

The American College of Radiology, with more than 30,000 members, is the principal organization of radiologists, radiation oncologists, and clinical medical physicists in the United States. The College is a nonprofit professional society whose primary purposes are to advance the science of radiology, improve radiologic services to the patient, study the socioeconomic aspects of the practice of radiology, and encourage continuing education for radiologists, radiation oncologists, medical physicists, and persons practicing in allied professional fields.

The American College of Radiology will periodically define new practice parameters and technical standards for radiologic practice to help advance the science of radiology and to improve the quality of service to patients throughout the United States. Existing practice parameters and technical standards will be reviewed for revision or renewal, as appropriate, on their fifth anniversary or sooner, if indicated.

Each practice parameter and technical standard, representing a policy statement by the College, has undergone a thorough consensus process in which it has been subjected to extensive review and approval. The practice parameters and technical standards recognize that the safe and effective use of diagnostic and therapeutic radiology requires specific training, skills, and techniques, as described in each document. Reproduction or modification of the published practice parameter and technical standard by those entities not providing these services is not authorized.

Revised 2015 (Resolution 3)*

ACR–SAR–SPR PRACTICE PARAMETER FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING (MRI) OF THE LIVER

PREAMBLE

This document is an educational tool designed to assist practitioners in providing appropriate radiologic care for patients. Practice Parameters and Technical Standards are not inflexible rules or requirements of practice and are not intended, nor should they be used, to establish a legal standard of care¹. For these reasons and those set forth below, the American College of Radiology 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

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the liver is a proven and useful tool for the evaluation, assessment of severity, and follow-up of diseases of the liver. Although liver MRI is one of the most sensitive diagnostic tests for detection and characterization of hepatic lesions, findings may be misleading if not closely correlated with the results of previous imaging studies, clinical history, physical examination, or laboratory tests. Adherence to the following parameters will enhance the probability of accurately assessing such abnormalities.

II. INDICATIONS

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

1. Detection of focal hepatic lesions
2. Focal hepatic lesion characterization, eg, cyst, focal fat, hemangiomas, and vascular malformations, hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC), hepatoblastoma, metastasis, cholangiocarcinoma, focal nodular hyperplasia, and hepatic adenoma.
3. Evaluation for known or suspected metastasis
4. Evaluation of vascular patency, including Budd-Chiari and portal vein thrombosis
5. Evaluation of chronic liver disease such as hemochromatosis, hemosiderosis, or steatosis
6. Evaluation of cirrhotic liver and HCC surveillance
7. Clarification of findings from other imaging studies, laboratory abnormalities, or alternative imaging for contraindications to CT scans
8. Evaluation of infection
9. Potential liver donor evaluation, liver resection evaluation, liver transplant evaluation, and evaluation of postsurgical complications
10. Evaluation of tumor response to treatment, eg, image-guided liver interventions/tumor ablation, chemoembolization, radioembolization, chemotherapy, radiotherapy, or surgery
11. Evaluation of known or suspected congenital abnormalities
12. Informing or guiding clinical decision-making and treatment planning

III. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

See the [ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\)](#) [1].

IV. SAFETY PARAMETERS AND POSSIBLE CONTRAINDICATIONS

See the [ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\)](#) [1], the [ACR Guidance Document on MR Safe Practices](#) [2], and the [ACR Manual on Contrast Media](#) [3].

Peer-reviewed literature pertaining to MR safety should be reviewed on a regular basis [4-13].

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 liver 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. It is also critical to understand the different contrast agents used for liver MRI as well as the basis for choosing between them. 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 must be screened and interviewed prior to the examination to exclude individuals who may be at risk by exposure to the MR environment (See the [ACR Guidance Document on MR Safe Practices](#) [2]).

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 (See the [ACR-SPR Practice Parameter for the Use of Intravascular Contrast Media](#) [14]).

