

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 2016 (Resolution 7)*

ACR–SPR–SSR PRACTICE PARAMETER FOR THE PERFORMANCE AND INTERPRETATION OF MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING (MRI) OF THE HIP AND PELVIS FOR MUSCULOSKELETAL DISORDERS

PREAMBLE

This document is an educational tool designed to assist practitioners in providing appropriate radiologic care for patients. Practice parameters and technical standards are not inflexible rules or requirements of practice and are not intended, nor should they be used, to establish a legal standard of care¹. For these reasons and those set forth below, the American College of Radiology and our collaborating medical specialty societies caution against the use of these documents in litigation in which the clinical decisions of a practitioner are called into question.

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

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

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

I. INTRODUCTION

This practice parameter was developed and written collaboratively by the American College of Radiology (ACR), the Society for Pediatric Radiology (SPR), and the Society of Skeletal Radiology (SSR). It addresses magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) performed to evaluate musculoskeletal disorders of the pelvis and hips and to investigate symptoms that are believed to originate in the musculoskeletal system. Guidelines for pelvic MRI examinations performed to evaluate the male and female genitourinary tracts, bowel, and vasculature are not included herein (see the [ACR–SAR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\) of the Soft-Tissue Components of the Pelvis](#) [1]).

Magnetic resonance imaging is a proven, established imaging method for the detection, evaluation, staging, and follow-up of musculoskeletal conditions of the hip and pelvis. Properly performed and interpreted, MRI not only contributes to diagnosis but also serves as an important guide to treatment planning and prognostication [2-11]. However, MRI should be performed only for a valid medical reason and only after careful consideration of alternative imaging methods. The strengths of MRI and other imaging techniques should be weighed as to their suitability in particular patients and clinical conditions.

Radiographs should be the initial imaging study for most suspected abnormalities of the hip and pelvis [12]. Sequential radiographs are a key component in the postoperative evaluation of hip arthroplasty and other orthopedic procedures [13]. Bone scintigraphy is used to screen the entire skeleton for conditions such as metastases. Additionally, with some limitations [14], bone scans can also detect radiographically occult osteonecrosis, fractures [15], and stress fractures [16] in the hips and pelvis. Because of its superior sensitivity and specificity, however, MRI has largely replaced scintigraphy for these indications [12,17-19]. Other radionuclide studies do contribute to the evaluation of symptomatic hip arthroplasties [20]. Ultrasound may be used for tendon disorders in the proximal thighs [21-23] and bursitis [24] but is unreliable for detecting hip effusions in adults [25]. Ultrasound is useful in the assessment of the snapping hip due to external and internal causes [26,27]. Ultrasound is a useful tool for guiding hip and pelvis injections and aspirations. In children, sonography can be used to diagnose developmental dysplasia of the hip, hip effusions, and pelvic apophyseal avulsions [28]. Sonography and conventional arthrography can be used to evaluate developmental hip dysplasia in infants and young children [29]. In adults, the clinical response to intra-articular anesthetic injection in the hip helps predict intra-articular pathology [30,31]. Therapeutic injection of the pubic symphysis cleft may help diagnose the cause of groin pain in athletes [32,33]. Hip arthroscopy, an invasive procedure, provides a detailed examination of the internal structures of the hip joint, allowing the surgeon to treat as well as diagnose many internal derangements [34,35].

Computed tomography (CT), especially with multidetector helical scanners using thin collimation, is often preferred to MRI for detailed evaluation of bony alignment and cortical pathology. Multiplanar 2-D reformatting and 3-D volume rendering increase the utility of CT for orthopedic purposes. Typical applications include evaluation of the acetabulum and hip joint after fractures or dislocations [36-38], preoperative planning for complex pelvic osteotomies and arthroplasties [37,39], and evaluation of osteolysis around hip arthroplasty components [40-42]. MRI has largely replaced CT for detecting femoral head osteonecrosis [43], but CT is still valuable for detecting subchondral fractures in necrotic femoral heads [44]. CT can detect radiographically occult hip fractures, but MRI is more sensitive [45,46]. CT is a reasonable secondary imaging method (after MRI) for soft-tissue disorders such as sports hernias [47] and monoarticular proliferative arthropathies [12]. CT can detect erosions in patients with sacroiliitis but normal radiographs [48]. Multidetector CT arthrography can detect cartilage lesions [49]. In patients with contraindications to MR imaging, CT arthrography may be valuable for the evaluation of acetabular cartilage and labrum. Radially oriented multiplanar reformation may be a useful adjunct in the assessment of bone morphology, acetabular cartilage, and labrum [49,50].

Although MRI is often the most sensitive noninvasive diagnostic test for detecting anatomic abnormalities of the hip and pelvis, its findings may be misleading if not closely correlated with the clinical history, physical examination, physiologic tests such as nerve conduction analysis and electromyography, and other imaging studies. Adherence to the following parameters will enhance the probability of detecting such abnormalities.

II. INDICATIONS

A. Primary indications for MRI of the hip and pelvis include, but are not limited to, screening, diagnosis, exclusion, grading, and/or prognostication of suspected:

1. Osteonecrosis of the femoral head(s), including staging of osteonecrosis and screening of asymptomatic hips contralateral to a hip with osteonecrosis [2,6,43,51-64]
2. Other marrow abnormalities of the femoral head(s), including transient and migratory osteoporosis, transient marrow edema syndrome, and subchondral insufficiency fractures* [61,63,65-68]
3. Radiographically occult traumatic fractures of the proximal femur and pelvis [11,17,18,46,69-76]
4. Stress fractures (fatigue and insufficiency types) of the proximal femur, pelvis, and sacrum [16,19,45,77-85]
5. Childhood hip disorders and their adult sequelae: Legg-Calvé-Perthes disease, slipped capital femoral epiphysis, idiopathic chondrolysis, coxa vara, proximal femoral focal deficiency, and developmental dysplasia*† [3,7,39,86-91]
6. Femoroacetabular impingement (cam, pincer, and mixed types), including evaluation of labral, articular cartilage, and bone morphologic abnormalities† [5,90,92-103]
7. Acetabular labral tears, traumatic and/or degenerative† [90,92,104-113]
8. Abductor (gluteus medius and minimus) musculotendinous disorders and greater trochanteric bursitis* [114-121]
9. Proximal hamstring musculotendinous disorders and ischial bursitis* [21,122-124]
10. Hip rotator and flexor musculotendinous disorders and iliopsoas bursitis (including quadratus femoris, iliopsoas, rectus femoris) [24,125-130]
11. Athletic pubalgia, including adductor/rectus abdominus musculotendinous disorders and pubic bone, osteitis pubis, and other disorders presenting as “sports hernia”† [10,19,32,33,47,82,131-140]
12. Osteochondral and chondral abnormalities in the hip joint, including chondral delamination† [91,95,97,98,104,105,141-144]
13. Ligamentum teres rupture† [145,146]
14. Bursitis in and around the pelvis* [24,82,104,115,127,147,148]
15. Sacral plexus abnormalities, nerve entrapment, and piriformis syndrome [85,149,150]

B. MRI of the hip and pelvis may be indicated to further clarify and stage conditions diagnosed clinically and/or suggested by other imaging modalities, including, but not limited to:

1. Hip arthritis and synovitis: inflammatory, infectious, degenerative, crystal-induced, post-traumatic, proliferative* [151-161]
2. Hip joint effusions [24,55,162]
3. Hip joint bodies† [163]
4. Pelvic impingement syndromes, including ischiofemoral and lesser trochanter [125,130]
5. Sacroiliitis* [4,151,164]
6. Primary and secondary bone and soft-tissue tumors of the pelvis, proximal femur, and thigh* [149,165-168] (see also the [ACR–SSR Practice Parameter for the Performance and Interpretation of Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\) of Bone and Soft Tissue Tumors](#) [169])
7. Fractures and dislocations of the hip and pelvis* [28,170,171]
8. Osteomyelitis, septic arthritis, and soft-tissue infection of the hip and pelvis* [9,154,172-176]

C. MRI of the hip and pelvis may be useful to evaluate specific clinical scenarios, including, but not limited to:

1. Prolonged, refractory, or unexplained hip, trochanteric, pubic, or pelvic pain† [82,115,117,119,121,135,140,150,177]
2. Pelvic, proximal thigh, or groin pain in athletes† [19,21,32,33,82,104,131-135,137-140,143,178]
3. Acute or chronic hip and pelvis trauma with associated soft-tissue injuries* [38,71,179]
4. Pelvic pain after radiation therapy [78,79,81]

5. Mechanical symptoms in the hip, including snapping and clicking† [8,23,35,105,107]
6. Following reduction of congenital hip dislocation in infants and children*† [62,180-185]
7. Symptomatic adults with developmental dysplasia of the hip† [3,7,39,49,90]
8. Patients for whom diagnostic or therapeutic hip arthroscopy is planned† [31,105,109]
9. Hip arthroplasties with suspected soft tissue or periprosthetic abnormalities*§ [13,120,121,186-191]
10. Pelvimetry in women with obstructed labor [192,193]

* Conditions in which intravenous (IV) contrast may be useful

† Conditions in which intra-articular contrast (performed by direct intra-articular injection or indirect joint opacification following IV administration) may be useful

§ Conditions in which use of metal artifact reduction pulse sequences (MARS) may be useful

III. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

See the [ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\)](#) [194].

IV. SAFETY GUIDELINES AND POSSIBLE CONTRAINDICATIONS

See the [ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\)](#) [194] and the [ACR Guidance Document on MR Safe Practices: 2013](#) [195].

Peer-reviewed literature pertaining to MR safety should be reviewed on a regular basis [196,197].

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 hip and pelvis for musculoskeletal disorders 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 telephone for consultation. Patients must be screened and interviewed prior to the examination to exclude individuals who may be at risk by exposure to the MR 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 use (see the [ACR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Use of Intravascular Contrast Media](#) [198]).

