

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 2013 (Resolution 6)*

ACR–ASNR–SPR PRACTICE PARAMETER FOR THE PERFORMANCE AND INTERPRETATION OF MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING (MRI) OF THE BRAIN

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

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.

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.

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).

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the brain is a proven and well-established imaging modality in the evaluation and assessment of normal and abnormal conditions of the brain. MRI of the brain is the most sensitive technique available because of its high sensitivity in exploiting inherent contrast differences of tissues as a result of variable magnetic relaxation properties and magnetic susceptibilities. MRI is a rapidly changing technology, and ongoing technical improvements will continue to improve MRI diagnosis of brain disorders. This practice parameter outlines the principles for performing high-quality MRI of the brain.

II. INDICATIONS

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

1. Neoplastic conditions or other mass or mass like conditions of the brain parenchyma, meninges or cranium, either primary or secondary [1-8].
2. Vascular
 - a. Acute ischemia and infarction [9-13].
 - b. Chronic vascular disease [14-16].
 - c. Vascular malformations such as developmental venous anomaly, cavernous angioma, arteriovenous malformation, arteriovenous fistulas and aneurysm [17-20].
 - d. Arterial or venous/dural venous sinus abnormalities, including congenital and acquired disorders and thrombosis [21,22].
 - e. Additionally, magnetic resonance angiography (MRA) may provide more detailed noninvasive vascular information. (See the [ACR–ASNR–SNIS–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Cervicocerebral Magnetic Resonance Angiography \[MRA\]](#).)
3. Congenital disorders and anatomical abnormalities including the evaluation of brain maturation [23-26].
4. Congenital or acquired neurodegenerative disorders [14,27-30].
5. Congenital or acquired hydrocephalus [31,32].
6. Metabolic disorders [33,34].
7. Trauma [35-38].
 - a. Certain benefits over computed tomography (CT), such as detection of diffuse axonal injury.
 - b. Post-traumatic brain injury.
 - c. Nonaccidental trauma.
8. Hemorrhage.
 - a. Certain benefits over CT, such as determining the age of hemorrhages, evaluation of chronic hemorrhage, and detection of microhemorrhages [39,40].
 - b. MRI with gradient echo axial imaging has sensitivity comparable to that of CT in specific settings such as the rapid evaluation of acute ischemic stroke [41].
9. Inflammatory and autoimmune disorders including disorders of myelination [42-45].
10. Infectious disorders: encephalitis, meningitis, abscess [46-49].
11. Endocrine disorders [50,51].
12. Evaluation of the cranial nerves [52].
13. Epilepsy and movement disorders [30,53-57].
14. Psychiatric disorders [58].
15. Follow-up of treatment including iatrogenic sequelae such as radiation necrosis [59-62].
16. Image guidance for treatment planning, surgery, or interventional [63-65]. (See the [ACR–ASNR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Non-Breast MRI-Guided Procedures](#).)

Extended indications for brain MRI include techniques that provide additional real-time, dynamic or quantitative information that assists in therapeutic guidance or decision-making.

1. CSF flow, blood flow, and brain perfusion [13,31,32,66,67].
2. Spectroscopy [10,34,67-71].
3. Functional imaging [63,72-75].
4. Volumetry [14,28,76].
5. Morphometry [57,58,77].
6. Tractography [26,78-81].
7. Combination with positron emission tomography [82-84].

III. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

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

IV. SAFETY GUIDELINES AND POSSIBLE CONTRAINDICATIONS

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

Peer-reviewed literature pertaining to MR safety should be reviewed on a regular basis.

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 [85-88]. 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. (See the [ACR Practice Parameter for Communication of Diagnostic Imaging Findings](#).) The physician performing MRI interpretation must have a clear understanding and knowledge of the anatomy and pathophysiology relevant to the MRI examination.

The clinical request form should be initiated by the referring physician or any appropriate allied health care professional acting within his or her scope of practice. It should contain pertinent information regarding the clinical indication for the procedure.

The written or electronic request for MRI of the brain 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)

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. Patients and all other persons entering the MRI safety zone (employees and nonemployees) must be screened and interviewed (when their condition permits) prior to the examination to exclude individuals who may be at risk by exposure to the MRI environment.

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 utilization. Patients receiving intravenous gadolinium chelates should be evaluated for risk factors or contraindications to intravenous MRI contrast media, especially the potential risk of nephrogenic systemic fibrosis (NSF) [89]. (See the ACR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Use of Intravascular Contrast Media, the [ACR Manual on Contrast Media](#), the [ACR Guidance Document on MR Safe Practices](#), and the [ACR website](#).)

Patients suffering from anxiety or claustrophobia may require sedation or additional assistance. Sedation of pediatric patients (and in some cases nonsedated patients) may benefit from child life support staff. Administration of anxiolytics or moderate sedation may be needed to achieve a successful examination. If moderate sedation is necessary, refer to the [ACR–SIR Practice Parameter for Sedation/Analgesia](#).

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.

C. Examination Technique

MRI examination of the brain can be performed on closed and open MRI systems of various field strengths, using a local surface coil (head coil), and with a wide array of pulse sequences [8,10,12,23,25,29,30,32,44,45,49,50,67,73,74,90-108]. This is a rapidly evolving field, and the appropriate pulse sequences and plane of imaging must be individualized and tailored to the clinical question at hand under the supervision of the MRI physician. The most commonly accepted basic imaging protocols for MRI of the brain currently include a T1-weighted sequence in the sagittal plane (or a T1-weighted volumetric acquisition), and T2-weighted fluid-attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR) and fast spin-echo or turbo-spin-echo (or equivalent) sequences in the axial plane. If FLAIR is not available or in children under the age of 2 years, proton density weighted sequences may be helpful. Under certain clinical circumstances, very rapid acquisitions such as echo planar imaging or single shot fast-spin-echo imaging can be performed to obtain T2 information. Diffusion imaging, if available, is helpful in many indications. The entire brain should be covered in the respective axial and/or coronal and/or sagittal imaging planes. (See the ACR MRI Accreditation Program Clinical Image Quality Guide.)

The recovery time (TR) and echo time (TE) required to optimize image quality depends on the field strength of the magnet. These parameters must therefore be adjusted by the supervising physician for image optimization. For example, lower-field-strength magnets may require lower TRs, while higher-field-strength magnets may require longer TRs for image optimization.

Slice thickness, spatial resolution, signal-to-noise ratio, acquisition time, and contrast are all interrelated. To optimize spatial resolution, imaging of the brain should be performed with a slice thickness of no greater than 5 mm and an interslice gap of no greater than 2.5 mm. Thinner slices (less than 5 mm) and smaller interslice gaps (less than 2.5 mm) may provide superior image detail, if clinical circumstances warrant.