Patients suffering from anxiety or claustrophobia, or who are unable to cooperate or suspend respiration may require sedation or additional assistance. Administration of sedation may be necessary to achieve a successful examination. If sedation is necessary, refer to the [ACR-SIR Practice Parameter for Sedation/Analgesia](#) [15] and the AAP-AAPD Guidelines for Monitoring and Management of Pediatric Patients During and After Sedation for Diagnostic and Therapeutic procedures.

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

A phased array surface coil should be used [16] unless precluded by patient body habitus. The field of view should be selected so that it includes the entire liver without introducing undesirable artifacts.

An adequate MRI examination of the liver is typically performed in the axial plane, and coronal plane images are added as necessary to improve the visualization of the liver dome, evaluate vasculature, and facilitate interventional and surgical planning.

A satisfactory MRI of the liver should include T2-weighted imaging, which may be performed with an accelerated fast spin-echo or single-shot accelerated fast spin-echo (half-Fourier single-shot turbo spin-echo

(HASTE) or single shot fast spin-echo (SSFSE)) sequence in axial and/or coronal planes. T2-weighted images can be obtained using a breath-hold or non-breath-hold technique. When a non-breath-hold technique is used, every effort should be made to minimize the respiratory motion artifacts by using multiple signal averages and/or respiratory compensation or respiratory triggering, which could include bellows or navigator triggered sequence. Other motion-correction strategies, including PROPELLER (periodically rotated overlapping parallel lines with enhanced reconstruction), may be useful. For effective T2-weighting, an echo time (TE) between approximately 80 and 100 msec should be used at 1.5T and 70–100 msec at 3T. T2-weighted images are helpful to show abnormal increased fluid content in diseased tissue and fluid-containing lesions (eg, cysts, biliary hamartoma, hemangiomas, and vascular malformations) [17]. When using a 2-D technique, the slice thickness and interslice gap in one of the planes should not exceed 8 mm and 2 mm, respectively. Parallel MR imaging with suitable phased-array coils is often used to reduce scan time and increase spatial resolution. Fat suppression may be helpful to assess for fluid and inflammation and to improve image contrast dynamic range.

Intravenous contrast enhancement with gadolinium chelates is critical for accurate diagnosis [18]. Every attempt should be made to use intravenous contrast media except when there is a) no intravenous access, b) history of prior allergic-type reaction to gadolinium chelates and the patient has not been premedicated, c) contraindication to gadolinium chelates (such as pregnancy), d) known or suspected nephrogenic systemic fibrosis (NSF) or particular concerns regarding NSF risk that outweigh the benefits of a contrast-enhanced liver MR, or e) contrast is not felt necessary for the diagnosis [2,3,19]. In patients with a high risk of NSF in whom contrast is not used, an unenhanced MR could still be helpful to assess the patient. Dynamic fat-suppressed MR imaging should be performed after bolus administration of a gadolinium chelate contrast agent. T1-weighted images should be acquired before gadolinium contrast injection as well as during late hepatic arterial, portal venous, and 2-minute to 5-minute delayed phases using a 2-D or 3-D technique [20,21]. Methods to obtain late arterial phase include using a bolus timing technique, such as automated bolus detection algorithm or fluoroscopic triggering, or obtaining multiple consecutive arterial-phase datasets with higher temporal but lower spatial resolution. An optimal late arterial phase is characterized by the following:

- Hepatic artery and branches are fully enhanced
- Hepatic veins not yet enhanced by antegrade flow
- Portal vein is enhanced

Additional delayed images with delays greater than 2 to 5 minutes may help characterize certain lesions such as hepatocellular carcinoma, hemangiomas and vascular malformations, or cholangiocarcinomas [22-24]. Fat-suppressed volumetric interpolated breath-hold images have quality comparable to that of conventional fat-suppressed 2-D gradient-echo images [25]. It is advantageous to acquire 3-D datasets using the smallest voxel dimensions possible to achieve the highest resolution practical in each axis. Minimizing slice thickness of a volumetric acquisition can reduce truncation artifacts in the axis of slice encoding, which can be a source of boundary artifacts at high-contrast borders. When using a 2-D technique, the slice thickness and interslice gap are not to exceed 8 mm and 2 mm, respectively.