Pediatric patients or patients suffering from anxiety or claustrophobia may require sedation or additional assistance. Administration of moderate sedation or general anesthesia may be needed to achieve a successful examination, particularly in young children. If moderate sedation is necessary, refer to the [ACR–SIR Practice Parameter for Sedation/Analgesia](#) [199].

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

Diagnostic-quality hip and pelvis MRI can be performed with low-, medium-, or high-field systems of either closed-bore or open design. High-field magnets (1.5T and higher) have inherently better signal-to-noise ratios (SNR) than lower-field systems, providing greater flexibility to obtain high-resolution images in a reasonable amount of time. However, there are circumstances where lower field strength may be advantageous. These situations include imaging around metallic implants like prostheses and screws [13,200] and imaging in pregnant patients to reduce energy deposition in the fetus [193] (for more information, refer to the [ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\)](#) [194] and the [ACR Guidance Document on MR Safe Practices: 2013](#) [195]). Three-tesla (3T) MRI systems have higher SNR and may offer improvements in assessment of cartilage and functional imaging [201-204].

Although an initial screen for abnormalities may use a body coil [37,57,205,206], high-resolution images require the use of a local coil. Multicoil arrays work best when imaging the entire pelvis and both hips [207,208]. When detailed images of a single hip or proximal femur are needed, several coil choices are available, ranging in configuration from flexible single coils [72,209] to paired loop-gap designs to commercially available or custom-built phased arrays [71,186,210-212].

Patients are typically positioned supine. The feet may be internally rotated and gently immobilized with tape, if necessary. Slight flexion at the knees achieved with padding may be more comfortable for some patients.

Coronal images are a mainstay of pelvic and hip MRI, and coronal T1-weighted and short-tau inversion recovery (STIR) images alone can rapidly screen for fractures [11,72,74] or femoral head osteonecrosis [57], but a complete examination should also include images in at least 1 additional imaging plane. Coronal and transverse images constitute a minimum examination for most indications [83,135,140,213]. The addition of sagittal plane images is useful for quantifying the extent of femoral head osteonecrosis [53,58,214], evaluating the hip joint cartilage and acetabular roof [79,215], investigating abnormalities of the proximal hamstring muscles and tendons [122,123], assessing anterosuperior labral tears, and performing MR pelvimetry [192,193]. Additionally, the standard imaging planes may be altered for specific indications.

Oblique coronal and transverse images angled parallel to the upper sacrum are useful to evaluate the sacroiliac joints [151,164], while either direct or oblique coronal and transverse images can image the sacral plexus [149,216]. Selective use of oblique images along one femoral neck may assist in the diagnosis of subtle fractures [206,209,217] and labral tears [112,218] and in the evaluation of the femoral head-neck junction in femoroacetabular impingement syndrome [94]. Axial oblique images obtained parallel to the arcuate line of the pelvic inlet using a sagittal localizer can provide improved delineation of symphysis pubis anatomy in cases of groin pain or pubalgia [139]. In some practices, radial images acquired either directly [219,220] or via multiplanar reformatting of a volumetric data set [96,109,221,222] may assist the diagnosis of labral and cartilage pathology and potentially provide a more sensitive assessment of femoral head asphericity in cam-type femoroacetabular impingement [96,221], but whether the accuracy for diagnosing labral tears in such patients is improved compared to conventional imaging planes has not been determined [219]. Typically, 3 imaging planes are used for MR arthrography of the hip [107]. These may be oriented orthogonal to the pelvis or parallel to the femoral neck and perpendicular to the acetabular face for evaluating the acetabular labrum and hip joint capsule [223]. Three-dimensional imaging may be useful for delineation and follow-up of femoral head and acetabular cartilage abnormalities [224-226].

The field of view (FOV) should be tailored to the size of the patient and the structures being examined. To screen the entire pelvis, a 35- to 45-cm FOV is typical, and the images should include enough tissue laterally to encompass the gluteal insertions and trochanteric bursae [116]. Images that include the entire pelvis are useful for making side-to-side comparisons [206]. Even when symptoms are unilateral, it may be advantageous to include at least 1 sequence with a large enough FOV to detect contralateral disease, which is frequently present [80]. Hip or groin pain may originate from several different anatomic structures, and a larger FOV may be required for evaluating the source of pain [139]. Larger FOV images can also frequently detect clinically occult pathology in patients with suspected proximal femur fractures [11]. For screening purposes, 6- to 8-mm-thick sections are adequate. However, higher imaging resolution is necessary to distinguish femoral head osteonecrosis from transient marrow conditions [61], to demonstrate subtle fracture lines, and to quantify the extent of osteonecrosis [53]. High-resolution imaging can be accomplished with a relatively large FOV if thin slices and a high imaging matrix are used (for example, 3- to 4-mm slice thickness and a 512 x 512 matrix) [53], or it can be accomplished by reducing the FOV to 16 to 20 cm and imaging each hip separately [71,227]. MR arthrography for labral or articular cartilage disease often requires even higher spatial resolution, with a small FOV to cover just 1 hip (typically 15 to 22 cm), thin sections (1.5 to 3 mm), and a relatively high matrix (256 phase steps or more) [141,223]. There is generally a trade-off between spatial resolution and imaging time [207]. Parallel imaging, which is available on some MR systems, allows faster image acquisition without substantial loss in image quality [228]. Parallel imaging can also mitigate undesired energy deposition on higher-field MRI systems like 3T scanners [229]. An interslice gap can increase coverage and decrease signal loss due to crosstalk [230] but should be no more than 33% of the slice width and should not impair visualization of the intra-articular structures.

A wide variety of pulse sequences are available to image the pelvis and hips [231]. The choice of sequences, like other aspects of the imaging protocol, can be tailored to optimize the examination to answer specific clinical questions [37] and may vary due to local preferences. Short transition time/echo time (TR/TE) (T1-weighted) images are typically obtained using conventional spin-echo (SE) or fast (turbo) spin-echo (FSE) sequences. Long TR/TE (T2-weighted) and STIR images are frequently obtained using FSE techniques for more rapid image acquisition than SE technique allows [59]. Gradient-recalled sequences tend to produce larger artifacts and result in lower soft-tissue contrast [206] but may be advantageous at lower field strengths [232] and for selected applications such as demonstration of hemosiderin in hips affected by pigmented villonodular synovitis [153] or evaluation of articular cartilage [142,220]. Gradient-echo and modified fast (turbo) spin-echo sequences can also be acquired as a 3-D volume, which is partitioned into contiguous thin sections or nonorthogonal imaging planes.

An imaging protocol will be composed of 1 or more pulse sequence types. For each sequence, the exact TR, TE, TI (inversion time), and flip angle chosen will depend on the field strength of the magnet and the desired contrast weighting. A typical minimal MRI examination of the pelvis and hips might consist of coronal SE or FSE T1-weighted and fat-suppressed, FSE T2-weighted or STIR images, and transverse T1-weighted and T2-weighted sequences [140,206,213]. The T1-weighted images optimally show anatomic details such as fracture lines and bone marrow assessment [53,72,79,81], while T2-weighted or STIR images demonstrate fluid collections and

edema within the soft tissue and bone marrow [79,162,205]; the combination is an effective screen for a variety of hip and pelvic pathologies [77,135,213]. T1-weighted sequences also have a role in characterizing various stages of hemorrhage [233,234] and muscle pathology [235,236] and for showing enhancement when gadolinium-based IV contrast agents are used [237]. T1-weighted images with fat suppression—either 2-D spin-echo or FSE [107,141] or 3-D spoiled gradient-echo [222,223]—are also used when MR arthrography is performed with a gadolinium-based contrast agent. At least 1 T2-weighted sequence should also be performed with MR arthrograms to show additional abnormalities affecting the hip (eg, stress fractures, tendon/muscle injuries, bursitis, and cystic structures that do not communicate with the joint). Additionally, at least 1 T1-weighted sequence without fat suppression is useful for evaluating bone marrow and characterizing soft-tissue lesions.

Suppressing the signal from fat may enhance the diagnostic yield of some pulse sequences [231]. Fat suppression can use spectral suppression of water protons, a phase-dependent method such as the Dixon technique, or a STIR sequence [238,239]. The latter 2 methods may be necessary on low-field systems [240]. Fat suppression increases the conspicuity of marrow abnormalities and soft-tissue edema on fluid-sensitive sequences [4,206] and is useful with a T1-weighted sequence when using gadolinium-based contrast agents such as in MR arthrographic evaluation of hip cartilage or labral tears [97,112]. Selective excitation of water protons is an alternative to fat suppression and has been investigated for evaluating the hip articular cartilage [215].

For specific hip and pelvis disorders, IV contrast may be useful. Contrast enhancement suggests femoral head viability in Legg-Calvé-Perthes disease [241] and femoral neck fractures [170,171] and may predict future risk of osteonecrosis after closed reduction of developmental hip dysplasia [62]. IV contrast can also aid in the diagnosis of hip joint synovitis [151,154,176], pelvic infections [172], tendon degeneration [138], and tumors, and it may play a role in the evaluation of the interface surrounding hip prosthesis components [13]. MR arthrography is beneficial for evaluating internal hip derangements [31,35] and sports injury [82]. The MR diagnosis of labral, articular cartilage, and joint capsule abnormalities in the hip is enhanced by the addition of intra-articular contrast [90,105,223,242] and may be superior to conventional small-FOV MRI in the evaluation of labral tears [111]. For the hip joint, MR arthrography is usually performed following direct imaging-guided, intra-articular injection of dilute gadolinium-based contrast or saline. Adding leg traction has been reported to improve delineation of the cartilage surfaces [142,243] and acetabular labrum [242] during MR arthrography but is not commonly used in clinical practice because of logistical issues.

