such as pregnancy), d) severe renal insufficiency with an estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) <30 mL/min per 1.73 m² or acute renal insufficiency of any severity, or e) known or suspected diagnosis of nephrogenic systemic fibrosis. Of note, in eGFR of 15–30, many practices are now opting to perform a clinically indicated contrast-enhanced MR examination utilizing a macrocyclic gadolinium agent. Multiphase contrast-enhanced sequences (including precontrast, arterial, venous, and delayed phase images) are beneficial for evaluating blood vessels and tumors of the solid organs [26,27]. Subtraction images may also be generated, which can be helpful in identifying tumor enhancement [28]. Postcontrast enhanced imaging may be performed with a 2-D or 3-D technique. Three-dimensional imaging allows isotropic or near-isotropic resolution and facilitates multiplanar reconstructions [29]. The use of fat suppression during dynamic contrast-enhanced, T1-weighted imaging is encouraged, as it improves the conspicuity of enhancing structures and abnormalities. Fat suppression can be accomplished using chemically selective fat-saturation techniques, water excitation, or chemical shift/Dixon technique. STIR should be avoided for gadolinium-enhanced T1-weighted imaging, as enhancement due to gadolinium is suppressed with this technique.

Delayed postcontrast T1-weighted imaging (5 minutes or greater after extracellular gadolinium-based contrast administration) can be useful in detecting pathology of the urinary tract (excretory MR urography) [30,31]. Intravenous hydration and/or diuretic administration has been shown to improve visualization of the nondilated collecting system [32] and ureters [33] during excretory MR urography. Delayed imaging with extracellular gadolinium-based agents may also be useful in diagnosing cancer of the biliary system [34]. Different intravenous gadolinium chelates are available that are targeted toward visualization of particular organs and organ systems. Specifically, hepatobiliary agents (eg, gadoxetate disodium, gadobenate dimeglumine) localize to the liver and biliary tree, and fat-suppressed T1-weighted imaging during the hepatobiliary phase timing varies depending on the agent) provide images based on hepatocyte uptake and biliary excretion of these agents [35]. (See the [ACR-SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\) of the Liver](#) [1]). Similarly, blood-pool agents target the vascular system on postcontrast T1-weighted imaging [36].

The use of an oral contrast agent for MRI of the abdomen is considered optional but may occasionally be beneficial for gastrointestinal imaging [37]. Negative oral contrast agents may be helpful in selected cases to suppress signal and reduce artifact from bowel contents when imaging other organs or structures such as the peritoneum, pancreaticobiliary tree, or urinary system. When using oral contrast media for assessing the small bowel and its serosal surface, a nonabsorbable agent that produces a dark enteric lumen on T1-weighted images is recommended to distend the bowel and optimize detection of mural enhancement after intravenous administration of a gadolinium chelate. Administration of spasmolytic agents, such as glucagon [38], can reduce peristalsis and its resultant motion artifact. This can be particularly helpful for contrast-enhanced fast gradient-echo T1-weighted imaging of the bowel [39] or for evaluating the mesentery and peritoneal surfaces [40]. For MR enterography, see the [ACR-SAR-SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Magnetic Resonance \(MR\) Enterography](#).

The addition of a heavily T2-weighted magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP) sequence may be beneficial for evaluating the biliary and pancreatic ducts [41-43]. The use of secretin has been shown to significantly improve visualization of the pancreatic duct during MRCP, which can aid in the diagnosis of

anatomic variants [44-46], chronic pancreatitis [47,48], and side-branch intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasms [49] and in quantifying pancreatic exocrine function [50,51]. T2-weighted imaging can be performed using a rapid acquisition relaxation enhancement (RARE) or half-Fourier single-shot echo train spin-echo sequence. These sequences can be performed as a thick slab acquisition in multiple projections or as multiple thin (less than 5 mm) slices in at least one imaging plane during breath-holding. Three-dimensional respiratory triggered T2-weighted FSE techniques can also be used, potentially offering improved SNR and isotropic spatial resolution [52]. Such heavily T2-weighted sequences may also serve to evaluate dilated renal collecting systems (static-fluid MR urography) [30,53]. Additional sequences, such as postcontrast T1-weighted and FSE T2-weighted sequences, can aid in the assessment of periductal tissues, in the evaluation for causes of extrinsic ductal compression, and in the staging of cholangiocarcinoma [54,55].