To aid in the detection of contrast enhancement of lesions, subtraction of unenhanced from contrast-enhanced images may be considered for lesions that are hyperintense on T1-weighted images prior to gadolinium administration, for example, in cases of hepatic lesions following radiofrequency ablation or chemoembolization and nodules within cirrhotic livers. Efforts should be made to ensure that patients' respirations are suspended in an identical manner during precontrast and postcontrast dynamic phases. However, misregistration artifacts have to be excluded to minimize erroneous interpretation of subtraction images.

The use of images obtained 1–3 hours after the administration of gadobenate dimeglumine and at least 20 minutes after the administration of gadoxetate revealing retention of contrast within the lesion can confirm the diagnosis of focal nodular hyperplasia [26-28] and can also be used to detect and characterize malignant disease and assess its extent [29,30]. The use of agents partially excreted in the biliary system such as gadoxetate and gadobenate can help delineate biliary anatomy [31-33]. T2-weighted imaging of the biliary tree (MRCP images) must be completed before contrast is excreted into bile ducts because enhanced bile will not be visible on MRCP images.

This can be prevented by obtaining MRCP agents before or within 5 minutes after administration of gadoxetate or within several minutes after administering gadobenate dimeglumine. T2-weighted and diffusion-weighted images can be obtained after injection of gadoxetate disodium to improve time efficiency.

In-phase and out-of-phase chemical shift gradient-recalled echo T1-weighted imaging should be included for lesion characterization and is a sensitive technique for confirmation of hepatic steatosis and iron overload prior to the administration of contrast [34]. Out-of-phase images can be helpful to assess for signal loss from fat in fat-containing lesions such as hepatic adenomas and HCC. A potential pitfall is that in livers with simultaneous iron overload and steatosis, in-phase and out-of-phase imaging may show no comparative signal loss (ie, signal loss due to steatosis on the out-of-phase image may be counterbalanced by signal loss due to iron overload on the in-phase image). Another pitfall is that some scanners use a sequence design where in-phase images have a shorter TE than out-of-phase images; in these instances, signal loss on the out-of-phase echo could be from either iron overload or steatosis, or both. Every effort should be made to ensure that the out-of-phase TE is shorter than the in-phase TE. In addition, the TEs for the in-phase and out-of-phase images at 3T are half that at 1.5T, which needs to be accounted for when assessing for fat or iron.

In recent years, 3T imaging systems have become more available. Potential advantages include an increased signal-to-noise [35] ratio and increased conspicuity of enhancement after administration of a gadolinium chelate contrast agent [36]. Potential disadvantages include decreased image contrast on T1-weighted images, increased susceptibility artifact, increased chemical shift artifact, increased specific absorption rate (SAR), and signal inhomogeneity [37]. The latter can be partially compensated for by the use of radiofrequency cushions [38] and/or parallel transmit technology. In short, 3T imaging can offer substantial improvements in SNR and spatial resolution, and/or decreases in imaging times, but sequence modifications are often required to maintain desired image contrast and reduce artifacts [39,40].

Diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) has recently been investigated for abdominal application [41-46]. The most common technique uses single-shot echo-planar imaging (SS-EPI). Breath-held, free breathing multiple-averaging, and respiratory-gated SS-EPI techniques have been described [47,48]. Parallel imaging can be used to decrease imaging time and has been shown to result in accurate apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) values [49]. DWI has shown promising results in detection and characterization of focal liver lesions and; detection and staging of liver fibrosis, and appears to be at least a value-added adjunct sequence capable of revealing additional sites of disease in the abdomen [50,51]. The ability to depict areas of high cellularity can be helpful in hepatic lesion detection and characterization in a noninvasive manner. DWI does not rely on intravenous gadolinium; therefore, its use is particularly attractive in patients with poor renal function who cannot receive contrast because of the potential risk of nephrogenic systemic fibrosis. ADC maps can be generated to help differentiate between restricted diffusion and T2 shine-through. At least 2 b-values are obtained, including $b = 20\text{--}50 \text{ s/mm}^2$ and $b = 400$ to 1000 s/mm^2 . However, overlap exists between ADC values of solid benign hepatocellular lesions such as focal nodular hyperplasia (FNH) or hepatocellular adenoma (HCA) and those of malignant lesions [42,45,52-56]. Thus, information provided by DWI needs to be interpreted in conjunction with lesion morphology and signal characteristics on other sequences. Moreover, ADC values are technique and scanner dependent; hence, diagnostic cutoff values reported in the literature may not be applicable to other scanners.

