

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 2019 (Resolution 31)\*

## **ACR–AIUM–SRU PRACTICE PARAMETER FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF VASCULAR ULTRASOUND FOR POSTOPERATIVE ASSESSMENT OF HEMODIALYSIS ACCESS**

---

### **PREAMBLE**

This document is an educational tool designed to assist practitioners in providing appropriate radiologic care for patients. Practice Parameters and Technical Standards are not inflexible rules or requirements of practice and are not intended, nor should they be used, to establish a legal standard of care<sup>1</sup>. 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Iowa Medical Society and Iowa Society of Anesthesiologists v. Iowa Board of Nursing, 831 N.W.2d 826 (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**

The clinical aspects contained in specific sections of this practice parameter (Introduction, Indications, Specifications of the Examination, and Equipment Specifications) were developed collaboratively by the American College of Radiology (ACR), the American Institute of Ultrasound in Medicine (AIUM), and the Society of Radiologists in Ultrasound (SRU). Recommendations for Qualifications and Responsibilities of Personnel, Written Requests for the Examination, Documentation, and Quality Control and Improvement, Safety, Infection Control, and Patient Education vary among the organizations and are addressed by each separately.

As the number of patients with kidney failure requiring hemodialysis each year exceeds 660,000 patients, initial creation and maintenance of a functional hemodialysis access is an increasingly critical health care concern [1]. To improve the care of hemodialysis patients, the National Kidney Foundation established the Kidney Disease Outcomes Quality Initiative (KDOQI) in 2000 and updated it in 2006 [2-4]. The project set recommendations for placement and monitoring of hemodialysis access. Although there have been no hemodialysis access monitoring updates from KDOQI since 2006, additional information on the subject has been published, indicating that there has been a movement toward earlier and more frequent hemodialysis in patients with chronic kidney disease (CKD), which in turn has resulted in more complications requiring an estimated 68% increase in interventions to repair accesses [5].

The failure rate of hemodialysis access in the first year is high [6]. In 5.1% of patients, early thrombosis occurs within 18 days of arteriovenous fistula (AVF) creation and is associated with small arterial diameter, forearm location, small draining vein diameter, protamine use, female gender, surgeon frustration/concern during access creation procedure, and reduced or absent thrill at surgery [7]. After fistula maturation and use, subsequent failure is frequently associated with thrombosis secondary to underlying focal stenosis, most commonly at the anastomosis. Clinical monitoring of AVF function is recommended to detect deterioration in function before thrombosis occurs [8-10]. However, in arteriovenous grafts (AVGs), an occult stenosis may be present in a significant number of patients with normal findings on clinical evaluation [11,12]. The reported sensitivity of clinical examination for stenosis in AVGs is only 36% to 57% [13,14]. In patients who have abnormal flow volumes, salvage procedures or surgical revision may lengthen the life of the access, but there is conflicting data in the literature [15-18]. In a data analysis of 40,132 CMS beneficiaries, the benefits of percutaneous intervention were greatest in patients with new-access or low-access flow rates [6]. Differences in flow parameters within an AVF versus an AVG must be considered, as different diagnostic Doppler criteria for stenosis are associated with these two access types. This practice parameter is intended to help physicians in the performance of hemodialysis access evaluation by ultrasound, to ensure a high-quality diagnostic examination and to promote further understanding of potential salvage options.

These practice parameters will address primarily upper-extremity hemodialysis access. Although lower extremity hemodialysis grafts have a significant role in patients without usable upper extremity access, the diagnostic Doppler criteria for lower-extremity hemodialysis graft evaluation are less well-defined.

## **II. INDICATIONS/CONTRAINDICATIONS**

A. Indications for hemodialysis access ultrasound include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Hemodialysis access blood flow inadequate for dialysis, defined as flow volume less than 500 to 600 ml/min or patients who have interval 25% decrease in blood flow.
2. Patients who develop persistent ipsilateral upper-extremity edema or pain after access placement or during hemodialysis.
3. Patients with delayed maturity (>6 weeks) of a surgically created AVF.
4. Patients suspected of having a pseudoaneurysm (PSA), AVF, or graft stenosis, perigraft soft-tissue infection, or adjacent fluid collection.
5. Patients with decreased or absent thrill or abnormal bruit over hemodialysis access.
6. Follow-up after intervention
7. Patients with clinical signs or symptoms of hand/digit ischemia typically during or immediately following hemodialysis but that may occur at other times.