Steady-state free-precession (SSFP) sequences display bright fluid and blood while minimizing motion and flow-related artifacts. Such sequences can provide a rapid abdominal survey [56] and can be useful for cine imaging of the bowel during MR enterography and for demonstration of intra-abdominal adhesions [56-59].

3 Tesla (3T) imaging systems have become widely available, and potential advantages include increased SNR [60], increased conspicuity of enhancement after administration of a gadolinium chelate [61], and more rapid chemical shift-type sequences (based on shorter in-phase and out-of-phase echo times compared with 1.5T). Potential disadvantages include decreased image contrast on T1-weighted images, increased susceptibility artifact, increased chemical shift artifact, increased specific absorption rate (SAR), and signal inhomogeneity [62]. The latter can be partially compensated for by the use of radiofrequency cushions [63]. In short, 3T imaging can offer substantial improvements in SNR and spatial resolution and/or decreases in imaging times, but careful sequence optimization is required to maintain desired image contrast and reduce artifacts [64,65].

Parallel imaging (PI) techniques take advantage of spatial sensitivity information from multiple independent receiver coil elements in order to reduce the number of phase encoding steps, therefore reducing scan times [66]. Parallel imaging (PI) techniques can also expand the options for breath-hold imaging and provide shorter effective echo times and decreased blurring on echo-train sequences such as single-shot FSE. The primary penalty for this time savings is reduced SNR [67]. There is a potentially synergistic effect between PI and imaging at 3T: 1) the decreased SNR inherent to PI is partially offset by the increased SNR of 3T, and 2) the SAR issues inherent to 3T can be offset by a reduced number of excitations [68]. Recently, 2-D PI techniques have become available, which provide higher order acceleration factors by reducing the number of measurements required to fill k-space in both the phase and partition directions [69,70].

Diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) can be utilized for abdominal application [71]. Most research to date has centered on oncologic applications, either for staging disease or monitoring response to therapy [72-78]. The most common technique uses single-shot echo-planar imaging (SS-EPI). Breath-held, free-breathing multiple-averaging, and respiratory-gated SS-EPI techniques have been described [79,80]. PI can be used to decrease imaging time, reduce susceptibility-related signal loss by shortening the effective echo time, and has been shown to result in accurate apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) values [81]. DWI has shown promising results in early research and at least appears to be a value-added adjunct sequence capable of revealing additional sites of disease in the abdomen [76]. ADC maps can be generated to help differentiate between restricted diffusion and T2 shine-through when at least 2 b-values are obtained, including $b=0$ to 50 s/mm^2 and $b=500$ to $1,000 \text{ s/mm}^2$. In addition, more complex models of diffusion, such as the intravoxel incoherent motion (IVIM) model, have shown the potential to separate perfusion effects from true diffusion values, and may provide more robust measures of diffusion compared with the ADC model [82].

VI. DOCUMENTATION

Reporting should be in accordance with the [ACR Practice Parameter for Communication of Diagnostic Imaging Findings](#) [83].

VII. EQUIPMENT SPECIFICATIONS

The MRI equipment specifications and performance must meet all state and federal requirements. The requirements include, but are not limited to, specifications of maximum static magnetic strength, maximum rate of change of magnetic field strength (dB/dt), maximum radiofrequency power deposition (specific absorption rate), and maximum acoustic noise levels.

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 *Position Statement on QC & Improvement, Safety, Infection Control, and Patient Education* on the ACR website (<http://www.acr.org/guidelines>).

Specific policies and procedures related to safety should be in place with documentation that is updated annually and compiled under the supervision and direction of the supervising MRI physician. Guidelines should be provided that deal with potential hazards associated with MRI examinations to the patient as well as to others in the immediate area [4,8]. Screening forms must also be provided to detect those patients who may be at risk for adverse events associated with the MRI examination [4,8].

Equipment performance monitoring should be in accordance with the [ACR Technical Standard for Diagnostic Medical Physics Performance Monitoring of Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\) Equipment](#) [84].

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 (<http://www.acr.org/guidelines>) by the Committee on Body Imaging (Abdominal) of the Commission on Body Imaging and by the Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology of the Commission on Pediatric Radiology, in collaboration with the SAR and the SPR.