Gadolinium chelates may be administered intravenously when there is suspicion of breakdown of the blood-brain barrier [6,109-112]. Postcontrast images should be obtained in at least one plane, but preferably two or more

perpendicular planes, with one plane being the same as the precontrast series, with short TR and TE sequences (T1-weighted). (Alternatively one postcontrast series could be obtained using a T1-weighted volumetric acquisition). Postcontrast FLAIR images may add value in the assessment of leptomeningeal disease [113].

With the advent of high-performance gradient coil assemblies and amplifiers and other technical enhancements, advanced imaging applications are also an option when the appropriate hardware and software exist. Improvements in the receiver and data acquisition systems also allow for more rapid imaging. Higher-field-strength MR (e.g., 3T and 7T) may provide added utility in some clinical situations [53,114-120].

While a detailed discussion of all the evolving advanced imaging techniques is beyond the scope of this practice parameter, it should be noted that rapid pulse sequences and other advanced imaging techniques may provide added value for MRI of the brain. These can include, but are not limited to echo planar imaging [121], parallel imaging [29,91,100,122,123], diffusion weighted imaging [45,90,93,124-130], diffusion tensor imaging [25,26,79,80,91,104,128,131-134], rapid gradient-echo pulse sequences (capable of providing T1 or T2 information and enabling 3D acquisitions) [135], susceptibility weighted imaging [136-142], functional imaging [131,143-158], perfusion imaging [159-166], volumetric [32,167-171], morphometric [172-182] magnetic source imaging [183], and other quantitative applications [128,184-194]. When considering T1- and/or T2-weighted 3D image acquisitions, it is essential to weigh benefits of efficiency against levels of diagnostic confidence. The latter may vary widely across imaging providers and may require extensive testing and consensus before implementing 3D sequences into diagnostic imaging protocols.

Certain clinical circumstances may warrant the use of proton MR spectroscopy [68-70,195-201] as an adjunct to routine MR brain imaging. (See the [ACR–ASNR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance and Interpretation of Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy of the Central Nervous System](#).) Additional techniques that may be useful under the appropriate clinical circumstances include 3-dimensional imaging techniques [202-205], neuronavigation and intraoperative MRI [64,96,105,206], magnetization transfer imaging [207-211], cerebral spinal fluid (CSF) flow study using phase-contrast pulse sequences [212], and variations of single shot fast-spin-echo or turbo spin-echo imaging.

It is the responsibility of the supervising physician to determine whether additional pulse sequences or nonconventional pulse sequences and imaging techniques confer added benefit for the diagnosis and management of the patient. Generally MRI examination of the brain should be performed within parameters approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Examinations that use techniques not approved by the FDA can be considered when they are judged to be medically appropriate.

VI. DOCUMENTATION

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

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 [213].

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 MRI 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 the MRI examination of the patient as well as to others in the immediate area. Screening forms must also be provided to detect those patients who may be at risk for adverse events associated with the MRI examination.

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This guideline was revised according to the process described under the heading *The Process for Developing ACR Practice Guidelines and Technical Standards* on the ACR website (<http://www.acr.org/guidelines>) by the Guidelines and Standards Committees of the ACR Commissions on Neuroradiology and Pediatric Radiology in collaboration with the ASNR and the SPR.

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

ACR

John E. Jordan, MD, FACR, Chair
Thierry A.G.M. Huisman, MD
Sumit Pruthi, MBBS
Robert J. Rapoport, MD, FACR

ASNR

Kristine A. Blackham, MD
T. Linda Chi, MD
P. Ellen Grant, MD
Michael J. Paldino, MD

SPR

Nadja Kadom, MD

Committee on Practice Parameters – Neuroradiology

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

Jacqueline A. Bello, MD, FACR, Chair
John E. Jordan, MD, FACR, Vice-Chair
Mark H. Depper, MD
Robert J. Feiwell, MD
Steven W. Hetts, MD
Ellen G. Hoeffner, MD
Thierry A.G.M. Huisman, MD
Stephen A. Kieffer, MD, FACR
Srinivasan Mukundan, Jr., MD, PhD
Eric M. Spickler, MD, FACR
Ashok Srinivasan, MD
Kurt E. Tech, MD, MMM, FACR
Max Wintermark, MD

Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology

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

Eric N. Faerber, MD, FACR, Chair
Sara J. Abramson, MD, FACR
Richard M. Benator, MD, FACR
Brian D. Coley, MD

Kristin L. Crisci, MD
Kate A. Feinstein, MD, FACR
Lynn A. Fordham, MD, FACR
S. Bruce Greenberg, MD
J. Herman Kan, MD
Beverley Newman, MB, BCh, BSc, FACR
Marguerite T. Parisi, MD, MS
Sumit Pruthi, MBBS
Nancy K. Rollins, MD
Manrita K. Sidhu, MD

Carolyn C. Meltzer, MD, FACR, Chair, Neuroradiology Commission
Marta Hernanz-Schulman, MD, FACR, Chair, Pediatric Commission
Debra L. Monticciolo, MD, FACR, Chair, Quality and Safety Commission
Julie K. Timins, MD, FACR, Chair, Committee on Practice Parameters and Technical Standards

Comments Reconciliation Committee

Jacqueline A. Bello, MD, FACR, Chair
Kurt E. Tech, MD, MMM, FACR, Co-Chair
Kimberly E. Applegate, MD, MS, FACR
Kristine A. Blackham, MD
T. Linda Chi, MD
Eric N. Faerber, MD, FACR
Howard B. Fleishon, MD, MMM, FACR
Marta Hernanz-Schulman, MD, FACR
Thierry A.G.M. Huisman, MD
John E. Jordan, MD, FACR
Nadja Kadom, MD
Paul A. Larson, MD, FACR
Neel Madan, MD
Carolyn C. Meltzer, MD, FACR
Debra L. Monticciolo, MD, FACR
Michael J. Paldino, MD
Sophia B. Peterman, MD, MPH
Sumit Pruthi, MBBS
Robert J. Rapoport, MD, FACR
Julie K. Timins, MD, FACR

REFERENCES

1. Cha S. Update on brain tumor imaging: from anatomy to physiology. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2006;27:475-487.
2. Dillon WP. Tumors in and adjacent to the brain. *Curr Opin Neurol Neurosurg* 1990;3:864-866.
3. Fukui MB, Meltzer CC, Kanal E, Smirniotopoulos JG. MR imaging of the meninges. Part II. Neoplastic disease. *Radiology* 1996;201:605-612.
4. Hanssens P, Karlsson B, Yeo TT, Chou N, Beute G. Detection of brain micrometastases by high-resolution stereotactic magnetic resonance imaging and its impact on the timing of and risk for distant recurrences. *J Neurosurg* 2011;115:499-504.
5. Hawighorst H, Debus J, Schreiber W, et al. Contrast-enhanced magnetization transfer imaging: improvement of brain tumor conspicuity and delineation for radiosurgical target volume definition. *Radiother Oncol* 1997;43:261-267.
6. Krautmacher C, Willinek WA, Tschampa HJ, et al. Brain tumors: full- and half-dose contrast-enhanced MR imaging at 3.0 T compared with 1.5 T--Initial Experience. *Radiology* 2005;237:1014-1019.