Although indirect MR arthrography is also possible for hip imaging, because of the size of the joint, a delay after IV contrast administration is necessary to allow adequate contrast diffusion into the joint [242]. Indirect MR arthrography may be more sensitive for labral tears but may not improve diagnosis of chondral abnormalities compared to nonarthrographic MRI [113].

dGEMRIC (delayed gadolinium enhanced MRI of cartilage) is a technique for assessing cartilage integrity in osteoarthritis and other hip diseases that result in cartilage damage. It requires the use of an anionically charged gadolinium contrast agent, typically administered intravenously [5,102,103,244], but can also be performed after intra-articular injection [245]. dGEMRIC has been used to diagnose and stage osteoarthritis in patients with femoroacetabular impingement [5] and for preosteotomy evaluation of patients with hip dysplasia [7]. Additional MR techniques for cartilage assessment have been tested in patients with hip diseases. T2 mapping has been used to evaluate cartilage in hip dysplasia patients [246]. Leg traction may improve delineation of the cartilage surfaces [142,243] and acetabular labrum [242] during MR arthrography. T1-rho may be a useful imaging technique in the detection of early cartilage degeneration [247,248].

Various techniques are used to reduce artifacts that can reduce imaging quality. When the FOV excludes parts of the pelvis that are within the sensitivity range of the coil (eg, when imaging a single hip), aliasing artifacts can be reduced by phase oversampling or by orienting the phase-encoding direction along the anteroposterior axis [241]. Ensuring patient comfort combined with gentle immobilization when necessary best controls involuntary patient motion [231]. Presaturation pulses and/or gradient moment nulling will reduce ghosting artifacts caused by flowing blood [249,250]. Imaging near metallic implants requires special care to reduce susceptibility to artifacts. Orienting the long axis of the implant along the frequency-encoding gradient [121,187,210,251], avoiding

gradient-recalled sequences [187], and substituting STIR for chemical fat suppression [13,120,187,190,252] are important. FSE sequences with short interecho spacing, multiple refocusing pulses (long echo trains), and tailored RF pulses will further minimize metallic artifacts [120,186,188,210,251,253]. Metal artifact is further reduced by using a wide readout bandwidth and small pixel dimensions, which may require more signals averaged to maintain an adequate SNR and are better performed using MR systems with wider available receiver bandwidths [13,186,190,210,251]. In addition, recent progress in vendor-specific metal artifact reduction techniques, such as the section encoding for metal artifact correction technique (SEMAC) and multiacquisition variable-resonance image combination technique (MAVRIC), reduce metal-related artifacts while improving depiction of synovium and bone-implant interfaces [254]. Both techniques provide a diagnostically meaningful reduction of metal artifact around implants and can be used as an adjunct to optimized 2-D FSE sequences [254]. Lastly, artifacts from metal implants are less prominent on low-field systems compared with high-field systems [13].

It is the responsibility of the supervising physician to determine whether additional or unconventional pulse sequences or imaging techniques would confer added benefit for the diagnosis and management of the patient. Examinations that use techniques not approved by the Food and Drug Administration—such as the intra-articular injection of gadolinium chelates (direct MR arthrography) [255]—should be considered only 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](#) [256].

At a minimum, the report should address any abnormalities in the bone marrow, soft tissues, and joints. In selected cases, a description of findings in specific muscles and tendons, articular cartilage, fibrocartilage, synovium, neurovascular structures, lymph nodes, cortical bone, and surrounding bursae would be appropriate. For MR arthrograms of the hip, the report should also specifically indicate the condition of the acetabular labrum and articular cartilage. Whenever possible, the report should use standard anatomic nomenclature and precise terms and anatomic localization for describing identified abnormalities.

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 the 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 MRI safety should be in place along 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. [196,197,257]. Screening forms must also be provided to detect those patients who may be at risk for adverse events associated with the MRI examination [258].

Equipment monitoring should be in accordance with the [ACR–AAPM Technical Standard for Diagnostic Medical Physics Performance Monitoring of Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\) Equipment](#) [259].

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 Practice Parameters – Body Imaging (Musculoskeletal) of the ACR Commission on Body Imaging and the Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology of the ACR Commission on Pediatric Radiology, in collaboration with the SPR and the SSR.

Principal Reviewer: Martin P. Torriani, MD

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

ACR

David A. Rubin, MD, FACR, Chair
Donna G. Blankenbaker, MD
Tal Laor, MD

SPR

Jerry R. Dwek, MD
Jeffrey L. Koning, MD
Amisha J. Shah, MD

SSR

Mary G. Hochman, MD
Jonathan S. Luchs, MD, FACR
Adam C. Zoga, MD

Committee on Body Imaging (Musculoskeletal)

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

William B. Morrison, MD, Chair
Christine B. Chung, MD
Robert K. Gelczer, MD
Dawn M. Hastreiter, MD, PhD
Viviane Khoury, MD
Jonathan S. Luchs, MD, FACR
Jeffrey J. Peterson, MD
Catherine C. Roberts, MD
Trenton D. Roth, MD
David A. Rubin, MD, FACR

Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology

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

Beverly Newman, MB, BCh, BSc, FACR, Chair
Lorna P. Browne, MB, BCh
Timothy J. Carmody, MD, FACR
Brian D. Coley, MD, FACR
Lee K. Collins, MD
Monica S. Epelman, MD
Lynn Ansley Fordham, MD, FACR
Kerri A. Highmore, MD
Sue C. Kaste, DO
Tal Laor, MD
Terry L. Levin, MD
Marguerite T. Parisi, MD, MS
Sumit Pruthi, MBBS

Nancy K. Rollins, MD
Pallavi Sagar, MD

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

Comments Reconciliation Committee

Sanjay K. Shetty, MD, MBA, Chair
Catherine J. Everett, MD, MBA, FACR, Co-Chair
Jacqueline A. Bello, MD, FACR
Lincoln L Berland, MD, FACR
Donna G. Blankenbaker, MD
Jerry R. Dwek, MD
Marta Hernanz-Schulman, MD, FACR
William T. Herrington, MD, FACR
Mary G. Hochman, MD
Jeffrey L. Koning, MD
Tal Laor, MD
Paul A. Larson, MD, FACR
Jonathan S. Luchs, MD, FACR
William B. Morrison, MD
Beverly Newman, MB, BCh, BSc, FACR
Matthew S. Pollack, MD, FACR
David A. Rubin, MD, FACR
Amisha J. Shah, MD
Timothy L. Swan, MD, FACR, FSIR
Martin P. Torriani, MD
Adam C. Zoga, MD

REFERENCES

1. American College of Radiology. ACR–SAR–SPR practice parameter for the performance of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the soft-tissue components of the pelvis. 2015; Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-SoftTissue-Pel.pdf>. Accessed July 20, 2015.
2. Bassounas AE, Karantanas AH, Fotiadis DI, Malizos KN. Femoral head osteonecrosis: volumetric MRI assessment and outcome. *Eur J Radiol.* 2007;63(1):10-15.
3. Ueshima K, Takahashi KA, Fujioka M, et al. Relationship between acetabular labrum evaluation by using radial magnetic resonance imaging and progressive joint space narrowing in mild hip dysplasia. *Magn Reson Imaging.* 2006;24(5):645-650.
4. Bennett AN, McGonagle D, O'Connor P, et al. Severity of baseline magnetic resonance imaging-evident sacroiliitis and HLA-B27 status in early inflammatory back pain predict radiographically evident ankylosing spondylitis at eight years. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2008;58(11):3413-3418.
5. Jessel RH, Zilkens C, Tiderius C, Dudda M, Mamisch TC, Kim YJ. Assessment of osteoarthritis in hips with femoroacetabular impingement using delayed gadolinium enhanced MRI of cartilage. *J Magn Reson Imaging.* 2009;30(5):1110-1115.
6. Zibis AH, Karantanas AH, Roidis NT, et al. The role of MR imaging in staging femoral head osteonecrosis. *Eur J Radiol.* 2007;63(1):3-9.
7. Cunningham T, Jessel R, Zurakowski D, Millis MB, Kim YJ. Delayed gadolinium-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging of cartilage to predict early failure of Bernese periacetabular osteotomy for hip dysplasia. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2006;88(7):1540-1548.