Collaborative Committee

Members represent their societies in the initial and final revision of this practice parameter.

ACR

John R. Leyendecker, MD, Co-Chair
David D. Childs, MD, Co-Chair
Mustafa Shadi Rifaat Bashir, MD

SAR

Nicole M. Hindman, MD
David M. Hough, MB, ChB

SPR

Michael S. Gee, MD, PhD
Daniel J. Podberesky, MD

Committee on Body Imaging (Abdominal)

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

Ruedi F. Thoeni, MD, Chair
Mahmoud M. Al-Hawary, MD
Mark E. Baker, MD, FACR

Barry D. Daly, MD, MB, BCh
Isaac R. Francis, MD
Richard M. Gore, MD, FACR
Amy K. Hara, MD
Dean D. Maglinte, MD, FACR
Frank H. Miller, MD, FACR
Donald G. Mitchell, MD, FACR
Eric M. Rubin, MD
Scott D. Stevens, MD, FACR
William E. Torres, MD, FACR

Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology

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

Eric N. Faerber, MD, FACR, Chair
Richard M. Benator, MD, FACR
Lorna P. Browne, MB, BCh
Timothy J. Carmody, MD
Brian D. Coley, MD, FACR
Lee K. Collins, MD
Monica S. Epelman, MD
Lynn A. Fordham, MD, FACR
Kerri A. Highmore, MD
Tal Laor, MD
Marguerite T. Parisi, MD, MS
Sumit Pruthi, MBBS
Nancy K. Rollins, MD
Pallavi Sagar, MD
Manrita K. Sidhu, MD

Lincoln L. Berland, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Body Imaging
Marta Hernanz-Schulman, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Pediatric Radiology
Debra L. Monticciolo, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Quality and Safety
Jacqueline A. Bello, MD, FACR, Vice Chair, Commission on Quality and Safety
Julie K. Timins, MD, FACR, Chair, Committee on Practice Parameters and Technical Standards
Matthew S. Pollack, MD, FACR, Vice Chair, Committee on Practice Parameters and Technical Standards

Comments Reconciliation Committee

Sanjay J. Shetty, MD, MBA, Chair
Andrew Moriarity, MD, Co-Chair
Kimberly E. Applegate, MD, MS, FACR
Mustafa Shadi Rifaat Bashir, MD
Lincoln L. Berland, MD, FACR
David D. Childs, MD
Eric N. Faerber, MD, FACR
Michael S. Gee, MD, PhD
Marta Hernanz-Schulman, MD, FACR
William T. Herrington, MD, FACR
Nicole M. Hindman, MD
David M. Hough, MB, ChB
John R. Leyendecker, MD
Donald G. Mitchell, MD, FACR

Debra L. Monticciolo, MD, FACR
Daniel J. Podberesky, MD
Matthew S. Pollack, MD, FACR
William L. Simpson, Jr., MD
Ruedi F. Thoeni, MD
Julie K. Timins, MD, FACR