8. Access collapse during hemodialysis.
9. Prolonged bleeding (>20 min) from access needle sites.
10. Unexplained decrease in delivered dose of hemodialysis (Kt/V). Kt/V is the product of dialyzer clearance and time divided by volume of water in the patient.
11. Repeated difficult cannulation.
12. Thrombus aspiration during hemodialysis.
13. Elevated venous pressure greater than 200 mmHg on a 300 ml/min pump.
14. Elevated recirculation time >15%

There are no absolute contraindications to performance of this examination, but there may be physical limitations that prevent a complete duplex Doppler examination, such as the presence of indwelling catheters, open wounds, recent surgery, pain, scar tissue or calcification especially in the regions of multiple puncture sites, severe edema, contractures, or other reasons for immobility.

### **III. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL**

Core Privileging: This procedure is considered part of or amendable to image-guided core privileging.

See the [ACR–SPR–SRU Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Diagnostic Ultrasound Examinations](#) [19].

### **IV. SPECIFICATIONS OF THE EXAMINATION**

The ultrasound examination is designed to detect abnormalities that may cause access thrombosis, poor function, inability to access for dialysis, or undesirable upper-extremity symptoms and to assess for causes of AVF nonmaturation.

It is important to understand the anatomic configuration of the hemodialysis access to enable accurate and complete evaluation. Review of clinical records can be useful if there is history of documented variant anatomy or surgery, such as failed fistulas or jump grafts.

AVFs are most commonly placed in the upper extremity, either in the forearm or upper arm. A forearm AVF directly connects an artery (usually radial) to a vein (usually cephalic) at the wrist or distal forearm to increase flow in the draining vein (forearm cephalic vein AVF). This results in dilatation and wall thickening of the vein, allowing for frequent cannulation for hemodialysis. An upper arm AVF is typically created at the antecubital fossa and connects the brachial artery to the cephalic vein or at the basilic vein, which is usually transposed more anterolaterally for easier access and is called a basilic vein transposition fistula.

If AVF creation is not possible or not preferred, a prosthetic graft may be placed to create an AVG. A graft is a tube connecting an artery and vein that is used to provide a conduit for needle access during hemodialysis. Graft configurations may include a forearm loop graft anastomosed between the brachial artery and an antecubital vein at the antecubital fossa, an upper arm straight graft from the brachial artery at the antecubital fossa to the axillary or proximal basilic vein, or an upper arm loop graft anastomosed to the axillary artery and axillary vein.

Whether an examination is requested for failure to mature or dysfunction, the components of the sonographic study of both AVFs and grafts are similar [20,21]. Copious amounts of ultrasound gel and careful attention to apply only limited pressure from the transducer will minimize deformity of the vein, which may affect measurements of the vein diameter. Evaluation of arterial inflow, venous outflow, turbulent or stenotic flow, anterior AVF vein wall depth from skin, and identification of PSAs or large accessory veins or an area of significant diameter narrowing are basic components of the hemodialysis access examination. Characterization of any collection/mass near the access should be performed.

Note: For anatomic localization of an abnormality in the upper-extremity venous structures, the words “cranial” and “caudal” are preferred because there is some uncertainty in the use of the terms “proximal” and “distal” with regards to the veins. Alternatively, the location of a draining vein stenosis may be described by its distance from

the anastomosis. The longitudinal, or long, axis is parallel to or along the length of the vessel. Transverse, or short, axis is perpendicular to the long axis of the vessel. When measuring the velocity in the feeding artery or draining vein to be used as the denominator in the peak velocity ratio of a stenosis, the location may be described as “2 cm upstream” indicating the distance from the anastomosis. The artery supplying the anastomosis is commonly described as the “feeding artery” or “arterial inflow.”

#### A. Upper-Extremity AVF Examination for Fistula Dysfunction

Decreased blood flow in a hemodialysis fistula is a hallmark of access dysfunction. Sonographic evaluation of an AVF seeks to detect stenosis, which may limit flow within the AVF and progress to thrombosis [23].