In patients with cirrhosis or those at risk for HCC, please refer to the Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System (LI-RADS) (<http://www.acr.org/Quality-Safety/Resources/LIRADS>) for additional guidance on optimal performance of MRI in this population.

VI. DOCUMENTATION

Reporting should be in accordance with the [ACR Practice Parameter for Communication of Diagnostic Imaging Findings](#) [57]. In patients with cirrhosis or those at risk for HCC, please refer to the Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System (LI-RADS) (<http://www.acr.org/Quality-Safety/Resources/LIRADS>) for additional guidance on reporting of MRI in this population.

VII. EQUIPMENT SPECIFICATIONS

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

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

Policies and procedures related to quality, patient education, infection control, and safety should be developed and implemented in accordance with the ACR Policy on Quality Control and Improvement, Safety, Infection Control, and Patient Education appearing under the heading *Position Statement on QC & Improvement, Safety, Infection Control, and Patient Education* on the ACR website (<http://www.acr.org/guidelines>).

Specific policies and procedures related to 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 MRI examination of the patient as well as to others in the immediate area [4-13]. Screening forms must also be provided to detect those patients who may be at risk for adverse events associated with the MRI examination [4-13].

Equipment monitoring should be in accordance with the [ACR-AAPM Technical Standard for Diagnostic Medical Physics Performance Monitoring of Magnetic Resonance Imaging \(MRI\) Equipment](#) [58].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This practice parameter was revised according to the process described under the heading *The Process for Developing ACR Practice Parameters and Technical Standards* on the ACR website (<http://www.acr.org/guidelines>) by the Committee on Body Imaging (Abdominal) of the Commission on Body Imaging and by the Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology of the Commission on Pediatric Radiology, in collaboration with the Society of Abdominal Radiology (SAR) and the Society for Pediatric Radiology (SPR).

Collaborative Committee

ACR

Frank H. Miller, MD, FACR, Chair
John R. Leyendecker, MD
Alvin C. Silva, MD
Claude B. Sirlin, MD

SAR

Hersh Chandarana, MD
Bobby T. Kalb, MD

SPR

Jonathan R. Dillman, MD
Arthur Meyers, MD
Anil G. Rao, MD, DMRD, DNB

Committee on Body Imaging (Abdominal)

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

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

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

Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology

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

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

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

Comments Reconciliation Committee

Sanjay J. Shetty, MD, MBA, Chair
Andrew Moriarity, MD, Co-Chair
Kimberly E. Applegate, MD, MS, FACR
Lincoln L. Berland, MD, FACR
Hersh Chandarana, MD
Jonathan R. Dillman, MD
Eric N. Faerber, MD, FACR
William T. Herrington, MD, FACR
Marta Hernanz-Schulman, MD, FACR
Bobby T. Kalb, MD
Paul A. Larson, MD, FACR
John R. Leyendecker, MD
Arthur Meyers, MD
Frank H. Miller, MD, FACR
Donald G. Mitchell, MD, FACR
Debra L. Monticciolo, MD, FACR
Matthew S. Pollack, MD, FACR
Anil G. Rao, MD, DMRD, DNB
Alvin C. Silva, MD
Claude B. Sirlin, MD
Scott D. Stevens, MD, FACR
Ruedi F. Thoeni, MD
Julie K. Timins, MD, FACR