REFERENCES

1. American College of Radiology. ACR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) of the Liver. 2014; <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-Liver.pdf>. Accessed October 8, 2014.
2. American College of Radiology. ACR–NASCI–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Body Magnetic Resonance Angiography (MRA). 2014; <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Body-MRA.pdf>. Accessed October 8, 2014.
3. American College of Radiology. ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI). 2014; <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-Perf-Interpret.pdf>. Accessed October 8, 2014.
4. Kanal E, Barkovich AJ, Bell C, et al. ACR guidance document on MR safe practices: 2013. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2013;37(3):501-530.
5. American College of Radiology. Manual on Contrast Media. 2013; <http://www.acr.org/Quality-Safety/Resources/Contrast-Manual>. Accessed May 22, 2014.
6. American College of Radiology. ACR-SPR Practice Parameter for Performance and Interpretation of Pediatric Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI). 2014; <http://www.acr.org/-/media/6DA1E94ED99645CDB414AB325414F542.pdf>. Accessed October 8, 2014.
7. American College of Radiology. ACR-SIR Practice Parameter for Sedation/Analgesia. 2014; <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Sed-Analgesia.pdf>. Accessed October 8, 2014.
8. Shellock FG. *Reference Manual for Magnetic Resonance Safety, Implants, and Devices*. Playa Del Rey, CA Biomedical Research Publishing Group; 2013.
9. American College of Radiology. ACR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Use of Intravascular Contrast Media. 2014; <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/IVCM.pdf>. Accessed October 8, 2014.
10. Karantanas AH, Papanikolaou N. T2-weighted magnetic resonance imaging of the liver: comparison of fat-suppressed GRASE with conventional spin echo, fat-suppressed turbo spin echo, and gradient echo at 1.0 T. *Abdom Imaging*. 2001;26(2):139-145.
11. Ma J. Dixon techniques for water and fat imaging. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2008;28(3):543-558.
12. Low RN, Ma J, Panchal N. Fast spin-echo triple-echo Dixon: initial clinical experience with a novel pulse sequence for fat-suppressed T2-weighted abdominal MR imaging. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2009;30(3):569-577.
13. Vasanawala SS, Madhuranthakam AJ, Venkatesan R, Sonik A, Lai P, Brau AC. Volumetric fat-water separated T2-weighted MRI. *Pediatr Radiol*. 2011;41(7):875-883.
14. Kim BS, Kim JH, Choi GM, et al. Comparison of three free-breathing T2-weighted MRI sequences in the evaluation of focal liver lesions. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2008;190(1):W19-27.
15. Lee SS, Byun JH, Hong HS, et al. Image quality and focal lesion detection on T2-weighted MR imaging of the liver: comparison of two high-resolution free-breathing imaging techniques with two breath-hold imaging techniques. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2007;26(2):323-330.
16. Hirokawa Y, Isoda H, Maetani YS, Arizono S, Shimada K, Togashi K. Evaluation of motion correction effect and image quality with the periodically rotated overlapping parallel lines with enhanced reconstruction (PROPELLER) (BLADE) and parallel imaging acquisition technique in the upper abdomen. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2008;28(4):957-962.
17. Pokharel SS, Macura KJ, Kamel IR, Zaheer A. Current MR imaging lipid detection techniques for diagnosis of lesions in the abdomen and pelvis. *Radiographics*. 2013;33(3):681-702.
18. Kim HJ, Byun JH, Park SH, et al. Focal fatty replacement of the pancreas: usefulness of chemical shift MRI. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2007;188(2):429-432.
19. Bilbey JH, McLoughlin RF, Kurkjian PS, et al. MR imaging of adrenal masses: value of chemical-shift imaging for distinguishing adenomas from other tumors. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1995;164(3):637-642.