8. Neumann G, Mendicuti AD, Zou KH, et al. Prevalence of labral tears and cartilage loss in patients with mechanical symptoms of the hip: evaluation using MR arthrography. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2007;15(8):909-917.
9. Zalavras CG, Rigopoulos N, Lee J, Learch T, Patzakis MJ. Magnetic resonance imaging findings in hematogenous osteomyelitis of the hip in adults. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2009;467(7):1688-1692.
10. Meyers WC, McKechnie A, Philippon MJ, Horner MA, Zoga AC, Devon ON. Experience with "sports hernia" spanning two decades. *Ann Surg*. 2008;248(4):656-665.
11. Sankey RA, Turner J, Lee J, Healy J, Gibbons CE. The use of MRI to detect occult fractures of the proximal femur: a study of 102 consecutive cases over a ten-year period. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. 2009;91(8):1064-1068.
12. Newberg AH, Newman JS. Imaging the painful hip. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2003(406):19-28.
13. Sugimoto H, Hirose I, Miyaoka E, et al. Low-field-strength MR imaging of failed hip arthroplasty: association of femoral periprosthetic signal intensity with radiographic, surgical, and pathologic findings. *Radiology*. 2003;229(3):718-723.
14. Garcia-Morales F, Seo GS, Chengazi V, Monu JU. Collar osteophytes: a cause of false-positive findings in bone scans for hip fractures. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2003;181(1):191-194.
15. Holder LE, Schwarz C, Wernicke PG, Michael RH. Radionuclide bone imaging in the early detection of fractures of the proximal femur (hip): multifactorial analysis. *Radiology*. 1990;174(2):509-515.
16. Song WS, Yoo JJ, Koo KH, Yoon KS, Kim YM, Kim HJ. Subchondral fatigue fracture of the femoral head in military recruits. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2004;86-A(9):1917-1924.
17. Feldman F, Staron RB. MRI of seemingly isolated greater trochanteric fractures. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2004;183(2):323-329.
18. Rubin SJ, Marquardt JD, Gottlieb RH, Meyers SP, Totterman SM, O'Mara RE. Magnetic resonance imaging: a cost-effective alternative to bone scintigraphy in the evaluation of patients with suspected hip fractures. *Skeletal Radiol*. 1998;27(4):199-204.
19. Shin AY, Morin WD, Gorman JD, Jones SB, Lapinsky AS. The superiority of magnetic resonance imaging in differentiating the cause of hip pain in endurance athletes. *Am J Sports Med*. 1996;24(2):168-176.
20. Stumpe KD, Notzli HP, Zanetti M, et al. FDG PET for differentiation of infection and aseptic loosening in total hip replacements: comparison with conventional radiography and three-phase bone scintigraphy. *Radiology*. 2004;231(2):333-341.
21. Connell DA, Schneider-Kolsky ME, Hoving JL, et al. Longitudinal study comparing sonographic and MRI assessments of acute and healing hamstring injuries. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2004;183(4):975-984.
22. Wahl CJ, Warren RF, Adler RS, Hannafin JA, Hansen B. Internal coxa saltans (snapping hip) as a result of overtraining: a report of 3 cases in professional athletes with a review of causes and the role of ultrasound in early diagnosis and management. *Am J Sports Med*. 2004;32(5):1302-1309.
23. Wunderbaldinger P, Bremer C, Matuszewski L, Marten K, Turetschek K, Rand T. Efficient radiological assessment of the internal snapping hip syndrome. *Eur Radiol*. 2001;11(9):1743-1747.
24. Wunderbaldinger P, Bremer C, Schellenberger E, Cejna M, Turetschek K, Kainberger F. Imaging features of iliopsoas bursitis. *Eur Radiol*. 2002;12(2):409-415.
25. Weybright PN, Jacobson JA, Murry KH, et al. Limited effectiveness of sonography in revealing hip joint effusion: preliminary results in 21 adult patients with native and postoperative hips. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2003;181(1):215-218.
26. Deslandes M, Guillin R, Cardinal E, Hobden R, Bureau NJ. The snapping iliopsoas tendon: new mechanisms using dynamic sonography. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2008;190(3):576-581.
27. Choi YS, Lee SM, Song BY, Paik SH, Yoon YK. Dynamic sonography of external snapping hip syndrome. *J Ultrasound Med*. 2002;21(7):753-758.
28. Pisacano RM, Miller TT. Comparing sonography with MR imaging of apophyseal injuries of the pelvis in four boys. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2003;181(1):223-230.
29. Liu JS, Kuo KN, Lubicky JP. Arthrographic evaluation of developmental dysplasia of the hip. Outcome prediction. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 1996(326):229-237.
30. Martin RL, Irrgang JJ, Sekiya JK. The diagnostic accuracy of a clinical examination in determining intra-articular hip pain for potential hip arthroscopy candidates. *Arthroscopy*. 2008;24(9):1013-1018.

31. Byrd JW, Jones KS. Diagnostic accuracy of clinical assessment, magnetic resonance imaging, magnetic resonance arthrography, and intra-articular injection in hip arthroscopy patients. *Am J Sports Med.* 2004;32(7):1668-1674.
32. Schilders E, Bismil Q, Robinson P, O'Connor PJ, Gibbon WW, Talbot JC. Adductor-related groin pain in competitive athletes. Role of adductor enthesis, magnetic resonance imaging, and enthesal pubic cleft injections. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2007;89(10):2173-2178.
33. Schilders E, Talbot JC, Robinson P, Dimitrakopoulou A, Gibbon WW, Bismil Q. Adductor-related groin pain in recreational athletes: role of the adductor enthesis, magnetic resonance imaging, and enthesal pubic cleft injections. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2009;91(10):2455-2460.
34. Kelly BT, Williams RJ, 3rd, Philippon MJ. Hip arthroscopy: current indications, treatment options, and management issues. *Am J Sports Med.* 2003;31(6):1020-1037.
35. McCarthy JC, Lee JA. Arthroscopic intervention in early hip disease. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2004(429):157-162.
36. Brooks RA, Ribbans WJ. Diagnosis and imaging studies of traumatic hip dislocations in the adult. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2000(377):15-23.
37. Conway WF, Totty WG, McEnery KW. CT and MR imaging of the hip. *Radiology.* 1996;198(2):297-307.
38. Potter HG, Montgomery KD, Heise CW, Helfet DL. MR imaging of acetabular fractures: value in detecting femoral head injury, intraarticular fragments, and sciatic nerve injury. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1994;163(4):881-886.
39. Garbuz DS, Masri BA, Haddad F, Duncan CP. Clinical and radiographic assessment of the young adult with symptomatic hip dysplasia. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2004(418):18-22.
40. Claus AM, Totterman SM, Sychterz CJ, Tamez-Pena JG, Looney RJ, Engh CA, Sr. Computed tomography to assess pelvic lysis after total hip replacement. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2004(422):167-174.
41. Park JS, Ryu KN, Hong HP, Park YK, Chun YS, Yoo MC. Focal osteolysis in total hip replacement: CT findings. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2004;33(11):632-640.
42. Puri L, Wixson RL, Stern SH, Kohli J, Hendrix RW, Stulberg SD. Use of helical computed tomography for the assessment of acetabular osteolysis after total hip arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2002;84-A(4):609-614.
43. Mitchell MD, Kundel HL, Steinberg ME, Kressel HY, Alavi A, Axel L. Avascular necrosis of the hip: comparison of MR, CT, and scintigraphy. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1986;147(1):67-71.
44. Stevens K, Tao C, Lee SU, et al. Subchondral fractures in osteonecrosis of the femoral head: comparison of radiography, CT, and MR imaging. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2003;180(2):363-368.
45. Cabarrus MC, Ambekar A, Lu Y, Link TM. MRI and CT of insufficiency fractures of the pelvis and the proximal femur. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2008;191(4):995-1001.
46. Lubovsky O, Liebergall M, Mattan Y, Weil Y, Mosheiff R. Early diagnosis of occult hip fractures MRI versus CT scan. *Injury.* 2005;36(6):788-792.
47. Fon LJ, Spence RA. Sportsman's hernia. *Br J Surg.* 2000;87(5):545-552.
48. Kozin F, Carrera GF, Ryan LM, Foley D, Lawson T. Computed tomography in the diagnosis of sacroiliitis. *Arthritis Rheum.* 1981;24(12):1479-1485.
49. Nishii T, Tanaka H, Nakanishi K, Sugano N, Miki H, Yoshikawa H. Fat-suppressed 3D spoiled gradient-echo MRI and MDCT arthrography of articular cartilage in patients with hip dysplasia. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2005;185(2):379-385.
50. Yamamoto Y, Tonotsuka H, Ueda T, Hamada Y. Usefulness of radial contrast-enhanced computed tomography for the diagnosis of acetabular labrum injury. *Arthroscopy.* 2007;23(12):1290-1294.
51. Beltran J, Knight CT, Zuelzer WA, et al. Core decompression for avascular necrosis of the femoral head: correlation between long-term results and preoperative MR staging. *Radiology.* 1990;175(2):533-536.
52. Cheng EY, Thongtrangan I, Laorr A, Saleh KJ. Spontaneous resolution of osteonecrosis of the femoral head. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2004;86-A(12):2594-2599.
53. Cherian SF, Laorr A, Saleh KJ, Kuskowski MA, Bailey RF, Cheng EY. Quantifying the extent of femoral head involvement in osteonecrosis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2003;85-A(2):309-315.
54. Coleman BG, Kressel HY, Dalinka MK, Scheibler ML, Burk DL, Cohen EK. Radiographically negative avascular necrosis: detection with MR imaging. *Radiology.* 1988;168(2):525-528.