7. Schumacher M, Schulte-Monting J, Stoeter P, Warmuth-Metz M, Solymosi L. Magnetic resonance imaging compared with biopsy in the diagnosis of brainstem diseases of childhood: a multicenter review. *J Neurosurg* 2007;106:111-119.
8. Yuh WT, Christoforidis GA, Koch RM, et al. Clinical magnetic resonance imaging of brain tumors at ultrahigh field: a state-of-the-art review. *Top Magn Reson Imaging* 2006;17:53-61.
9. Gonzalez RG. Imaging-guided acute ischemic stroke therapy: From "time is brain" to "physiology is brain". *AJNR* 2006;27:728-735.
10. Parsons MW, Li T, Barber PA, et al. Combined (1)H MR spectroscopy and diffusion-weighted MRI improves the prediction of stroke outcome. *Neurology* 2000;55:498-505.
11. Ricci PE, Jr. Proton MR spectroscopy in ischemic stroke and other vascular disorders. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 1998;8:881-900.
12. Srinivasan A, Goyal M, Al Azri F, Lum C. State-of-the-art imaging of acute stroke. *Radiographics* 2006;26 Suppl 1:S75-95.
13. Sunshine JL, Tarr RW, Lanzieri CF, Landis DM, Selman WR, Lewin JS. Hyperacute stroke: ultrafast MR imaging to triage patients prior to therapy. *Radiology* 1999;212:325-332.
14. Au R, Massaro JM, Wolf PA, et al. Association of white matter hyperintensity volume with decreased cognitive functioning: the Framingham Heart Study. *Arch Neurol* 2006;63:246-250.
15. Bryan RN, Manolio TA, Schertz LD, et al. A method for using MR to evaluate the effects of cardiovascular disease on the brain: the cardiovascular health study. *AJNR* 1994;15:1625-1633.
16. Ketonen LM. Neuroimaging of the aging brain. *Neurol Clin* 1998;16:581-598.
17. Abe T, Singer RJ, Marks MP, Norbash AM, Crowley RS, Steinberg GK. Coexistence of occult vascular malformations and developmental venous anomalies in the central nervous system: MR evaluation. *AJNR* 1998;19:51-57.
18. Hetts SW, English JD, Dowd CF, Higashida RT, Scanlon JT, Halbach VV. Pediatric intracranial aneurysms: new and enlarging aneurysms after index aneurysm treatment or observation. *AJNR* 2011;32:2017-2022.
19. Martin AJ, Hetts SW, Dillon WP, et al. MR imaging of partially thrombosed cerebral aneurysms: characteristics and evolution. *AJNR* 2011;32:346-351.
20. Wagner BJ, Richardson KJ, Moran AM, Carrier DA. Intracranial vascular malformations. *Semin Ultrasound CT MR* 1995;16:253-268.
21. Knopp EA. Venous disease and tumors. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am* 1995;3:509-528.
22. Wang WC, Gallagher DM, Pegelow CH, et al. Multicenter comparison of magnetic resonance imaging and transcranial Doppler ultrasonography in the evaluation of the central nervous system in children with sickle cell disease. *J Pediatr Hematol Oncol* 2000;22:335-339.
23. Barkovich AJ. The encephalopathic neonate: choosing the proper imaging technique. *AJNR* 1997;18:1816-1820.
24. Griffiths PD, Russell SA, Mason G, Morris J, Fanou E, Reeves MJ. The use of in utero MR imaging to delineate developmental brain abnormalities in multifetal pregnancies. *AJNR* 2012;33:359-365.
25. Kim MJ, Provenzale JM, Law M. Magnetic resonance and diffusion tensor imaging in pediatric white matter diseases. *Top Magn Reson Imaging* 2006;17:265-274.
26. Mukherjee P, McKinstry RC. Diffusion tensor imaging and tractography of human brain development. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2006;16:19-43, vii.
27. Barkovich AJ. Malformations of neocortical development: magnetic resonance imaging correlates. *Curr Opin Neurol* 1996;9:118-121.
28. Smith EE, Egorova S, Blacker D, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging white matter hyperintensities and brain volume in the prediction of mild cognitive impairment and dementia. *Arch Neurol* 2008;65:94-100.
29. Stahl R, Dietrich O, Teipel SJ, Hampel H, Reiser MF, Schoenberg SO. White matter damage in Alzheimer disease and mild cognitive impairment: assessment with diffusion-tensor MR imaging and parallel imaging techniques. *Radiology* 2007;243:483-492.
30. Vymazal J, Righini A, Brooks RA, et al. T1 and T2 in the brain of healthy subjects, patients with Parkinson disease, and patients with multiple system atrophy: relation to iron content. *Radiology* 1999;211:489-495.
31. Algin O, Turkbey B. Evaluation of Aqueductal Stenosis by 3D Sampling Perfection with Application-Optimized Contrasts Using Different Flip Angle Evolutions Sequence: Preliminary Results with 3T MR Imaging. *AJNR* 2011.