20. Israel GM, Hindman N, Hecht E, Krinsky G. The use of opposed-phase chemical shift MRI in the diagnosis of renal angiomyolipomas. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2005;184(6):1868-1872.
21. Yoshimitsu K, Irie H, Tajima T, et al. MR imaging of renal cell carcinoma: its role in determining cell type. *Radiat Med.* 2004;22(6):371-376.
22. Yoshimitsu K, Kakihara D, Irie H, et al. Papillary renal carcinoma: diagnostic approach by chemical shift gradient-echo and echo-planar MR imaging. *J Magn Reson Imaging.* 2006;23(3):339-344.
23. Arizono S, Isoda H, Maetani YS, et al. High-spatial-resolution three-dimensional MR cholangiography using a high-sampling-efficiency technique (SPACE) at 3T: comparison with the conventional constant flip angle sequence in healthy volunteers. *J Magn Reson Imaging.* 2008;28(3):685-690.
24. Futterer JJ, Yakar D, Strijk SP, Barentsz JO. Preoperative 3T MR imaging of rectal cancer: local staging accuracy using a two-dimensional and three-dimensional T2-weighted turbo spin echo sequence. *Eur J Radiol.* 2008;65(1):66-71.
25. Lichy MP, Wietek BM, Mugler JP, 3rd, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging of the body trunk using a single-slab, 3-dimensional, T2-weighted turbo-spin-echo sequence with high sampling efficiency (SPACE) for high spatial resolution imaging: initial clinical experiences. *Invest Radiol.* 2005;40(12):754-760.
26. Ho VB, Allen SF, Hood MN, Choyke PL. Renal masses: quantitative assessment of enhancement with dynamic MR imaging. *Radiology.* 2002;224(3):695-700.
27. Tajima Y, Kuroki T, Tsutsumi R, Isomoto I, Uetani M, Kanematsu T. Pancreatic carcinoma coexisting with chronic pancreatitis versus tumor-forming pancreatitis: diagnostic utility of the time-signal intensity curve from dynamic contrast-enhanced MR imaging. *World J Gastroenterol.* 2007;13(6):858-865.
28. Hecht EM, Israel GM, Krinsky GA, et al. Renal masses: quantitative analysis of enhancement with signal intensity measurements versus qualitative analysis of enhancement with image subtraction for diagnosing malignancy at MR imaging. *Radiology.* 2004;232(2):373-378.
29. Rofsky NM, Lee VS, Laub G, et al. Abdominal MR imaging with a volumetric interpolated breath-hold examination. *Radiology.* 1999;212(3):876-884.
30. Leyendecker JR, Barnes CE, Zagoria RJ. MR urography: techniques and clinical applications. *Radiographics.* 2008;28(1):23-46; discussion 46-27.
31. Takahashi N, Kawashima A, Glockner JF, et al. Small (<2-cm) upper-tract urothelial carcinoma: evaluation with gadolinium-enhanced three-dimensional spoiled gradient-recalled echo MR urography. *Radiology.* 2008;247(2):451-457.
32. Ergen FB, Hussain HK, Carlos RC, et al. 3D excretory MR urography: improved image quality with intravenous saline and diuretic administration. *J Magn Reson Imaging.* 2007;25(4):783-789.
33. Nolte-Ernsting CC, Bucker A, Adam GB, et al. Gadolinium-enhanced excretory MR urography after low-dose diuretic injection: comparison with conventional excretory urography. *Radiology.* 1998;209(1):147-157.
34. Manfredi R, Barbaro B, Masselli G, Vecchioli A, Marano P. Magnetic resonance imaging of cholangiocarcinoma. *Semin Liver Dis.* 2004;24(2):155-164.
35. Seale MK, Catalano OA, Saini S, Hahn PF, Sahani DV. Hepatobiliary-specific MR contrast agents: role in imaging the liver and biliary tree. *Radiographics.* 2009;29(6):1725-1748.
36. Sabach AS, Bruno M, Kim D, et al. Gadofosveset trisodium: abdominal and peripheral vascular applications. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2013;200(6):1378-1386.
37. Giovagnoni A, Fabbri A, Maccioni F. Oral contrast agents in MRI of the gastrointestinal tract. *Abdom Imaging.* 2002;27(4):367-375.
38. Marti-Bonmati L, Graells M, Ronchera-Oms CL. Reduction of peristaltic artifacts on magnetic resonance imaging of the abdomen: a comparative evaluation of three drugs. *Abdom Imaging.* 1996;21(4):309-313.
39. Fidler J. MR imaging of the small bowel. *Radiol Clin North Am.* 2007;45(2):317-331.
40. Low RN. MR imaging of the peritoneal spread of malignancy. *Abdom Imaging.* 2007;32(3):267-283.
41. Fayad LM, Kowalski T, Mitchell DG. MR cholangiopancreatography: evaluation of common pancreatic diseases. *Radiol Clin North Am.* 2003;41(1):97-114.
42. Fulcher AS, Turner MA, Capps GW, Zfass AM, Baker KM. Half-Fourier RARE MR cholangiopancreatography: experience in 300 subjects. *Radiology.* 1998;207(1):21-32.
43. Leyendecker JR, Elsayes KM, Gratz BI, Brown JJ. MR cholangiopancreatography: spectrum of pancreatic duct abnormalities. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2002;179(6):1465-1471.