55. Huang GS, Chan WP, Chang YC, Chang CY, Chen CY, Yu JS. MR imaging of bone marrow edema and joint effusion in patients with osteonecrosis of the femoral head: relationship to pain. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2003;181(2):545-549.
56. Iida S, Harada Y, Shimizu K, et al. Correlation between bone marrow edema and collapse of the femoral head in steroid-induced osteonecrosis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2000;174(3):735-743.
57. Khanna AJ, Yoon TR, Mont MA, Hungerford DS, Bluemke DA. Femoral head osteonecrosis: detection and grading by using a rapid MR imaging protocol. *Radiology.* 2000;217(1):188-192.
58. Koo KH, Kim R. Quantifying the extent of osteonecrosis of the femoral head. A new method using MRI. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 1995;77(6):875-880.
59. May DA, Disler DG. Screening for avascular necrosis of the hip with rapid MRI: preliminary experience. *J Comput Assist Tomogr.* 2000;24(2):284-287.
60. Radke S, Kirschner S, Seipel V, Rader C, Eulert J. Magnetic resonance imaging criteria of successful core decompression in avascular necrosis of the hip. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2004;33(9):519-523.
61. Watson RM, Roach NA, Dalinka MK. Avascular necrosis and bone marrow edema syndrome. *Radiol Clin North Am.* 2004;42(1):207-219.
62. Tiderius C, Jaramillo D, Connolly S, et al. Post-closed reduction perfusion magnetic resonance imaging as a predictor of avascular necrosis in developmental hip dysplasia: a preliminary report. *J Pediatr Orthop.* 2009;29(1):14-20.
63. Ito H, Matsuno T, Minami A. Relationship between bone marrow edema and development of symptoms in patients with osteonecrosis of the femoral head. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2006;186(6):1761-1770.
64. Piyakunmala K, Sangkomkarn T, Chareonchonvanitch K. Is magnetic resonance imaging necessary for normal plain radiography evaluation of contralateral non-traumatic asymptomatic femoral head in high osteonecrosis risk patient. *J Med Assoc Thai.* 2009;92 Suppl 6:S147-151.
65. Bloem JL. Transient osteoporosis of the hip: MR imaging. *Radiology.* 1988;167(3):753-755.
66. Malizos KN, Zibis AH, Dailiana Z, Hantes M, Karachalios T, Karantanas AH. MR imaging findings in transient osteoporosis of the hip. *Eur J Radiol.* 2004;50(3):238-244.
67. Neuhold A, Hofmann S, Engel A, et al. Bone marrow edema of the hip: MR findings after core decompression. *J Comput Assist Tomogr.* 1992;16(6):951-955.
68. Vande Berg BC, Malghem JJ, Lecouvet FE, Jamart J, Maldague BE. Idiopathic bone marrow edema lesions of the femoral head: predictive value of MR imaging findings. *Radiology.* 1999;212(2):527-535.
69. Deutsch AL, Mink JH, Waxman AD. Occult fractures of the proximal femur: MR imaging. *Radiology.* 1989;170(1 Pt 1):113-116.
70. Haramati N, Staron RB, Barax C, Feldman F. Magnetic resonance imaging of occult fractures of the proximal femur. *Skeletal Radiol.* 1994;23(1):19-22.
71. Oka M, Monu JU. Prevalence and patterns of occult hip fractures and mimics revealed by MRI. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2004;182(2):283-288.
72. Quinn SF, McCarthy JL. Prospective evaluation of patients with suspected hip fracture and indeterminate radiographs: use of T1-weighted MR images. *Radiology.* 1993;187(2):469-471.
73. Rizzo PF, Gould ES, Lyden JP, Asnis SE. Diagnosis of occult fractures about the hip. Magnetic resonance imaging compared with bone-scanning. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 1993;75(3):395-401.
74. Frihagen F, Nordsletten L, Tariq R, Madsen JE. MRI diagnosis of occult hip fractures. *Acta Orthop.* 2005;76(4):524-530.
75. Hossain M, Barwick C, Sinha AK, Andrew JG. Is magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) necessary to exclude occult hip fracture? *Injury.* 2007;38(10):1204-1208.
76. Verbeeten KM, Hermann KL, Hasselqvist M, et al. The advantages of MRI in the detection of occult hip fractures. *Eur Radiol.* 2005;15(1):165-169.
77. Ahovuo JA, Kiuru MJ, Visuri T. Fatigue stress fractures of the sacrum: diagnosis with MR imaging. *Eur Radiol.* 2004;14(3):500-505.
78. Blomlie V, Rofstad EK, Talle K, Sundfor K, Winderen M, Lien HH. Incidence of radiation-induced insufficiency fractures of the female pelvis: evaluation with MR imaging. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1996;167(5):1205-1210.
79. Grangier C, Garcia J, Howarth NR, May M, Rossier P. Role of MRI in the diagnosis of insufficiency fractures of the sacrum and acetabular roof. *Skeletal Radiol.* 1997;26(9):517-524.

80. Kiuru MJ, Pihlajamaki HK, Ahovuo JA. Fatigue stress injuries of the pelvic bones and proximal femur: evaluation with MR imaging. *Eur Radiol.* 2003;13(3):605-611.
81. Otte MT, Helms CA, Fritz RC. MR imaging of supra-acetabular insufficiency fractures. *Skeletal Radiol.* 1997;26(5):279-283.
82. Overdeck KH, Palmer WE. Imaging of hip and groin injuries in athletes. *Semin Musculoskelet Radiol.* 2004;8(1):41-55.
83. Slocum KA, Gorman JD, Puckett ML, Jones SB. Resolution of abnormal MR signal intensity in patients with stress fractures of the femoral neck. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1997;168(5):1295-1299.
84. Hebert KJ, Laor T, Divine JG, Emery KH, Wall EJ. MRI appearance of chronic stress injury of the iliac crest apophysis in adolescent athletes. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2008;190(6):1487-1491.
85. Pecina HI, Boric I, Smoljanovic T, Duvancic D, Pecina M. Surgical evaluation of magnetic resonance imaging findings in piriformis muscle syndrome. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2008;37(11):1019-1023.
86. Futami T, Suzuki S, Seto Y, Kashiwagi N. Sequential magnetic resonance imaging in slipped capital femoral epiphysis: assessment of preslip in the contralateral hip. *J Pediatr Orthop B.* 2001;10(4):298-303.
87. Jaramillo D, Kasser JR, Villegas-Medina OL, Gaary E, Zurakowski D. Cartilaginous abnormalities and growth disturbances in Legg-Calve-Perthes disease: evaluation with MR imaging. *Radiology.* 1995;197(3):767-773.
88. Kaniklides C, Lonnerholm T, Moberg A, Sahlstedt B. Legg-Calve-Perthes disease. Comparison of conventional radiography, MR imaging, bone scintigraphy and arthrography. *Acta Radiol.* 1995;36(4):434-439.
89. Zilkens C, Holstein A, Bittersohl B, et al. Delayed gadolinium-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging of cartilage in the long-term follow-up after Perthes disease. *J Pediatr Orthop.* 2010;30(2):147-153.
90. Leunig M, Podeszwa D, Beck M, Werlen S, Ganz R. Magnetic resonance arthrography of labral disorders in hips with dysplasia and impingement. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2004(418):74-80.
91. Laor T, Crawford AH. Idiopathic chondrolysis of the hip in children: early MRI findings. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2009;192(2):526-531.
92. Ito K, Leunig M, Ganz R. Histopathologic features of the acetabular labrum in femoroacetabular impingement. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2004(429):262-271.
93. Ito K, Minka MA, 2nd, Leunig M, Werlen S, Ganz R. Femoroacetabular impingement and the cam-effect. A MRI-based quantitative anatomical study of the femoral head-neck offset. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2001;83(2):171-176.
94. Notzli HP, Wyss TF, Stoecklin CH, Schmid MR, Treiber K, Hodler J. The contour of the femoral head-neck junction as a predictor for the risk of anterior impingement. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2002;84(4):556-560.
95. Schmid MR, Notzli HP, Zanetti M, Wyss TF, Hodler J. Cartilage lesions in the hip: diagnostic effectiveness of MR arthrography. *Radiology.* 2003;226(2):382-386.
96. Rakhra KS, Sheikh AM, Allen D, Beaulé PE. Comparison of MRI alpha angle measurement planes in femoroacetabular impingement. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2009;467(3):660-665.
97. Anderson LA, Peters CL, Park BB, Stoddard GJ, Erickson JA, Crim JR. Acetabular cartilage delamination in femoroacetabular impingement. Risk factors and magnetic resonance imaging diagnosis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2009;91(2):305-313.
98. Pfirrmann CW, Duc SR, Zanetti M, Dora C, Hodler J. MR arthrography of acetabular cartilage delamination in femoroacetabular cam impingement. *Radiology.* 2008;249(1):236-241.
99. Pfirrmann CW, Mengiardi B, Dora C, Kalberer F, Zanetti M, Hodler J. Cam and pincer femoroacetabular impingement: characteristic MR arthrographic findings in 50 patients. *Radiology.* 2006;240(3):778-785.
100. Kassarian A, Yoon LS, Belzile E, Connolly SA, Millis MB, Palmer WE. Triad of MR arthrographic findings in patients with cam-type femoroacetabular impingement. *Radiology.* 2005;236(2):588-592.
101. James SL, Ali K, Malara F, Young D, O'Donnell J, Connell DA. MRI findings of femoroacetabular impingement. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2006;187(6):1412-1419.
102. Bittersohl B, Hosalkar HS, Kim YJ, Werlen S, Siebenrock KA, Mamisch TC. Delayed gadolinium-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging (dGEMRIC) of hip joint cartilage in femoroacetabular impingement (FAI): Are pre- and postcontrast imaging both necessary? *Magn Reson Med.* 2009;62(6):1362-1367.
103. Bittersohl B, Steppacher S, Haamberg T, et al. Cartilage damage in femoroacetabular impingement (FAI): preliminary results on comparison of standard diagnostic vs delayed gadolinium-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging of cartilage (dGEMRIC). *Osteoarthritis Cartilage.* 2009;17(10):1297-1306.