REFERENCES

1. American College of Radiology. ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI). 2014; <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-Perf-Interpret.pdf>. Accessed October 8, 2014.
2. 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.
3. American College of Radiology. Manual on Contrast Media. 2009; http://www.acr.org/SecondaryMainMenuCategories/quality_safety/contrast_manual.aspx. Accessed September 11, 2009.
4. Colletti PM. Magnetic resonance procedures and pregnancy. In: Shellock FG, ed. *Magnetic Resonance Procedures: Health Effects and Safety*. Boca Raton, Fla.: CRC Press; 2001.
5. Finelli DA, Rezai AR, Ruggieri PM, et al. MR imaging-related heating of deep brain stimulation electrodes: in vitro study. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2002;23(10):1795-1802.
6. Rezai AR, Finelli D, Nyenhuis JA, et al. Neurostimulation systems for deep brain stimulation: in vitro evaluation of magnetic resonance imaging-related heating at 1.5 tesla. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2002;15(3):241-250.
7. 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.
8. Shellock FG. *Magnetic Resonance Procedures: Health Effects and Safety*. Boca Raton, Fla.: CRC Press; 2001.
9. Shellock FG. Magnetic resonance safety update 2002: implants and devices. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2002;16(5):485-496.
10. Shellock FG. Biomedical implants and devices: assessment of magnetic field interactions with a 3.0-Tesla MR system. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2002;16(6):721-732.
11. Shellock FG. *Reference Manual for Magnetic Resonance Safety, Implants and Devices*. 2005 ed. Los Angeles, Calif: Biomedical Research Publishing Group; 2005.