44. Akisik MF, Sandrasegaran K, Aisen AA, Maglinte DD, Sherman S, Lehman GA. Dynamic secretin-enhanced MR cholangiopancreatography. *Radiographics*. 2006;26(3):665-677.
45. Kamisawa T, Tu Y, Egawa N, Tsuruta K, Okamoto A, Kamata N. MRCP of congenital pancreaticobiliary malformation. *Abdom Imaging*. 2007;32(1):129-133.
46. Lee NJ, Kim KW, Kim TK, et al. Secretin-stimulated MRCP. *Abdom Imaging*. 2006;31(5):575-581.
47. Sai JK, Suyama M, Kubokawa Y, Watanabe S. Diagnosis of mild chronic pancreatitis (Cambridge classification): comparative study using secretin injection-magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography and endoscopic retrograde pancreatography. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2008;14(8):1218-1221.
48. Schlaudraff E, Wagner HJ, Klose KJ, Heverhagen JT. Prospective evaluation of the diagnostic accuracy of secretin-enhanced magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography in suspected chronic pancreatitis. *Magn Reson Imaging*. 2008;26(10):1367-1373.
49. Carbognin G, Pinali L, Girardi V, Casarin A, Mansueto G, Mucelli RP. Collateral branches IPMTs: secretin-enhanced MRCP. *Abdom Imaging*. 2007;32(3):374-380.
50. Gillams AR, Lees WR. Quantitative secretin MRCP (MRCPQ): results in 215 patients with known or suspected pancreatic pathology. *Eur Radiol*. 2007;17(11):2984-2990.
51. Schneider AR, Hammerstingl R, Heller M, et al. Does secretin-stimulated MRCP predict exocrine pancreatic insufficiency?: A comparison with noninvasive exocrine pancreatic function tests. *J Clin Gastroenterol*. 2006;40(9):851-855.
52. Nandalur KR, Hussain HK, Weadock WJ, et al. Possible biliary disease: diagnostic performance of high-spatial-resolution isotropic 3D T2-weighted MRCP. *Radiology*. 2008;249(3):883-890.
53. Nolte-Ernsting CC, Staatz G, Tacke J, Gunther RW. MR urography today. *Abdom Imaging*. 2003;28(2):191-209.
54. Hanninen EL, Ricke J, Amthauer H, et al. Magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography: image quality, ductal morphology, and value of additional T2- and T1-weighted sequences for the assessment of suspected pancreatic cancer. *Acta Radiol*. 2005;46(2):117-125.
55. Kim JY, Lee JM, Han JK, et al. Contrast-enhanced MRI combined with MR cholangiopancreatography for the evaluation of patients with biliary strictures: differentiation of malignant from benign bile duct strictures. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2007;26(2):304-312.
56. Dutka MV, Bergin D, O'Kane PL, Frangos AJ, Parker L, Mitchell DG. Rapid multiplanar abdominal survey using MRI with the steady-state free-precession technique. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2008;27(1):198-203.
57. Froehlich JM, Waldherr C, Stoupis C, Erturk SM, Patak MA. MR motility imaging in Crohn's disease improves lesion detection compared with standard MR imaging. *Eur Radiol*. 2010;20(8):1945-1951.
58. Heye T, Stein D, Antolovic D, Dueck M, Kauczor HU, Hosch W. Evaluation of bowel peristalsis by dynamic cine MRI: detection of relevant functional disturbances--initial experience. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2012;35(4):859-867.
59. Lienemann A, Sprenger D, Steitz HO, Korell M, Reiser M. Detection and mapping of intraabdominal adhesions by using functional cine MR imaging: preliminary results. *Radiology*. 2000;217(2):421-425.
60. Choi JY, Kim MJ, Chung YE, et al. Abdominal applications of 3.0-T MR imaging: comparative review versus a 1.5-T system. *Radiographics*. 2008;28(4):e30.
61. Soher BJ, Dale BM, Merkle EM. A review of MR physics: 3T versus 1.5T. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am*. 2007;15(3):277-290, v.
62. Leyendecker JR, Childs DD. Kidneys and MR urography. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am*. 2007;15(3):373-382, vii.
63. Franklin KM, Dale BM, Merkle EM. Improvement in B1-inhomogeneity artifacts in the abdomen at 3T MR imaging using a radiofrequency cushion. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2008;27(6):1443-1447.
64. Hussain SM, Wielopolski PA, Martin DR. Abdominal magnetic resonance imaging at 3.0 T: problem or a promise for the future? *Top Magn Reson Imaging*. 2005;16(4):325-335.
65. Martin DR, Friel HT, Danrad R, De Becker J, Hussain SM. Approach to abdominal imaging at 1.5 Tesla and optimization at 3 Tesla. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am*. 2005;13(2):241-254, v-vi.
66. Glockner JF, Hu HH, Stanley DW, Angelos L, King K. Parallel MR imaging: a user's guide. *Radiographics*. 2005;25(5):1279-1297.
67. Larkman DJ, Nunes RG. Parallel magnetic resonance imaging. *Phys Med Biol*. 2007;52(7):R15-55.
68. Pruessmann KP. Parallel imaging at high field strength: synergies and joint potential. *Top Magn Reson Imaging*. 2004;15(4):237-244.