104. Boutin RD, Newman JS. MR imaging of sports-related hip disorders. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am*. 2003;11(2):255-281.
105. Keeney JA, Peelle MW, Jackson J, Rubin D, Maloney WJ, Clohisy JC. Magnetic resonance arthrography versus arthroscopy in the evaluation of articular hip pathology. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2004(429):163-169.
106. Magee T, Hinson G. Association of paralabral cysts with acetabular disorders. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2000;174(5):1381-1384.
107. Petersilge CA, Haque MA, Petersilge WJ, Lewin JS, Lieberman JM, Buly R. Acetabular labral tears: evaluation with MR arthrography. *Radiology*. 1996;200(1):231-235.
108. Schnarkowski P, Steinbach LS, Tirman PF, Peterfy CG, Genant HK. Magnetic resonance imaging of labral cysts of the hip. *Skeletal Radiol*. 1996;25(8):733-737.
109. Chan YS, Lien LC, Hsu HL, et al. Evaluating hip labral tears using magnetic resonance arthrography: a prospective study comparing hip arthroscopy and magnetic resonance arthrography diagnosis. *Arthroscopy*. 2005;21(10):1250.
110. Mintz DN, Hooper T, Connell D, Buly R, Padgett DE, Potter HG. Magnetic resonance imaging of the hip: detection of labral and chondral abnormalities using noncontrast imaging. *Arthroscopy*. 2005;21(4):385-393.
111. Toomayan GA, Holman WR, Major NM, Kozlowicz SM, Vail TP. Sensitivity of MR arthrography in the evaluation of acetabular labral tears. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2006;186(2):449-453.
112. Freedman BA, Potter BK, Dinauer PA, Giuliani JR, Kuklo TR, Murphy KP. Prognostic value of magnetic resonance arthrography for Czerny stage II and III acetabular labral tears. *Arthroscopy*. 2006;22(7):742-747.
113. Zlatkin MB, Pevsner D, Sanders TG, Hancock CR, Ceballos CE, Herrera MF. Acetabular labral tears and cartilage lesions of the hip: indirect MR arthrographic correlation with arthroscopy--a preliminary study. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2010;194(3):709-714.
114. Chung CB, Robertson JE, Cho GJ, Vaughan LM, Copp SN, Resnick D. Gluteus medius tendon tears and avulsive injuries in elderly women: imaging findings in six patients. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1999;173(2):351-353.
115. Bird PA, Oakley SP, Shnier R, Kirkham BW. Prospective evaluation of magnetic resonance imaging and physical examination findings in patients with greater trochanteric pain syndrome. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2001;44(9):2138-2145.
116. Cvitanic O, Henzie G, Skezas N, Lyons J, Minter J. MRI diagnosis of tears of the hip abductor tendons (gluteus medius and gluteus minimus). *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2004;182(1):137-143.
117. Kingzett-Taylor A, Tirman PF, Feller J, et al. Tendinosis and tears of gluteus medius and minimus muscles as a cause of hip pain: MR imaging findings. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1999;173(4):1123-1126.
118. Kagan A, 2nd. Rotator cuff tears of the hip. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 1999(368):135-140.
119. Demant AW, Kocovic L, Henschkowski J, et al. Hip pain in renal transplant recipients: symptomatic gluteus minimus and gluteus medius tendon abnormality as an alternative MRI diagnosis to avascular necrosis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2007;188(2):515-519.
120. Twair A, Ryan M, O'Connell M, Powell T, O'Byrne J, Eustace S. MRI of failed total hip replacement caused by abductor muscle avulsion. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2003;181(6):1547-1550.
121. Pfirmann CW, Notzli HP, Dora C, Hodler J, Zanetti M. Abductor tendons and muscles assessed at MR imaging after total hip arthroplasty in asymptomatic and symptomatic patients. *Radiology*. 2005;235(3):969-976.
122. De Smet AA, Best TM. MR imaging of the distribution and location of acute hamstring injuries in athletes. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2000;174(2):393-399.
123. Slavotinek JP, Verrall GM, Fon GT. Hamstring injury in athletes: using MR imaging measurements to compare extent of muscle injury with amount of time lost from competition. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2002;179(6):1621-1628.
124. Askling CM, Tengvar M, Saartok T, Thorstensson A. Acute first-time hamstring strains during slow-speed stretching: clinical, magnetic resonance imaging, and recovery characteristics. *Am J Sports Med*. 2007;35(10):1716-1724.
125. O'Brien SD, Bui-Mansfield LT. MRI of quadratus femoris muscle tear: another cause of hip pain. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2007;189(5):1185-1189.

126. Bui KL, Ilaslan H, Recht M, Sundaram M. Iliopsoas injury: an MRI study of patterns and prevalence correlated with clinical findings. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2008;37(3):245-249.
127. Kozlov DB, Sonin AH. Iliopsoas bursitis: diagnosis by MRI. *J Comput Assist Tomogr.* 1998;22(4):625-628.
128. Nguyen JT, Peterson JS, Biswal S, Beaulieu CF, Fredericson M. Stress-related injuries around the lesser trochanter in long-distance runners. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2008;190(6):1616-1620.
129. Ouellette H, Thomas BJ, Nelson E, Torriani M. MR imaging of rectus femoris origin injuries. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2006;35(9):665-672.
130. Torriani M, Souto SC, Thomas BJ, Ouellette H, Bredella MA. Ischiofemoral impingement syndrome: an entity with hip pain and abnormalities of the quadratus femoris muscle. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2009;193(1):186-190.
131. Zoga AC, Kavanagh EC, Omar IM, et al. Athletic pubalgia and the "sports hernia": MR imaging findings. *Radiology.* 2008;247(3):797-807.
132. Cunningham PM, Brennan D, O'Connell M, MacMahon P, O'Neill P, Eustace S. Patterns of bone and soft-tissue injury at the symphysis pubis in soccer players: observations at MRI. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2007;188(3):W291-296.
133. Slavotinek JP, Verrall GM, Fon GT, Sage MR. Groin pain in footballers: the association between preseason clinical and pubic bone magnetic resonance imaging findings and athlete outcome. *Am J Sports Med.* 2005;33(6):894-899.
134. Nelson EN, Kassarian A, Palmer WE. MR imaging of sports-related groin pain. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am.* 2005;13(4):727-742.
135. Brennan D, O'Connell MJ, Ryan M, et al. Secondary cleft sign as a marker of injury in athletes with groin pain: MR image appearance and interpretation. *Radiology.* 2005;235(1):162-167.
136. Anderson SE, Johnston JO, O'Donnell R, Steinbach LS. MR Imaging of sports-related pseudotumor in children: mid femoral diaphyseal periostitis at insertion site of adductor musculature. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2001;176(5):1227-1231.
137. Anderson MW, Kaplan PA, Dussault RG. Adductor insertion avulsion syndrome (thigh splints): spectrum of MR imaging features. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2001;177(3):673-675.
138. Robinson P, Barron DA, Parsons W, Grainger AJ, Schilders EM, O'Connor PJ. Adductor-related groin pain in athletes: correlation of MR imaging with clinical findings. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2004;33(8):451-457.
139. Omar IM, Zoga AC, Kavanagh EC, et al. Athletic pubalgia and "sports hernia": optimal MR imaging technique and findings. *Radiographics.* 2008;28(5):1415-1438.
140. Albers SL, Spritzer CE, Garrett WE, Jr., Meyers WC. MR findings in athletes with pubalgia. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2001;30(5):270-277.
141. Beaulieu PE, Zaragoza E, Copelan N. Magnetic resonance imaging with gadolinium arthrography to assess acetabular cartilage delamination. A report of four cases. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2004;86-A(10):2294-2298.
142. Nishii T, Nakanishi K, Sugano N, Masuhara K, Ohzono K, Ochi T. Articular cartilage evaluation in osteoarthritis of the hip with MR imaging under continuous leg traction. *Magn Reson Imaging.* 1998;16(8):871-875.
143. Weaver CJ, Major NM, Garrett WE, Urbaniak JE. Femoral head osteochondral lesions in painful hips of athletes: MR imaging findings. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2002;178(4):973-977.
144. Zaragoza E, Lattanzio PJ, Beaulieu PE. Magnetic resonance imaging with gadolinium arthrography to assess acetabular cartilage delamination. *Hip Int.* 2009;19(1):18-23.
145. Byrd JW, Jones KS. Traumatic rupture of the ligamentum teres as a source of hip pain. *Arthroscopy.* 2004;20(4):385-391.
146. Chang CY, Gill CM, Huang AJ, et al. Use of MR arthrography in detecting tears of the ligamentum teres with arthroscopic correlation. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2015;44(3):361-367.
147. Robinson P, White LM, Agur A, Wunder J, Bell RS. Obturator externus bursa: anatomic origin and MR imaging features of pathologic involvement. *Radiology.* 2003;228(1):230-234.
148. Varma DG, Richli WR, Charnsangavej C, Samuels BI, Kim EE, Wallace S. MR appearance of the distended iliopsoas bursa. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1991;156(5):1025-1028.
149. Gierada DS, Erickson SJ. MR imaging of the sacral plexus: abnormal findings. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1993;160(5):1067-1071.
150. Tibor LM, Sekiya JK. Differential diagnosis of pain around the hip joint. *Arthroscopy.* 2008;24(12):1407-1421.

151. Bollow M, Braun J, Hamm B, et al. Early sacroiliitis in patients with spondyloarthropathy: evaluation with dynamic gadolinium-enhanced MR imaging. *Radiology*. 1995;194(2):529-536.
152. Boutry N, Paul C, Leroy X, Fredoux D, Migaud H, Cotten A. Rapidly destructive osteoarthritis of the hip: MR imaging findings. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2002;179(3):657-663.
153. Cheng XG, You YH, Liu W, Zhao T, Qu H. MRI features of pigmented villonodular synovitis (PVNS). *Clin Rheumatol*. 2004;23(1):31-34.
154. Lee SK, Suh KJ, Kim YW, et al. Septic arthritis versus transient synovitis at MR imaging: preliminary assessment with signal intensity alterations in bone marrow. *Radiology*. 1999;211(2):459-465.
155. Otake S, Tsuruta Y, Yamana D, Mizutani H, Ohba S. Amyloid arthropathy of the hip joint: MR demonstration of presumed amyloid lesions in 152 patients with long-term hemodialysis. *Eur Radiol*. 1998;8(8):1352-1356.
156. Soini I, Kotaniemi A, Kautiainen H, Kauppi M. US assessment of hip joint synovitis in rheumatic diseases. A comparison with MR imaging. *Acta Radiol*. 2003;44(1):72-78.
157. Sugano N, Ohzono K, Nishii T, et al. Early MRI findings of rapidly destructive coxopathy. *Magn Reson Imaging*. 2001;19(1):47-50.
158. Watanabe W, Itoi E, Yamada S. Early MRI findings of rapidly destructive coxarthrosis. *Skeletal Radiol*. 2002;31(1):35-38.
159. Zhai G, Cicuttini F, Srikanth V, Cooley H, Ding C, Jones G. Factors associated with hip cartilage volume measured by magnetic resonance imaging: the Tasmanian Older Adult Cohort Study. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2005;52(4):1069-1076.
160. Mamisch TC, Zilkens C, Siebenrock KA, Bittersohl B, Kim YJ, Werlen S. MRI of hip osteoarthritis and implications for surgery. *Radiol Clin North Am*. 2009;47(4):713-722.
161. Taljanovic MS, Graham AR, Benjamin JB, et al. Bone marrow edema pattern in advanced hip osteoarthritis: quantitative assessment with magnetic resonance imaging and correlation with clinical examination, radiographic findings, and histopathology. *Skeletal Radiol*. 2008;37(5):423-431.
162. Moss SG, Schweitzer ME, Jacobson JA, et al. Hip joint fluid: detection and distribution at MR imaging and US with cadaveric correlation. *Radiology*. 1998;208(1):43-48.
163. Neckers AC, Polster JM, Winalski CS, Krebs VE, Sundaram M. Comparison of MR arthrography with arthroscopy of the hip for the assessment of intra-articular loose bodies. *Skeletal Radiol*. 2007;36(10):963-967.
164. Murphey MD, Wetzel LH, Bramble JM, Levine E, Simpson KM, Lindsley HB. Sacroiliitis: MR imaging findings. *Radiology*. 1991;180(1):239-244.
165. Disler DG, Miklic D. Imaging findings in tumors of the sacrum. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1999;173(6):1699-1706.
166. Gaeta M, Minutoli F, Pandolfo I, Vinci S, D'Andrea L, Blandino A. Magnetic resonance imaging findings of osteoid osteoma of the proximal femur. *Eur Radiol*. 2004;14(9):1582-1589.
167. Llauger J, Palmer J, Amores S, Bague S, Camins A. Primary tumors of the sacrum: diagnostic imaging. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2000;174(2):417-424.
168. Ozaki T, Putzke M, Burger H, Gosheger G, Winkelmann W, Lindner N. Infiltration of sarcomas into the hip joint: comparison of CT, MRI and histologic findings in 67 cases. *Acta Orthop Scand*. 2002;73(2):220-226.
169. American College of Radiology. ACR–SSR practice parameter for the performance and interpretation of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of bone and soft tissue tumors. 2015; Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-SoftTissue-Tumors.pdf>. Accessed July 23, 2015.
170. Hirata T, Konishiike T, Kawai A, Sato T, Inoue H. Dynamic magnetic resonance imaging of femoral head perfusion in femoral neck fracture. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2001(393):294-301.
171. Kamano M, Narita S, Honda Y, Fukushima K, Yamano Y. Contrast enhanced magnetic resonance imaging for femoral neck fracture. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 1998(350):179-186.
172. Huang AB, Schweitzer ME, Hume E, Batte WG. Osteomyelitis of the pelvis/hips in paralyzed patients: accuracy and clinical utility of MRI. *J Comput Assist Tomogr*. 1998;22(3):437-443.
173. Connolly SA, Connolly LP, Drubach LA, Zurakowski D, Jaramillo D. MRI for detection of abscess in acute osteomyelitis of the pelvis in children. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2007;189(4):867-872.