32. Bradley WG, Safar FG, Furtado C, Ord J, Alksne JF. Increased intracranial volume: a clue to the etiology of idiopathic normal-pressure hydrocephalus? *AJNR* 2004;25:1479-1484.
33. Tan ZS, Beiser AS, Fox CS, et al. Association of metabolic dysregulation with volumetric brain magnetic resonance imaging and cognitive markers of subclinical brain aging in middle-aged adults: the Framingham Offspring Study. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1766-1770.
34. Zimmerman RA, Wang ZJ. The value of proton MR spectroscopy in pediatric metabolic brain disease. *AJNR* 1997;18:1872-1879.
35. Ashwal S, Wycliffe ND, Holshouser BA. Advanced neuroimaging in children with nonaccidental trauma. *Dev Neurosci* 2010;32:343-360.
36. Barnes PD. Imaging of nonaccidental injury and the mimics: issues and controversies in the era of evidence-based medicine. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2011;49:205-229.
37. Kou Z, Wu Z, Tong KA, et al. The role of advanced MR imaging findings as biomarkers of traumatic brain injury. *J Head Trauma Rehabil* 2010;25:267-282.
38. Kubal WS. Updated imaging of traumatic brain injury. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2012;50:15-41.
39. Burgess RE, Kidwell CS. Use of MRI in the assessment of patients with stroke. *Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep* 2011;11:28-34.
40. Vernooij MW, van der Lugt A, Ikram MA, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of cerebral microbleeds: the Rotterdam Scan Study. *Neurology* 2008;70:1208-1214.
41. Kidwell CS, Chalela JA, Saver JL, et al. Comparison of MRI and CT for detection of acute intracerebral hemorrhage. *JAMA* 2004;292:1823-1830.
42. Bartynski WS. Posterior reversible encephalopathy syndrome, part 1: fundamental imaging and clinical features. *AJNR* 2008;29:1036-1042.
43. Ge Y. Multiple sclerosis: the role of MR imaging. *AJNR* 2006;27:1165-1176.
44. Jager HR, Albrecht T, Curati-Alasonatti WL, Williams EJ, Haskard DO. MRI in neuro-Behcet's syndrome: comparison of conventional spin-echo and FLAIR pulse sequences. *Neuroradiology* 1999;41:750-758.
45. Pagani E, Bammer R, Horsfield MA, et al. Diffusion MR imaging in multiple sclerosis: technical aspects and challenges. *AJNR* 2007;28:411-420.
46. Dousset V, Armand JP, Huot P, Viaud B, Caille JM. Magnetization transfer imaging in AIDS-related brain diseases. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 1997;7:447-460.
47. Dousset V, Armand JP, Lacoste D, et al. Magnetization transfer study of HIV encephalitis and progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy. Groupe d'Epidemiologie Clinique du SIDA en Aquitaine. *AJNR* 1997;18:895-901.
48. Noujaim SE, Rossi MD, Rao SK, et al. CT and MR imaging of neurocysticercosis. *AJR* 1999;173:1485-1490.
49. Tsuchiya K, Inaoka S, Mizutani Y, Hachiya J. Fast fluid-attenuated inversion-recovery MR of intracranial infections. *AJNR* 1997;18:909-913.
50. Chong BW, Kucharczyk W, Singer W, George S. Pituitary gland MR: a comparative study of healthy volunteers and patients with microadenomas. *AJNR* 1994;15:675-679.
51. Famini P, Maya MM, Melmed S. Pituitary magnetic resonance imaging for sellar and parasellar masses: ten-year experience in 2598 patients. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2011;96:1633-1641.
52. Nagae-Poetscher LM, Jiang H, Wakana S, Golay X, van Zijl PC, Mori S. High-resolution diffusion tensor imaging of the brain stem at 3 T. *AJNR* 2004;25:1325-1330.
53. Craven I, Griffiths PD, Hoggard N. Magnetic resonance imaging of epilepsy at 3 Tesla. *Clin Radiol* 2011;66:278-286.
54. Lee JW, Wen PY, Hurwitz S, et al. Morphological characteristics of brain tumors causing seizures. *Arch Neurol* 2010;67:336-342.
55. Moore KR, Funke ME, Constantino T, Katzman GL, Lewine JD. Magnetoencephalographically directed review of high-spatial-resolution surface-coil MR images improves lesion detection in patients with extratemporal epilepsy. *Radiology* 2002;225:880-887.
56. Sitoh YY, Tien RD. Neuroimaging in epilepsy. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 1998;8:277-288.
57. Wagner J, Weber B, Urbach H, Elger CE, Huppertz HJ. Morphometric MRI analysis improves detection of focal cortical dysplasia type II. *Brain* 2011;134:2844-2854.

58. Mietchen D, Gaser C. Computational morphometry for detecting changes in brain structure due to development, aging, learning, disease and evolution. *Front Neuroinform* 2009;3:25.
59. Hill KL, Jr., Lipson AC, Sheehan JM. Brain magnetic resonance imaging changes after sorafenib and sunitinib chemotherapy in patients with advanced renal cell and breast carcinoma. *J Neurosurg* 2009;111:497-503.
60. Norden AD, Young GS, Setayesh K, et al. Bevacizumab for recurrent malignant gliomas: efficacy, toxicity, and patterns of recurrence. *Neurology* 2008;70:779-787.
61. Rush S, Elliott RE, Morsi A, et al. Incidence, timing, and treatment of new brain metastases after Gamma Knife surgery for limited brain disease: the case for reducing the use of whole-brain radiation therapy. *J Neurosurg* 2011;115:37-48.
62. Wang YX, King AD, Zhou H, et al. Evolution of radiation-induced brain injury: MR imaging-based study. *Radiology* 2010;254:210-218.
63. Amiez C, Kostopoulos P, Champod AS, et al. Preoperative functional magnetic resonance imaging assessment of higher-order cognitive function in patients undergoing surgery for brain tumors. *J Neurosurg* 2008;108:258-268.
64. Nimsky C, Ganslandt O, Von Keller B, Romstock J, Fahlbusch R. Intraoperative high-field-strength MR imaging: implementation and experience in 200 patients. *Radiology* 2004;233:67-78.
65. Pamir MN, Ozduman K, Dincer A, Yildiz E, Peker S, Ozek MM. First intraoperative, shared-resource, ultrahigh-field 3-Tesla magnetic resonance imaging system and its application in low-grade glioma resection. *J Neurosurg* 2010;112:57-69.
66. Barajas RF, Jr., Chang JS, Segal MR, et al. Differentiation of recurrent glioblastoma multiforme from radiation necrosis after external beam radiation therapy with dynamic susceptibility-weighted contrast-enhanced perfusion MR imaging. *Radiology* 2009;253:486-496.
67. Poussaint TY, Rodriguez D. Advanced neuroimaging of pediatric brain tumors: MR diffusion, MR perfusion, and MR spectroscopy. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2006;16:169-192, ix.
68. Castillo M, Kwock L. Proton MR spectroscopy of common brain tumors. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 1998;8:733-752.
69. Castillo M, Kwock L, Courvoisier HE, Hooper SR, Greenwood RS. Proton MR spectroscopy in psychiatric and neurodevelopmental childhood disorders: early experience. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 1998;8:901-912.
70. Castillo M, Kwock L, Scatliff J, Mukherji SK. Proton MR spectroscopy in neoplastic and non-neoplastic brain disorders. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am* 1998;6:1-20.
71. Hollingworth W, Medina LS, Lenkinski RE, et al. A systematic literature review of magnetic resonance spectroscopy for the characterization of brain tumors. *AJNR* 2006;27:1404-1411.
72. Bizzi A, Blasi V, Falini A, et al. Presurgical functional MR imaging of language and motor functions: validation with intraoperative electrocortical mapping. *Radiology* 2008;248:579-589.
73. Buckner RL. Event-related fMRI and the hemodynamic response. *Hum Brain Mapp* 1998;6:373-377.
74. Faisan S, Thoraval L, Armspach JP, Foucher JR, Metz-Lutz MN, Heitz F. Hidden Markov event sequence models: toward unsupervised functional MRI brain mapping. *Acad Radiol* 2005;12:25-36.
75. Turner R, Howseman A, Rees GE, Josephs O, Friston K. Functional magnetic resonance imaging of the human brain: data acquisition and analysis. *Exp Brain Res* 1998;123:5-12.
76. Seshadri S, Wolf PA, Beiser A, et al. Stroke risk profile, brain volume, and cognitive function: the Framingham Offspring Study. *Neurology* 2004;63:1591-1599.
77. Greenwood RS, Tupler LA, Whitt JK, et al. Brain morphometry, T2-weighted hyperintensities, and IQ in children with neurofibromatosis type 1. *Arch Neurol* 2005;62:1904-1908.
78. Ellmore TM, Beauchamp MS, O'Neill TJ, Dreyer S, Tandon N. Relationships between essential cortical language sites and subcortical pathways. *J Neurosurg* 2009;111:755-766.
79. Leclercq D, Duffau H, Delmaire C, et al. Comparison of diffusion tensor imaging tractography of language tracts and intraoperative subcortical stimulations. *J Neurosurg* 2010;112:503-511.
80. Peng H, Arfanakis K. Diffusion tensor encoding schemes optimized for white matter fibers with selected orientations. *Magn Reson Imaging* 2007;25:147-153.
81. Talos IF, Zou KH, Kikinis R, Jolesz FA. Volumetric assessment of tumor infiltration of adjacent white matter based on anatomic MRI and diffusion tensor tractography. *Acad Radiol* 2007;14:431-436.
82. Delso G, Furst S, Jakoby B, et al. Performance measurements of the Siemens mMR integrated whole-body PET/MR scanner. *J Nucl Med* 2011;52:1914-1922.