69. Breuer FA, Blaimer M, Heidemann RM, Mueller MF, Griswold MA, Jakob PM. Controlled aliasing in parallel imaging results in higher acceleration (CAIPIRINHA) for multi-slice imaging. *Magn Reson Med*. 2005;53(3):684-691.
70. Pietryga JA, Burke LM, Marin D, Jaffe TA, Bashir MR. Respiratory motion artifact affecting hepatic arterial phase imaging with gadoxetate disodium: examination recovery with a multiple arterial phase acquisition. *Radiology*. 2014;271(2):426-434.
71. Koh DM, Collins DJ. Diffusion-weighted MRI in the body: applications and challenges in oncology. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2007;188(6):1622-1635.
72. Akduman EI, Momtahan AJ, Balci NC, Mahajann N, Havlioglu N, Wolverson MK. Comparison between malignant and benign abdominal lymph nodes on diffusion-weighted imaging. *Acad Radiol*. 2008;15(5):641-646.
73. Cova M, Squillaci E, Stacul F, et al. Diffusion-weighted MRI in the evaluation of renal lesions: preliminary results. *Br J Radiol*. 2004;77(922):851-857.
74. Fujii S, Matsusue E, Kanasaki Y, et al. Detection of peritoneal dissemination in gynecological malignancy: evaluation by diffusion-weighted MR imaging. *Eur Radiol*. 2008;18(1):18-23.
75. Liapi E, Geschwind JF, Vossen JA, et al. Functional MRI evaluation of tumor response in patients with neuroendocrine hepatic metastasis treated with transcatheter arterial chemoembolization. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2008;190(1):67-73.
76. Low RN, Gurney J. Diffusion-weighted MRI (DWI) in the oncology patient: value of breathhold DWI compared to unenhanced and gadolinium-enhanced MRI. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2007;25(4):848-858.
77. Shinya S, Sasaki T, Nakagawa Y, Guiquing Z, Yamamoto F, Yamashita Y. Usefulness of diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) for the detection of pancreatic cancer: 4 case reports. *Hepatogastroenterology*. 2008;55(81):282-285.
78. Zhang J, Tehrani YM, Wang L, Ishill NM, Schwartz LH, Hricak H. Renal masses: characterization with diffusion-weighted MR imaging--a preliminary experience. *Radiology*. 2008;247(2):458-464.
79. Gourtsoyianni S, Papanikolaou N, Yarmenitis S, Maris T, Karantanis A, Gourtsoyiannis N. Respiratory gated diffusion-weighted imaging of the liver: value of apparent diffusion coefficient measurements in the differentiation between most commonly encountered benign and malignant focal liver lesions. *Eur Radiol*. 2008;18(3):486-492.
80. Koh DM, Takahara T, Imai Y, Collins DJ. Practical aspects of assessing tumors using clinical diffusion-weighted imaging in the body. *Magn Reson Med Sci*. 2007;6(4):211-224.
81. Yoshikawa T, Kawamitsu H, Mitchell DG, et al. ADC measurement of abdominal organs and lesions using parallel imaging technique. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2006;187(6):1521-1530.
82. Le Bihan D, Breton E, Lallemand D, Aubin ML, Vignaud J, Laval-Jeantet M. Separation of diffusion and perfusion in intravoxel incoherent motion MR imaging. *Radiology*. 1988;168(2):497-505.
83. American College of Radiology. ACR Practice Parameter for Communication of Diagnostic Imaging Findings. 2014; <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CommunicationDiag.pdf>. Accessed October 8, 2014.
84. American College of Radiology. ACR Technical Standard for Diagnostic Medical Physics Performance Monitoring of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) Equipment. 2014; <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-Equip.pdf>. Accessed October 8, 2014.

*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 Parameters and Technical Standards was amended, revised, or approved by the ACR Council.

Development Chronology for this Practice Parameter

2005 (Resolution 5)

Amended 2006 (Resolution 35)

Revised 2010 (Resolution 16)
Amended 2014 (Resolution 39)
Revised 2015 (Resolution 2)