Initial evaluation to measure fistula diameter and to detect stenosis is performed with grayscale imaging. Significant stenosis is usually defined as luminal narrowing equal to or exceeding 50% compared with the normal vascular segment (artery or vein) located upstream to the stenosis [15,24,25]. Using color and spectral Doppler in a long axis plane, the peak systolic velocity (PSV) at the anastomosis is compared with the PSV in the feeding artery 2 cm upstream from the anastomosis. A PSV ratio (anastomosis/artery 2 cm upstream) greater than 3:1 has been suggested to represent a stenosis with diameter reduction greater than 50% [26-28]. A small study using PSV >375 cm/s for detection of AVF anastomotic stenosis >50% demonstrated sensitivity and specificity of 96% (26/27) and 76% (13/17), respectively [29]. However, any anastomotic stenosis should be confirmed with grayscale imaging because there is often sharp angulation of the venous origin at the anastomosis, which may elevate PSV, simulating a stenosis [30]. It is important to note that although a stenosis is present, AVF vein blood flow may be adequate and the AVF useable for hemodialysis [31].

Inaccurate Doppler angle correction and incorrect Doppler settings can contribute to velocity measurement error [32]. The Doppler angle of insonation should be maintained at  $\leq 60^\circ$ , and the angle correction cursor should be parallel to the vessel wall. In the setting of stenosis, the resistive index (RI) measured within the inflow artery is greater than 0.5 in 84% (99/118) of patients, compared with an RI < 0.5 in 71% (10/14) of those without dysfunction [33].

In addition to the area of the anastomosis, any visible narrowing of the draining vein on grayscale imaging or area of color aliasing within the vein should be further assessed with velocity measurements by spectral Doppler. The PSV at the narrowing is compared with the PSV of the vein 2 cm upstream (caudal). A draining vein PSV ratio (narrowed draining vein/vein 2 cm upstream) greater than 2:1 suggests stenosis of  $\geq 50\%$  [21]. Alternatively, a large retrospective study of stenoses (excluding the anastomotic region) showed poor accuracy of the PSV ratio and better sensitivity (89%) for 50% stenosis using PSV < 500 cm/s. However, the location of stenosis was not described, and volume flows were not reported [34]. Doelman et al using PSV > 375 cm/s detected draining vein stenoses, including those in the cephalic vein with 91% sensitivity (31/34) and 95% specificity (71/75), respectively [29]. If there is poor draining vein flow in the absence of anastomotic stenosis, the downstream (cranial) venous system may be stenotic or thrombosed. Assessment of spectral Doppler waveforms in the ipsilateral internal jugular vein and subclavian vein can detect signs of central stenosis, which may be further assessed with other imaging modalities. Central stenoses can be present even with high flow in an access, causing arm swelling. Note that multiple abnormalities may be present in a single dysfunctional access [35].

An AVF must have adequate arterial inflow in order to mature and function [36]. The prevalence of an inflow arterial stenosis is much higher in dysfunctional AVFs (40%) or grafts (29%) than in functional accesses, and more than half of all patients with inflow arterial stenosis have associated venous abnormalities [24]. Poststenotic arterial waveforms with parvus and tardus characteristics should be considered abnormal in the inflow vessel (feeding artery). Failure to document velocity elevation in the presence of luminal narrowing on grayscale may indicate inflow disease/stenosis or low systemic pressure [28,37,38].

The direction of flow in the artery distal (caudal) to the anastomosis of an AVF may be evaluated to determine if flow in the artery is reversed or bidirectional. Reversal of arterial flow is common in AVFs, although it is usually asymptomatic and does not require intervention [39]. Arterial steal symptoms are more common in upper arm accesses with a brachial artery anastomosis. In a large prospective series of AVF-related hand ischemia, 7% of patients with hemodialysis access AVFs had symptoms and 4% required intervention. Intervention is associated

with female gender, diabetes, capacious outflow veins, and coronary artery disease [41]. Hand ischemia may occur for several reasons: inflow artery stenosis or occlusion, either in the feeding or a more proximal artery (such as the subclavian artery), outflow artery stenosis or occlusion, poor arterial collaterals, or excessive fistula flow volume. Doppler ultrasound evaluation may assist in the diagnosis of each of these etiologies [42]. In addition, pulse-volume recordings (PVRs) of the upper extremities with and without access compression will provide an indication of adequacy of flow and impact of the access on digital perfusion as some patients may have fixed arterial disease as a cause for their digital ischemia. Alternatively, the fistula can be manually compressed just beyond the arterial anastomosis to see if this maneuver redirects flow toward the hand or alleviates symptoms.