174. Karmazyn B, Kleiman MB, Buckwalter K, Loder RT, Siddiqui A, Applegate KE. Acute pyomyositis of the pelvis: the spectrum of clinical presentations and MR findings. *Pediatr Radiol*. 2006;36(4):338-343.
175. Karmazyn B, Loder RT, Kleiman MB, et al. The role of pelvic magnetic resonance in evaluating nonhip sources of infection in children with acute nontraumatic hip pain. *J Pediatr Orthop*. 2007;27(2):158-164.
176. Kwack KS, Cho JH, Lee JH, Oh KK, Kim SY. Septic arthritis versus transient synovitis of the hip: gadolinium-enhanced MRI finding of decreased perfusion at the femoral epiphysis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2007;189(2):437-445.
177. Woodley SJ, Nicholson HD, Livingstone V, et al. Lateral hip pain: findings from magnetic resonance imaging and clinical examination. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2008;38(6):313-328.
178. Bencardino JT, Kassarian A, Palmer WE. Magnetic resonance imaging of the hip: sports-related injuries. *Top Magn Reson Imaging*. 2003;14(2):145-160.
179. Mellado JM, Perez del Palomar L, Diaz L, Ramos A, Sauri A. Long-standing Morel-Lavallee lesions of the trochanteric region and proximal thigh: MRI features in five patients. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2004;182(5):1289-1294.
180. Duffy CM, Taylor FN, Coleman L, Graham HK, Nattrass GR. Magnetic resonance imaging evaluation of surgical management in developmental dysplasia of the hip in childhood. *J Pediatr Orthop*. 2002;22(1):92-100.
181. Jaramillo D, Villegas-Medina O, Laor T, Shapiro F, Millis MB. Gadolinium-enhanced MR imaging of pediatric patients after reduction of dysplastic hips: assessment of femoral head position, factors impeding reduction, and femoral head ischemia. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1998;170(6):1633-1637.
182. Kawaguchi AT, Otsuka NY, Delgado ED, Genant HK, Lang P. Magnetic resonance arthrography in children with developmental hip dysplasia. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2000(374):235-246.
183. Westhoff B, Wild A, Seller K, Krauspe R. Magnetic resonance imaging after reduction for congenital dislocation of the hip. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*. 2003;123(6):289-292.
184. Ranawat V, Rosendahl K, Jones D. MRI after operative reduction with femoral osteotomy in developmental dysplasia of the hip. *Pediatr Radiol*. 2009;39(2):161-163.
185. Yuksel HY, Yilmaz S, Aksahin E, et al. The evaluation of hip muscles in patients treated with one-stage combined procedure for unilateral developmental dysplasia of the hip: part I: MRI evaluation. *J Pediatr Orthop*. 2009;29(8):872-878.
186. Potter HG, Nestor BJ, Sofka CM, Ho ST, Peters LE, Salvati EA. Magnetic resonance imaging after total hip arthroplasty: evaluation of periprosthetic soft tissue. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2004;86-A(9):1947-1954.
187. White LM, Kim JK, Mehta M, et al. Complications of total hip arthroplasty: MR imaging-initial experience. *Radiology*. 2000;215(1):254-262.
188. Johnston C, Kerr J, Ford S, O'Byrne J, Eustace S. MRI as a problem-solving tool in unexplained failed total hip replacement following conventional assessment. *Skeletal Radiol*. 2007;36(10):955-961.
189. Toms AP, Marshall TJ, Cahir J, et al. MRI of early symptomatic metal-on-metal total hip arthroplasty: a retrospective review of radiological findings in 20 hips. *Clin Radiol*. 2008;63(1):49-58.
190. Cooper HJ, Ranawat AS, Potter HG, Foo LF, Jawetz ST, Ranawat CS. Magnetic resonance imaging in the diagnosis and management of hip pain after total hip arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty*. 2009;24(5):661-667.
191. Westrich GH, Salvati EA, Sharrock N, Potter HG, Sanchez PM, Sculco TP. The effect of intraoperative heparin administered during total hip arthroplasty on the incidence of proximal deep vein thrombosis assessed by magnetic resonance venography. *J Arthroplasty*. 2005;20(1):42-50.
192. Stark DD, McCarthy SM, Filly RA, Parer JT, Hricak H, Callen PW. Pelvimetry by magnetic resonance imaging. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1985;144(5):947-950.
193. Tukeva TA, Aronen HJ, Karjalainen PT, Makela PJ. Low-field MRI pelvimetry. *Eur Radiol*. 1997;7(2):230-234.
194. American College of Radiology. ACR practice parameter for performing and interpreting magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). 2011; Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-Perf-Interpret.pdf>. Accessed January 23, 2015.
195. 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.
196. Shellock FG. *Reference Manual for Magnetic Resonance Safety, Implants, and Devices*. 2010 ed. Los Angeles: Biomedical Research Publishing Company; 2010.

197. Shellock FG, Crues JV. MR procedures: biologic effects, safety, and patient care. *Radiology*. 2004;232(3):635-652.
198. American College of Radiology. ACR–SPR practice parameter for the use of intravascular contrast media. 2012; Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/IVCM.pdf>. Accessed January 23, 2015.
199. American College of Radiology. ACR–SIR practice parameter for sedation/analgesia. 2015; Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Sed-Analgesia.pdf>. Accessed July 23, 2015.
200. Ragnarsson JI, Ekelund L, Karrholm J, Hietala SO. Low field magnetic resonance imaging of femoral neck fractures. *Acta Radiol*. 1989;30(3):247-252.
201. Mosher TJ. Musculoskeletal imaging at 3T: current techniques and future applications. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am*. 2006;14(1):63-76.
202. Ramnath RR. 3T MR imaging of the musculoskeletal system (Part II): clinical applications. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am*. 2006;14(1):41-62.
203. Watanabe A, Boesch C, Siebenrock K, Obata T, Anderson SE. T2 mapping of hip articular cartilage in healthy volunteers at 3T: a study of topographic variation. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2007;26(1):165-171.
204. Carballido-Gamio J, Link TM, Li X, et al. Feasibility and reproducibility of relaxometry, morphometric, and geometrical measurements of the hip joint with magnetic resonance imaging at 3T. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2008;28(1):227-235.
205. Bogost GA, Lizerbram EK, Crues JV, 3rd. MR imaging in evaluation of suspected hip fracture: frequency of unsuspected bone and soft-tissue injury. *Radiology*. 1995;197(1):263-267.
206. Hayes CW, Balkissoon AA. Magnetic resonance imaging of the musculoskeletal system. II. The hip. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 1996(322):297-309.
207. Hayes CE, Dietz MJ, King BF, Ehman RL. Pelvic imaging with phased-array coils: quantitative assessment of signal-to-noise ratio improvement. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 1992;2(3):321-326.
208. Niitsu M, Mishima H, Miyakawa S, Itai Y. High resolution MR imaging of the bilateral hips with dual phased-array coil. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 1996;6(6):950-953.
209. Do-Dai DD, Youngberg RA. MRI of the hip with a shoulder surface coil in off-coronal plane. *J Comput Assist Tomogr*. 1995;19(2):336-338.
210. Cook SM, Pellicci PM, Potter HG. Use of magnetic resonance imaging in the diagnosis of an occult fracture of the femoral component after total hip arthroplasty. A case report. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2004;86-A(1):149-153.
211. Kwok WE, Lo KK, Seo G, Totterman SM. A volume adjustable four-coil phased array for high resolution MR imaging of the hip. *MAGMA*. 1999;9(1-2):59-64.
212. Rubin SJ, Totterman SM, Meyers SP, Hartley DF. Magnetic resonance imaging of the hip with a pelvic phased-array surface coil: a technical note. *Skeletal Radiol*. 1998;27(2):77-82.
213. Khoury NJ, Birjawi GA, Chaaya M, Hourani MH. Use of limited MR protocol (coronal STIR) in the evaluation of patients with hip pain. *Skeletal Radiol*. 2003;32(10):567-574.
214. Ha AS, Wells L, Jaramillo D. Importance of sagittal MR imaging in nontraumatic femoral head osteonecrosis in children. *Pediatr Radiol*. 2008;38(11):1195-1200.
215. Knuesel PR, Pfirrmann CW, Noetzli HP, et al. MR arthrography of the hip: diagnostic performance of a dedicated water-excitation 3D double-echo steady-state sequence to detect cartilage lesions. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2004;183(6):1729-1735.
216. Blake LC, Robertson WD, Hayes CE. Sacral plexus: optimal imaging planes for MR assessment. *Radiology*. 1996;199(3):767-772.
217. Toda K, Yoneda S, Urabe A, Hosoi N. Oblique axial and oblique coronal MR imaging of the proximal femur. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1997;168(6):1622-1623.
218. Ziegert AJ, Blankenbaker DG, De Smet AA, Keene JS, Shinki K, Fine JP. Comparison of standard hip MR arthrographic imaging planes and sequences for detection of arthroscopically proven labral tear. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2009;192(5):1397-1400.
219. Yoon LS, Palmer WE, Kassarian A. Evaluation of radial-sequence imaging in detecting acetabular labral tears at hip MR arthrography. *Skeletal Radiol*. 2007;36(11):1029-1033.
220. Horii M, Kubo T, Hirasawa Y. Radial MRI of the hip with moderate osteoarthritis. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. 2000;82(3):364-368.