83. Schmidt GP, Kramer H, Reiser MF, Glaser C. Whole-body magnetic resonance imaging and positron emission tomography-computed tomography in oncology. *Top Magn Reson Imaging* 2007;18:193-202.
84. Zaidi H, Ojha N, Morich M, et al. Design and performance evaluation of a whole-body Ingenuity TF PET-MRI system. *Phys Med Biol* 2011;56:3091-3106.
85. Kanal E, Barkovich AJ, Bell C, et al. ACR guidance document for safe MR practices: 2007. *AJR* 2007;188:1447-1474.
86. Seidenwurm DJ, McDonnell CH, 3rd, Raghavan N, Breslau J. Cost utility analysis of radiographic screening for an orbital foreign body before MR imaging. *AJNR* 2000;21:426-433.
87. Shellock FG. *Reference Manual for Magnetic Resonance Safety. Implants and Devices: 2012 Edition*. Los Angeles, Calif: Biomedical Research Publishing Company; 2012.
88. Shellock FG, Crues JV. MR procedures: biologic effects, safety, and patient care. *Radiology* 2004;232:635-652.
89. Grobner T. Gadolinium--a specific trigger for the development of nephrogenic fibrosing dermopathy and nephrogenic systemic fibrosis? *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2006;21:1104-1108.
90. Albers GW, Lansberg MG, Norbash AM, et al. Yield of diffusion-weighted MRI for detection of potentially relevant findings in stroke patients. *Neurology* 2000;54:1562-1567.
91. Alexander AL, Lee JE, Wu YC, Field AS. Comparison of diffusion tensor imaging measurements at 3.0 T versus 1.5 T with and without parallel imaging. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2006;16:299-309, xi.
92. Barkovich AJ, Kuzniecky RI. Neuroimaging of focal malformations of cortical development. *J Clin Neurophysiol* 1996;13:481-494.
93. Beauchamp NJ, Jr., Ulug AM, Passe TJ, van Zijl PC. MR diffusion imaging in stroke: review and controversies. *Radiographics* 1998;18:1269-1283; discussion 1283-1265.
94. Chong J, Lu D, Aragao F, et al. Diffusion-weighted MR of acute cerebral infarction: comparison of data processing methods. *AJNR* 1998;19:1733-1739.
95. Deliganis AV, Baxter AB, Berger MS, Marcus SG, Maravilla KR. Serial MR in gene therapy for recurrent glioblastoma: initial experience and work in progress. *AJNR* 1997;18:1401-1406.
96. Fried I. Magnetic resonance imaging and epilepsy: neurosurgical decision making. *Magn Reson Imaging* 1995;13:1163-1170.
97. Greenspan SL, Mathews VP, Caldemeyer KS, Patel MR. FLAIR and HASTE imaging in neurologic diseases. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am* 1998;6:53-65.
98. Harwood-Nash DC. Neuroimaging and pediatrics. *Curr Opin Neurol Neurosurg* 1991;4:858-863.
99. Kates R, Atkinson D, Brant-Zawadzki M. Fluid-attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR): clinical prospectus of current and future applications. *Top Magn Reson Imaging* 1996;8:389-396.
100. Larkman DJ, Nunes RG. Parallel magnetic resonance imaging. *Phys Med Biol* 2007;52:R15-55.
101. Lewine JD, Orrison WW, Jr. Magnetic source imaging: basic principles and applications in neuroradiology. *Acad Radiol* 1995;2:436-440.
102. Meltzer CC, Fukui MB, Kanal E, Smirniotopoulos JG. MR imaging of the meninges. Part I. Normal anatomic features and nonneoplastic disease. *Radiology* 1996;201:297-308.
103. Moseley ME, Glover GH. Functional MR imaging. Capabilities and limitations. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 1995;5:161-191.
104. Mukherjee P, Chung SW, Berman JI, Hess CP, Henry RG. Diffusion tensor MR imaging and fiber tractography: technical considerations. *AJNR* 2008;29:843-852.
105. Schwartz RB, Hsu L, Wong TZ, et al. Intraoperative MR imaging guidance for intracranial neurosurgery: experience with the first 200 cases. *Radiology* 1999;211:477-488.
106. Simonetta AB. Imaging of suprasellar and parasellar tumors. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 1999;9:717-732.
107. Tice HM, Jones KM, Mulkern RV, et al. Fast spin-echo imaging of intracranial neoplasms. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 1993;17:425-431.
108. Tyler DJ, Robson MD, Henkelman RM, Young IR, Bydder GM. Magnetic resonance imaging with ultrashort TE (UTE) PULSE sequences: technical considerations. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2007;25:279-289.
109. Haustein J, Laniado M, Niendorf HP, et al. Triple-dose versus standard-dose gadopentetate dimeglumine: a randomized study in 199 patients. *Radiology* 1993;186:855-860.
110. Knauth M, Forsting M, Hartmann M, Heiland S, Balzer T, Sartor K. MR enhancement of brain lesions: increased contrast dose compared with magnetization transfer. *AJNR* 1996;17:1853-1859.