12. Shellock FG, Crues JV. MR procedures: biologic effects, safety, and patient care. *Radiology*. 2004;232(3):635-652.
13. Shellock FG, Tkach JA, Ruggieri PM, Masaryk TJ, Rasmussen PA. Aneurysm clips: evaluation of magnetic field interactions and translational attraction by use of "long-bore" and "short-bore" 3.0-T MR imaging systems. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2003;24(3):463-471.
14. American College of Radiology. ACR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Use of Intravascular Contrast Media. 2014; <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/IVCM.pdf>. Accessed October 8, 2014.
15. American College of Radiology. ACR–SIR Practice Parameter for Sedation/Analgesia. 2014; <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Sed-Analgesia.pdf>. Accessed October 8, 2014.
16. Helmberger T, Holzkecht N, Lackerbauer CA, et al. [Phased-array superficial coil and breath holding technique in MRI of the liver. Comparison of conventional spin echo sequences with rapid fat suppressing gradient echo and turbo-spin sequences]. *Radiologe*. 1995;35(12):919-924.
17. Bong SK WA, Yong-Hwan J, Richard C. Semelka. Body MR Imaging: Fast, Efficient, and Comprehensive. *Radiologic Clinics of North America*. 2014;52:623-636.
18. Yamashita Y, Hatanaka Y, Yamamoto H, et al. Differential diagnosis of focal liver lesions: role of spin-echo and contrast-enhanced dynamic MR imaging. *Radiology*. 1994;193(1):59-65.
19. Broome DR, Girguis MS, Baron PW, Cottrell AC, Kjellin I, Kirk GA. Gadodiamide-associated nephrogenic systemic fibrosis: why radiologists should be concerned. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2007;188(2):586-592.
20. Mitchell DG, Palazzo J, Hann HW, Rifkin MD, Burk DL, Jr., Rubin R. Hepatocellular tumors with high signal on T1-weighted MR images: chemical shift MR imaging and histologic correlation. *J Comput Assist Tomogr*. 1991;15(5):762-769.
21. Semelka RC, Helmberger TK. Contrast agents for MR imaging of the liver. *Radiology*. 2001;218(1):27-38.
22. Runge VM. A comparison of two MR hepatobiliary gadolinium chelates: Gd-BOPTA and Gd-EOB-DTPA. *J Comput Assist Tomogr*. 1998;22(4):643-650.
23. Semelka RC, Brown ED, Ascher SM, et al. Hepatic hemangiomas: a multi-institutional study of appearance on T2-weighted and serial gadolinium-enhanced gradient-echo MR images. *Radiology*. 1994;192(2):401-406.
24. Soyer P, Bluemke DA, Reichle R, et al. Imaging of intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma: 2. Hilar cholangiocarcinoma. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1995;165(6):1433-1436.
25. Rofsky NM, Lee VS, Laub G, et al. Abdominal MR imaging with a volumetric interpolated breath-hold examination. *Radiology*. 1999;212(3):876-884.
26. Grazioli L, Morana G, Kirchin MA, Schneider G. Accurate differentiation of focal nodular hyperplasia from hepatic adenoma at gadobenate dimeglumine-enhanced MR imaging: prospective study. *Radiology*. 2005;236(1):166-177.
27. Zech CJ, Grazioli L, Breuer J, Reiser MF, Schoenberg SO. Diagnostic performance and description of morphological features of focal nodular hyperplasia in Gd-EOB-DTPA-enhanced liver magnetic resonance imaging: results of a multicenter trial. *Invest Radiol*. 2008;43(7):504-511.
28. Goodwin MD, Dobson JE, Sirlin CB, Lim BG, Stella DL. Diagnostic challenges and pitfalls in MR imaging with hepatocyte-specific contrast agents. *Radiographics*. 2011;31(6):1547-1568.
29. Jeon TY, Kim SH, Lee WJ, Lim HK. The value of gadobenate dimeglumine-enhanced hepatobiliary-phase MR imaging for the differentiation of scirrhous hepatocellular carcinoma and cholangiocarcinoma with or without hepatocellular carcinoma. *Abdom Imaging*. 2010;35(3):337-345.
30. Rimola J, Forner A, Reig M, et al. Cholangiocarcinoma in cirrhosis: absence of contrast washout in delayed phases by magnetic resonance imaging avoids misdiagnosis of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hepatology*. 2009;50(3):791-798.
31. Madan R. The bridging vascular sign. *Radiology*. 2006;238(1):371-372.
32. Carlos RC, Hussain HK, Song JH, Francis IR. Gadolinium-ethoxybenzyl-diethylenetriamine pentaacetic acid as an intrabiliary contrast agent: preliminary assessment. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2002;179(1):87-92.
33. Seale MK, Catalano OA, Saini S, Hahn PF, Sahani DV. Hepatobiliary-specific MR contrast agents: role in imaging the liver and biliary tree. *Radiographics*. 2009;29(6):1725-1748.
34. Heiken JP, Lee JK, Dixon WT. Fatty infiltration of the liver: evaluation by proton spectroscopic imaging. *Radiology*. 1985;157(3):707-710.