221. Dudda M, Albers C, Mamisch TC, Werlen S, Beck M. Do normal radiographs exclude asphericity of the femoral head-neck junction? *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2009;467(3):651-659.
222. Plotz GM, Brossmann J, von Knoch M, Muhle C, Heller M, Hassenpflug J. Magnetic resonance arthrography of the acetabular labrum: value of radial reconstructions. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2001;121(8):450-457.
223. Czerny C, Hofmann S, Urban M, et al. MR arthrography of the adult acetabular capsular-labral complex: correlation with surgery and anatomy. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1999;173(2):345-349.
224. Pienkowski D, Resig J, Talwalkar V, Tylkowski C. Novel three-dimensional MRI technique for study of cartilaginous hip surfaces in Legg-Calve-Perthes disease. *J Orthop Res.* 2009;27(8):981-988.
225. Takao M, Sugano N, Nishii T, et al. Application of three-dimensional magnetic resonance image registration for monitoring hip joint diseases. *Magn Reson Imaging.* 2005;23(5):665-670.
226. Li W, Abram F, Beaudoin G, Berthiaume MJ, Pelletier JP, Martel-Pelletier J. Human hip joint cartilage: MRI quantitative thickness and volume measurements discriminating acetabulum and femoral head. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng.* 2008;55(12):2731-2740.
227. Shuman WP, Castagno AA, Baron RL, Richardson ML. MR imaging of avascular necrosis of the femoral head: value of small-field-of-view sagittal surface-coil images. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1988;150(5):1073-1078.
228. Ryan M, Cunningham P, Cantwell C, Brennan D, Eustace S. A comparison of fast MRI of hips with and without parallel imaging using SENSE. *Br J Radiol.* 2005;78(928):299-302.
229. Ramnath RR. 3T MR imaging of the musculoskeletal system (Part I): considerations, coils, and challenges. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am.* 2006;14(1):27-40.
230. Kneeland JB, Shimakawa A, Wehrli FW. Effect of intersection spacing on MR image contrast and study time. *Radiology.* 1986;158(3):819-822.
231. Rubin DA, Kneeland JB. MR imaging of the musculoskeletal system: technical considerations for enhancing image quality and diagnostic yield. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1994;163(5):1155-1163.
232. Aydingoz U, Ozturk MH. MR imaging of the acetabular labrum: a comparative study of both hips in 180 asymptomatic volunteers. *Eur Radiol.* 2001;11(4):567-574.
233. Bush CH. The magnetic resonance imaging of musculoskeletal hemorrhage. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2000;29(1):1-9.
234. De Smet AA, Fisher DR, Heiner JP, Keene JS. Magnetic resonance imaging of muscle tears. *Skeletal Radiol.* 1990;19(4):283-286.
235. De Smet AA. Magnetic resonance findings in skeletal muscle tears. *Skeletal Radiol.* 1993;22(7):479-484.
236. Nguyen B, Brandser E, Rubin DA. Pains, strains, and fasciculations: lower extremity muscle disorders. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am.* 2000;8(2):391-408.
237. Wolf GL, Joseph PM, Goldstein EJ. Optimal pulsing sequences for MR contrast agents. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1986;147(2):367-371.
238. Rybicki FJ, Chung T, Reid J, Jaramillo D, Mulkern RV, Ma J. Fast three-point dixon MR imaging using low-resolution images for phase correction: a comparison with chemical shift selective fat suppression for pediatric musculoskeletal imaging. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2001;177(5):1019-1023.
239. Weinberger E, Shaw DW, White KS, et al. Nontraumatic pediatric musculoskeletal MR imaging: comparison of conventional and fast-spin-echo short inversion time inversion-recovery technique. *Radiology.* 1995;194(3):721-726.
240. Bredella MA, Losasso C, Moelleken SC, Huegeli RW, Genant HK, Tirman PF. Three-point Dixon chemical-shift imaging for evaluating articular cartilage defects in the knee joint on a low-field-strength open magnet. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2001;177(6):1371-1375.
241. Mahnken AH, Staatz G, Ihme N, Gunther RW. MR signal intensity characteristics in Legg-Calve-Perthes disease. Value of fat-suppressed (STIR) images and contrast-enhanced T1-weighted images. *Acta Radiol.* 2002;43(3):329-335.
242. Nishii T, Nakanishi K, Sugano N, Naito H, Tamura S, Ochi T. Acetabular labral tears: contrast-enhanced MR imaging under continuous leg traction. *Skeletal Radiol.* 1996;25(4):349-356.
243. Llopis E, Cerezal L, Kassarian A, Higuera V, Fernandez E. Direct MR arthrography of the hip with leg traction: feasibility for assessing articular cartilage. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2008;190(4):1124-1128.

244. Kim YJ, Jaramillo D, Millis MB, Gray ML, Burstein D. Assessment of early osteoarthritis in hip dysplasia with delayed gadolinium-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging of cartilage. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2003;85-A(10):1987-1992.
245. Boesen M, Jensen KE, Qvistgaard E, et al. Delayed gadolinium-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging (dGEMRIC) of hip joint cartilage: better cartilage delineation after intra-articular than intravenous gadolinium injection. *Acta Radiol*. 2006;47(4):391-396.
246. Nishii T, Tanaka H, Sugano N, Sakai T, Hananouchi T, Yoshikawa H. Evaluation of cartilage matrix disorders by T2 relaxation time in patients with hip dysplasia. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2008;16(2):227-233.
247. Rakhra KS, Lattanzio PJ, Cardenas-Blanco A, Cameron IG, Beaulé PE. Can T1-rho MRI detect acetabular cartilage degeneration in femoroacetabular impingement?: a pilot study. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. 2012;94(9):1187-1192.
248. Rakhra KS, Cardenas-Blanco A, Melkus G, Schweitzer ME, Cameron IG, Beaulé PE. Is the t1rho MRI profile of hyaline cartilage in the normal hip uniform? *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2015;473(4):1325-1332.
249. Haacke EM, Lenz GW. Improving MR image quality in the presence of motion by using rephasing gradients. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1987;148(6):1251-1258.
250. Peh WC, Chan JH. Artifacts in musculoskeletal magnetic resonance imaging: identification and correction. *Skeletal Radiol*. 2001;30(4):179-191.
251. Tormanen J, Tervonen O, Koivula A, Junila J, Suramo I. Image technique optimization in MR imaging of a titanium alloy joint prosthesis. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 1996;6(5):805-811.
252. Hilfiker P, Zanetti M, Debatin JF, McKinnon G, Hodler J. Fast spin-echo inversion-recovery imaging versus fast T2-weighted spin-echo imaging in bone marrow abnormalities. *Invest Radiol*. 1995;30(2):110-114.
253. Eustace S, Jara H, Goldberg R, et al. A comparison of conventional spin-echo and turbo spin-echo imaging of soft tissues adjacent to orthopedic hardware. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1998;170(2):455-458.
254. Fritz J, Lurie B, Miller TT, Potter HG. MR imaging of hip arthroplasty implants. *Radiographics*. 2014;34(4):E106-132.
255. Schulte-Altendorneburg G, Gebhard M, Wohlgemuth WA, et al. MR arthrography: pharmacology, efficacy and safety in clinical trials. *Skeletal Radiol*. 2003;32(1):1-12.
256. American College of Radiology. ACR practice parameter for communication of diagnostic imaging findings. 2014; Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CommunicationDiag.pdf>. Accessed January 23, 2015.
257. Shellock FG. *Guide to MR Procedures and Metallic Objects*. 7th ed. Philadelphia,PA: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins; 2001.
258. Sawyer-Glover AM, Shellock FG. Pre-MRI procedure screening: recommendations and safety considerations for biomedical implants and devices. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2000;12(1):92-106.
259. American College of Radiology. ACR–AAPM technical standard for diagnostic medical physics performance monitoring of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) equipment. 2014; Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-Equip.pdf>. Accessed January 23, 2015.

*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

2006 (Resolution 6, 35)

2011 (Resolution 21)

Amended 2014 (Resolution 39)

Revised 2016 (Resolution 7)