111. Lindsey RO, Yetkin FZ, Prost R, Haughton VM. Effect of dose and field strength on enhancement with paramagnetic contrast media. *AJNR* 1994;15:1849-1852.
112. Russell EJ, Schaible TF, Dillon W, et al. Multicenter double-blind placebo-controlled study of gadopentetate dimeglumine as an MR contrast agent: evaluation in patients with cerebral lesions. *AJR* 1989;152:813-823.
113. Fukuoka H, Hirai T, Okuda T, et al. Comparison of the added value of contrast-enhanced 3D fluid-attenuated inversion recovery and magnetization-prepared rapid acquisition of gradient echo sequences in relation to conventional postcontrast T1-weighted images for the evaluation of leptomeningeal diseases at 3T. *AJNR* 2010;31:868-873.
114. Bagnato F, Hametner S, Yao B, et al. Tracking iron in multiple sclerosis: a combined imaging and histopathological study at 7 Tesla. *Brain* 2011;134:3602-3615.
115. DeLano MC, Fisher C. 3T MR imaging of the brain. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am* 2006;14:77-88.
116. Tallantyre EC, Morgan PS, Dixon JE, et al. 3 Tesla and 7 Tesla MRI of multiple sclerosis cortical lesions. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2010;32:971-977.
117. Van de Moortele PF, Akgun C, Adriany G, et al. B(1) destructive interferences and spatial phase patterns at 7 T with a head transceiver array coil. *Magn Reson Med* 2005;54:1503-1518.
118. Willinek WA, Kuhl CK. 3.0 T neuroimaging: technical considerations and clinical applications. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2006;16:217-228, ix.
119. Zwanenburg JJ, Hendrikse J, Luijten PR. Generalized Multiple-Layer Appearance of the Cerebral Cortex with 3D FLAIR 7.0-T MR Imaging. *Radiology* 2012;262:995-1001.
120. Zwanenburg JJ, Hendrikse J, Visser F, Takahara T, Luijten PR. Fluid attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR) MRI at 7.0 Tesla: comparison with 1.5 and 3.0 Tesla. *Eur Radiol* 2010;20:915-922.
121. Carroll TJ, Horowitz S, Shin W, et al. Quantification of cerebral perfusion using the "bookend technique": an evaluation in CNS tumors. *Magn Reson Imaging* 2008;26:1352-1359.
122. Lindholm TL, Botes L, Engman EL, et al. Parallel imaging: is GRAPPA a useful acquisition tool for MR imaging intended for volumetric brain analysis? *BMC Med Imaging* 2009;9:15.
123. Skare S, Newbould RD, Nordell A, Holdsworth SJ, Bammer R. An auto-calibrated, angularly continuous, two-dimensional GRAPPA kernel for propeller trajectories. *Magn Reson Med* 2008;60:1457-1465.
124. Celsa Hygino da Cruz L. *Clinical Applications of Diffusion Imaging of the Brain, An Issue of Neuroimaging Clinics* Saunders; 2011.
125. Della Nave R, Foresti S, Pratesi A, et al. Whole-brain histogram and voxel-based analyses of diffusion tensor imaging in patients with leukoaraiosis: correlation with motor and cognitive impairment. *AJNR* 2007;28:1313-1319.
126. Gray L, MacFall J. Overview of diffusion imaging. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am* 1998;6:125-138.
127. Kranz PG, Eastwood JD. Does diffusion-weighted imaging represent the ischemic core? An evidence-based systematic review. *AJNR* 2009;30:1206-1212.
128. Seppi K, Poewe W. Brain magnetic resonance imaging techniques in the diagnosis of parkinsonian syndromes. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2010;20:29-55.
129. Stricker NH, Schweinsburg BC, Delano-Wood L, et al. Decreased white matter integrity in late-myelinating fiber pathways in Alzheimer's disease supports retrogenesis. *Neuroimage* 2009;45:10-16.
130. Wang S, Kim S, Chawla S, et al. Differentiation between glioblastomas, solitary brain metastases, and primary cerebral lymphomas using diffusion tensor and dynamic susceptibility contrast-enhanced MR imaging. *AJNR* 2011;32:507-514.
131. Gupta A, Shah A, Young RJ, Holodny AI. Imaging of brain tumors: functional magnetic resonance imaging and diffusion tensor imaging. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2010;20:379-400.
132. Hess CP, Mukherjee P. Visualizing white matter pathways in the living human brain: diffusion tensor imaging and beyond. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2007;17:407-426, vii.
133. Provenzale JM, Liang L, DeLong D, White LE. Diffusion tensor imaging assessment of brain white matter maturation during the first postnatal year. *AJR* 2007;189:476-486.
134. Rovaris M, Agosta F, Pagani E, Filippi M. Diffusion tensor MR imaging. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2009;19:37-43.
135. Kakeda S, Korogi Y, Hiai Y, et al. Detection of brain metastasis at 3T: comparison among SE, IR-FSE and 3D-GRE sequences. *Eur Radiol* 2007;17:2345-2351.