35. Choi JY, Kim MJ, Chung YE, et al. Abdominal applications of 3.0-T MR imaging: comparative review versus a 1.5-T system. *Radiographics*. 2008;28(4):e30.
36. Soher BJ, Dale BM, Merkle EM. A review of MR physics: 3T versus 1.5T. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am*. 2007;15(3):277-290, v.
37. Leyendecker JR, Childs DD. Kidneys and MR urography. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am*. 2007;15(3):373-382, vii.
38. Franklin KM, Dale BM, Merkle EM. Improvement in B1-inhomogeneity artifacts in the abdomen at 3T MR imaging using a radiofrequency cushion. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2008;27(6):1443-1447.
39. Chang KJ, Kamel IR, Macura KJ, Bluemke DA. 3.0-T MR imaging of the abdomen: comparison with 1.5 T. *Radiographics*. 2008;28(7):1983-1998.
40. Erturk SM, Alberich-Bayarri A, Herrmann KA, Marti-Bonmati L, Ros PR. Use of 3.0-T MR imaging for evaluation of the abdomen. *Radiographics*. 2009;29(6):1547-1563.
41. Koh DM, Collins DJ. Diffusion-weighted MRI in the body: applications and challenges in oncology. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2007;188(6):1622-1635.
42. Parikh T, Drew SJ, Lee VS, et al. Focal liver lesion detection and characterization with diffusion-weighted MR imaging: comparison with standard breath-hold T2-weighted imaging. *Radiology*. 2008;246(3):812-822.
43. Taouli B. Diffusion-weighted MR imaging for liver lesion characterization: a critical look. *Radiology*. 2012;262(2):378-380.
44. Taouli B, Koh DM. Diffusion-weighted MR imaging of the liver. *Radiology*. 2010;254(1):47-66.
45. Taouli B, Vilgrain V, Dumont E, Daire JL, Fan B, Menu Y. Evaluation of liver diffusion isotropy and characterization of focal hepatic lesions with two single-shot echo-planar MR imaging sequences: prospective study in 66 patients. *Radiology*. 2003;226(1):71-78.
46. de Souza DA, Parente DB, de Araujo AL, Mortelet KJ. Modern imaging evaluation of the liver: emerging MR imaging techniques and indications. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am*. 2013;21(2):337-363.
47. Gourtsoyianni S, Papanikolaou N, Yarmenitis S, Maris T, Karantanis A, Gourtsoyiannis N. Respiratory gated diffusion-weighted imaging of the liver: value of apparent diffusion coefficient measurements in the differentiation between most commonly encountered benign and malignant focal liver lesions. *Eur Radiol*. 2008;18(3):486-492.
48. Koh DM, Takahara T, Imai Y, Collins DJ. Practical aspects of assessing tumors using clinical diffusion-weighted imaging in the body. *Magn Reson Med Sci*. 2007;6(4):211-224.
49. Yoshikawa T, Kawamitsu H, Mitchell DG, et al. ADC measurement of abdominal organs and lesions using parallel imaging technique. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2006;187(6):1521-1530.
50. Low RN, Gurney J. Diffusion-weighted MRI (DWI) in the oncology patient: value of breathhold DWI compared to unenhanced and gadolinium-enhanced MRI. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2007;25(4):848-858.
51. Lewin M, Poujol-Robert A, Boelle PY, et al. Diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging for the assessment of fibrosis in chronic hepatitis C. *Hepatology*. 2007;46(3):658-665.
52. Bruegel M, Holzapfel K, Gaa J, et al. Characterization of focal liver lesions by ADC measurements using a respiratory triggered diffusion-weighted single-shot echo-planar MR imaging technique. *Eur Radiol*. 2008;18(3):477-485.
53. Miller FH, Hammond N, Siddiqi AJ, et al. Utility of diffusion-weighted MRI in distinguishing benign and malignant hepatic lesions. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2010;32(1):138-147.
54. Agnello F, Ronot M, Valla DC, Sinkus R, Van Beers BE, Vilgrain V. High-b-value diffusion-weighted MR imaging of benign hepatocellular lesions: quantitative and qualitative analysis. *Radiology*. 2012;262(2):511-519.
55. Cieszanowski A, Anysz-Grodzicka A, Szeszkowski W, et al. Characterization of focal liver lesions using quantitative techniques: comparison of apparent diffusion coefficient values and T2 relaxation times. *Eur Radiol*. 2012;22(11):2514-2524.
56. Sandrasegaran K, Akisik FM, Lin C, Tahir B, Rajan J, Aisen AM. The value of diffusion-weighted imaging in characterizing focal liver masses. *Acad Radiol*. 2009;16(10):1208-1214.
57. American College of Radiology. ACR Practice Parameter for Communication of Diagnostic Imaging Findings. 2014; <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CommunicationDiag.pdf>. Accessed October 8, 2014.

58. American College of Radiology. ACR-AAPM Technical Standard for Diagnostic Medical Physics Performance Monitoring of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) Equipment. 2014; <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/MR-Equip.pdf>. Accessed October 8, 2014.

*Parameters and 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 parameters and standards published before 1999, the effective date was January 1 following the year in which the parameter or standard was amended, revised, or approved by the ACR Council.

Development Chronology for this Parameter

2005 (Resolution 3)

Amended 2006 (Resolution 35)

Revised 2010 (Resolution 14)

Amended 2014 (Resolution 39)

Revised 2015 (Resolution 3)