136. Cha S, Lupo JM, Chen MH, et al. Differentiation of glioblastoma multiforme and single brain metastasis by peak height and percentage of signal intensity recovery derived from dynamic susceptibility-weighted contrast-enhanced perfusion MR imaging. *AJNR* 2007;28:1078-1084.
137. Eissa A, Lebel RM, Korzan JR, et al. Detecting lesions in multiple sclerosis at 4.7 tesla using phase susceptibility-weighting and T2-weighting. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2009;30:737-742.
138. Haacke EM, Mittal S, Wu Z, Neelavalli J, Cheng YC. Susceptibility-weighted imaging: technical aspects and clinical applications, part 1. *AJNR* 2009;30:19-30.
139. Haller S, Bartsch A, Nguyen D, et al. Cerebral microhemorrhage and iron deposition in mild cognitive impairment: susceptibility-weighted MR imaging assessment. *Radiology* 2010;257:764-773.
140. Li C, Ai B, Li Y, Qi H, Wu L. Susceptibility-weighted imaging in grading brain astrocytomas. *Eur J Radiol* 2010;75:e81-85.
141. Mittal S, Wu Z, Neelavalli J, Haacke EM. Susceptibility-weighted imaging: technical aspects and clinical applications, part 2. *AJNR* 2009;30:232-252.
142. Tong KA, Ashwal S, Obenaus A, Nickerson JP, Kido D, Haacke EM. Susceptibility-weighted MR imaging: a review of clinical applications in children. *AJNR* 2008;29:9-17.
143. Ben Bashat D, Sivan I, Ziv M, et al. T1-weighted functional imaging based on a contrast agent in presurgical mapping. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2008;28:1245-1250.
144. Bizzi A. Presurgical mapping of verbal language in brain tumors with functional MR imaging and MR tractography. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2009;19:573-596.
145. Chiarelli PA, Bulte DP, Wise R, Gallichan D, Jezard P. A calibration method for quantitative BOLD fMRI based on hyperoxia. *Neuroimage* 2007;37:808-820.
146. Diamond EL, Miller S, Dickerson BC, et al. Relationship of fMRI activation to clinical trial memory measures in Alzheimer disease. *Neurology* 2007;69:1331-1341.
147. Filippi M, Rocca MA. Functional MR imaging in multiple sclerosis. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2009;19:59-70.
148. Gartus A, Geissler A, Foki T, et al. Comparison of fMRI coregistration results between human experts and software solutions in patients and healthy subjects. *Eur Radiol* 2007;17:1634-1643.
149. Kokkonen SM, Nikkinen J, Remes J, et al. Preoperative localization of the sensorimotor area using independent component analysis of resting-state fMRI. *Magn Reson Imaging* 2009;27:733-740.
150. Lai G, Schneider HD, Schwarzenberger JC, Hirsch J. Speech stimulation during functional MR imaging as a potential indicator of autism. *Radiology* 2011;260:521-530.
151. Petrella JR, Shah LM, Harris KM, et al. Preoperative functional MR imaging localization of language and motor areas: effect on therapeutic decision making in patients with potentially resectable brain tumors. *Radiology* 2006;240:793-802.
152. Pillai JJ. Insights into adult postlesional language cortical plasticity provided by cerebral blood oxygen level-dependent functional MR imaging. *AJNR* 2010;31:990-996.
153. Pillai JJ, Zaca D. Relative utility for hemispheric lateralization of different clinical fMRI activation tasks within a comprehensive language paradigm battery in brain tumor patients as assessed by both threshold-dependent and threshold-independent analysis methods. *Neuroimage* 2011;54 Suppl 1:S136-145.
154. Schwenkreis P, Maier C, Tegenthoff M. Functional imaging of central nervous system involvement in complex regional pain syndrome. *AJNR* 2009;30:1279-1284.
155. Shi F, Liu Y, Jiang T, et al. Regional homogeneity and anatomical parcellation for fMRI image classification: application to schizophrenia and normal controls. *Med Image Comput Comput Assist Interv* 2007;10:136-143.
156. Suarez RO, Whalen S, Nelson AP, et al. Threshold-independent functional MRI determination of language dominance: a validation study against clinical gold standards. *Epilepsy Behav* 2009;16:288-297.
157. Weber MA, Henze M, Tuttonberg J, et al. Biopsy targeting gliomas: do functional imaging techniques identify similar target areas? *Invest Radiol* 2010;45:755-768.
158. Wengenroth M, Blatow M, Guenther J, Akbar M, Tronnier VM, Stippich C. Diagnostic benefits of presurgical fMRI in patients with brain tumours in the primary sensorimotor cortex. *Eur Radiol* 2011;21:1517-1525.
159. Deibler AR, Pollock JM, Kraft RA, Tan H, Burdette JH, Maldjian JA. Arterial spin-labeling in routine clinical practice, part 1: technique and artifacts. *AJNR* 2008;29:1228-1234.

160. Deibler AR, Pollock JM, Kraft RA, Tan H, Burdette JH, Maldjian JA. Arterial spin-labeling in routine clinical practice, part 2: hypoperfusion patterns. *AJNR* 2008;29:1235-1241.
161. Deibler AR, Pollock JM, Kraft RA, Tan H, Burdette JH, Maldjian JA. Arterial spin-labeling in routine clinical practice, part 3: hyperperfusion patterns. *AJNR* 2008;29:1428-1435.
162. Emblem KE, Zoellner FG, Tennoe B, et al. Predictive modeling in glioma grading from MR perfusion images using support vector machines. *Magn Reson Med* 2008;60:945-952.
163. Haris M, Husain N, Singh A, et al. Dynamic contrast-enhanced derived cerebral blood volume correlates better with leak correction than with no correction for vascular endothelial growth factor, microvascular density, and grading of astrocytoma. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2008;32:955-965.
164. Kim MJ, Kim HS, Kim JH, Cho KG, Kim SY. Diagnostic accuracy and interobserver variability of pulsed arterial spin labeling for glioma grading. *Acta Radiol* 2008;49:450-457.
165. Lacerda S, Law M. Magnetic resonance perfusion and permeability imaging in brain tumors. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2009;19:527-557.
166. Saindane AM, Law M, Ge Y, Johnson G, Babb JS, Grossman RI. Correlation of diffusion tensor and dynamic perfusion MR imaging metrics in normal-appearing corpus callosum: support for primary hypoperfusion in multiple sclerosis. *AJNR* 2007;28:767-772.
167. Ambarki K, Wahlin A, Birgander R, Eklund A, Malm J. MR imaging of brain volumes: evaluation of a fully automatic software. *AJNR* 2011;32:408-412.
168. Curiati PK, Tamashiro JH, Squarzone P, et al. Brain structural variability due to aging and gender in cognitively healthy Elders: results from the Sao Paulo Ageing and Health study. *AJNR* 2009;30:1850-1856.
169. Fleisher AS, Sun S, Taylor C, et al. Volumetric MRI vs clinical predictors of Alzheimer disease in mild cognitive impairment. *Neurology* 2008;70:191-199.
170. Heckemann RA, Hammers A, Rueckert D, Aviv RI, Harvey CJ, Hajnal JV. Automatic volumetry on MR brain images can support diagnostic decision making. *BMC Med Imaging* 2008;8:9.
171. Reig S, Sanchez-Gonzalez J, Arango C, et al. Assessment of the increase in variability when combining volumetric data from different scanners. *Hum Brain Mapp* 2009;30:355-368.
172. Aljabar P, Rueckert D, Crum WR. Automated morphological analysis of magnetic resonance brain imaging using spectral analysis. *Neuroimage* 2008;43:225-235.
173. Cardenas VA, Studholme C, Gazdzinski S, Durazzo TC, Meyerhoff DJ. Deformation-based morphometry of brain changes in alcohol dependence and abstinence. *Neuroimage* 2007;34:879-887.
174. Jack CR, Jr., Bernstein MA, Fox NC, et al. The Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI): MRI methods. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2008;27:685-691.
175. Kim JH, Suh SI, Seol HY, et al. Regional grey matter changes in patients with migraine: a voxel-based morphometry study. *Cephalalgia* 2008;28:598-604.
176. Moorhead TW, Gountouna VE, Job DE, et al. Prospective multi-centre Voxel Based Morphometry study employing scanner specific segmentations: procedure development using CaliBrain structural MRI data. *BMC Med Imaging* 2009;9:8.
177. Pieperhoff P, Sudmeyer M, Homke L, Zilles K, Schnitzler A, Amunts K. Detection of structural changes of the human brain in longitudinally acquired MR images by deformation field morphometry: methodological analysis, validation and application. *Neuroimage* 2008;43:269-287.
178. Roberts TP, Rowley HA. Mapping of the sensorimotor cortex: functional MR and magnetic source imaging. *AJNR* 1997;18:871-880.
179. Shen S, Szameitat AJ, Sterr A. VBM lesion detection depends on the normalization template: a study using simulated atrophy. *Magn Reson Imaging* 2007;25:1385-1396.
180. Shiino A, Watanabe T, Kitagawa T, et al. Different atrophic patterns in early- and late-onset Alzheimer's disease and evaluation of clinical utility of a method of regional z-score analysis using voxel-based morphometry. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord* 2008;26:175-186.
181. Spencer MD, Moorhead TW, McIntosh AM, et al. Grey matter correlates of early psychotic symptoms in adolescents at enhanced risk of psychosis: a voxel-based study. *Neuroimage* 2007;35:1181-1191.
182. Xu L, Pearlson G, Calhoun VD. Joint source based morphometry identifies linked gray and white matter group differences. *Neuroimage* 2009;44:777-789.
183. Heers M, Rampp S, Stefan H, et al. MEG-based identification of the epileptogenic zone in occult peri-insular epilepsy. *Seizure* 2012;21:128-133.

184. de Boer R, Vrooman HA, van der Lijn F, et al. White matter lesion extension to automatic brain tissue segmentation on MRI. *Neuroimage* 2009;45:1151-1161.
185. Denby CE, Vann SD, Tsvivilis D, et al. The frequency and extent of mammillary body atrophy associated with surgical removal of a colloid cyst. *AJNR* 2009;30:736-743.
186. Ganeshan B, Miles KA, Young RC, Chatwin CR, Gurling HM, Critchley HD. Three-dimensional textural analysis of brain images reveals distributed grey-matter abnormalities in schizophrenia. *Eur Radiol* 2010;20:941-948.
187. Goodwin JA, Vidyasagar R, Balanos GM, Bulte D, Parkes LM. Quantitative fMRI using hyperoxia calibration: reproducibility during a cognitive Stroop task. *Neuroimage* 2009;47:573-580.
188. Harrison LC, Raunio M, Holli KK, et al. MRI texture analysis in multiple sclerosis: toward a clinical analysis protocol. *Acad Radiol* 2010;17:696-707.
189. Hobbs NZ, Henley SM, Wild EJ, et al. Automated quantification of caudate atrophy by local registration of serial MRI: evaluation and application in Huntington's disease. *Neuroimage* 2009;47:1659-1665.
190. Holli KK, Harrison L, Dastidar P, et al. Texture analysis of MR images of patients with mild traumatic brain injury. *BMC Med Imaging* 2010;10:8.
191. Sati P, Cross AH, Luo J, Hildebolt CF, Yablonskiy DA. In vivo quantitative evaluation of brain tissue damage in multiple sclerosis using gradient echo plural contrast imaging technique. *Neuroimage* 2010;51:1089-1097.
192. Shen S, Szameitat AJ, Sterr A. An improved lesion detection approach based on similarity measurement between fuzzy intensity segmentation and spatial probability maps. *Magn Reson Imaging* 2010;28:245-254.
193. Wilson SM, Ogar JM, Laluz V, et al. Automated MRI-based classification of primary progressive aphasia variants. *Neuroimage* 2009;47:1558-1567.
194. Zacharaki EI, Wang S, Chawla S, et al. Classification of brain tumor type and grade using MRI texture and shape in a machine learning scheme. *Magn Reson Med* 2009;62:1609-1618.
195. Cecil KM, Lenkinski RE. Proton MR spectroscopy in inflammatory and infectious brain disorders. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 1998;8:863-880.
196. Cohen BA, Inglese M, Rusinek H, Babb JS, Grossman RI, Gonen O. Proton MR spectroscopy and MRI-volumetry in mild traumatic brain injury. *AJNR* 2007;28:907-913.
197. Gu M, Kim DH, Mayer D, Sullivan EV, Pfefferbaum A, Spielman DM. Reproducibility study of whole-brain 1H spectroscopic imaging with automated quantification. *Magn Reson Med* 2008;60:542-547.
198. Horska A, Barker PB. Imaging of brain tumors: MR spectroscopy and metabolic imaging. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2010;20:293-310.
199. Majos C, Bruna J, Julia-Sape M, et al. Proton MR spectroscopy provides relevant prognostic information in high-grade astrocytomas. *AJNR* 2011;32:74-80.
200. Sajja BR, Wolinsky JS, Narayana PA. Proton magnetic resonance spectroscopy in multiple sclerosis. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2009;19:45-58.
201. Sundgren PC. MR spectroscopy in radiation injury. *AJNR* 2009;30:1469-1476.
202. Arimura H, Yoshiura T, Kumazawa S, et al. Automated method for identification of patients with Alzheimer's disease based on three-dimensional MR images. *Acad Radiol* 2008;15:274-284.
203. Lee AD, Leow AD, Lu A, et al. 3D pattern of brain abnormalities in Fragile X syndrome visualized using tensor-based morphometry. *Neuroimage* 2007;34:924-938.
204. Mills RJ, Young CA, Smith ET. 3D MRI in multiple sclerosis: a study of three sequences at 3 T. *Br J Radiol* 2007;80:307-320.
205. Moraal B, Roosendaal SD, Pouwels PJ, et al. Multi-contrast, isotropic, single-slab 3D MR imaging in multiple sclerosis. *Eur Radiol* 2008;18:2311-2320.
206. Bello L, Fava E, Casaceli G, et al. Intraoperative mapping for tumor resection. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2009;19:597-614.
207. Grossman RI. Application of magnetization transfer imaging to multiple sclerosis. *Neurology* 1999;53:S8-11.
208. Helms G, Dathe H, Kallenberg K, Dechent P. High-resolution maps of magnetization transfer with inherent correction for RF inhomogeneity and T1 relaxation obtained from 3D FLASH MRI. *Magn Reson Med* 2008;60:1396-1407.

209. Portaccio E, Stromillo ML, Goretti B, et al. Neuropsychological and MRI measures predict short-term evolution in benign multiple sclerosis. *Neurology* 2009;73:498-503.
210. Ropele S, Fazekas F. Magnetization transfer MR imaging in multiple sclerosis. *Neuroimaging Clin N Am* 2009;19:27-36.
211. Wu Y, Storey P, Carrillo A, et al. Whole brain and localized magnetization transfer measurements are associated with cognitive impairment in patients infected with human immunodeficiency virus. *AJNR* 2008;29:140-145.
212. Hofkes SK, Iskandar BJ, Turski PA, Gentry LR, McCue JB, Haughton VM. Differentiation between symptomatic Chiari I malformation and asymptomatic tonsillar ectopia by using cerebrospinal fluid flow imaging: initial estimate of imaging accuracy. *Radiology* 2007;245:532-540.
213. Guidance for the Industry: Guidance for Premarket Notifications for Magnetic Resonance Diagnostic Devices. US Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, Center for Devices and Radiological Health. <http://www.fda.gov/MedicalDevices/DeviceRegulationandGuidance/GuidanceDocuments/ucm073817.htm>. Accessed January 20, 2012.

*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

2002 (Resolution 8)

Amended 2006 (Resolution 35)

Revised 2008 (Resolution 21)

Revised 2013 (Resolution 6)

Amended 2014 (Resolution 39)