Other nonstenotic abnormalities, such as PSA, hematoma, and abscess, can be diagnosed by a combination of grayscale and duplex Doppler ultrasound. Color Doppler should be used to evaluate any collection adjacent to the fistula. Grayscale and color Doppler imaging can diagnose aneurysmal dilatation, which may not be detected angiographically if mural thrombus fills at least 50% of the lumen [33]. A small aneurysm in a draining vein may not require treatment if the overlying skin remains intact. However, a PSA secondary to repeated needle sticks in a graft or rarely AVF may worsen and lead to hemorrhage; it can require surgical management if >1-cm diameter, especially if it contains mural thrombus [43].

## B. Evaluation of AVF for Failure to Mature

A normal AVF may take up to 3 months to fully mature and be usable for dialysis. Additionally, a large proportion (28%-60%) of surgically created AVFs do not initially adequately mature such that they become usable for hemodialysis within a typical maturation period of 6 weeks to 6 months [44-47]. A mature AVF must be easily palpable and support cannulation by two 17-gauge needles. Clinical determination of fistula maturity by skilled nursing was reportedly 80% accurate [48] in one study; however, palpation had 96% sensitivity in another study if a thrill was present [49]. If an adequate AVF is not clinically identified in the first 4 to 8 weeks after surgical access creation, ultrasound can be performed to assess for a potentially correctable anatomic problem. In a series of 153 patients with surveillance Doppler evaluation 4 to 8 weeks after access creation (but before attempted hemodialysis), ultrasound detected nine occluded fistulas. An additional 40% had significant lesions even though only 17% had an abnormal clinical examination. In this series, 70% of the AVFs that underwent secondary intervention matured, compared with 25% without intervention [50]. If the fistula is still not useable after 3 months despite interventions, it is considered as failure to mature [51]. A prospective study of 602 fistulas suggested that low blood flow and small venous diameter at 2 weeks are predictive of AVFs that may not develop optimally at 6 weeks [48]. Follow-up evaluation of the 602 AVFs showed that measurement of AVF blood flow rate, AVF diameter, and distance of the anterior AVF vein wall from the skin was moderately predictive of AVF maturation [52]. A separate study showed increased risk of failure to mature if blood flow was <413 ml/min at 2 weeks after fistula creation [53].

The anastomosis is evaluated for stenosis using the same diagnostic criteria defined in the section above on upper-extremity AVF examination for fistula dysfunction. Again, a greater than 3:1 PSV ratio of anastomosis compared with the feeding artery 2 cm upstream should suggest anastomotic stenosis. Special attention is given to detect stenosis of the draining vein, using a 2:1 threshold ratio for stenosis at the point of narrowing relative to 2 cm upstream.

Blood flow is measured in the midportion of the AVF draining vein where the vein is straight and nontapering, without turbulent flow typically around 10 cm cranial to the anastomosis [35]. The Doppler gate is adjusted to encompass the lumen of the vein with alignment of the sample volume markers perpendicular to the venous walls. The angle of Doppler insonation for blood flow calculation is standardized at 60° or less to minimize the degree of measurement error. A sequence of three to five cardiac cycles is obtained to allow calculation of time-averaged velocities, and the average of three separate measurements is reported [17]. On follow-up examinations, blood flow should be measured in the same location.

If no stenosis is identified, thresholds for AVF vein diameter and blood flow and AVF depth from the skin may suggest whether the AVF is adequately mature for hemodialysis [52]. An AVF with venous diameter of at least 0.4 to 0.6 cm and blood flow of at least 500 to 600 ml/min predicts that an AVF has a high likelihood of supporting successful hemodialysis [20,35]. The lower range of values may be chosen to reduce abandonment of a fistula that

may subsequently mature and recognize the measurement error in determining flow volumes. In one study, fistulas measuring >0.4 cm in diameter and with volume flow > 500 ml/min were usable for hemodialysis in 95% of patients, whereas, those measuring < 0.4 cm in diameter and with volume flow < 500 ml/min matured in only 33% of patients [20]. Another study of 125 hemodialysis fistulas and bridge grafts found that a volume flow threshold of 800 ml/min had improved accuracy for detection of access dysfunction relative to a 500 ml/min threshold [54]. Yet another study found a 0.5-cm diameter to be a better diameter threshold than 0.4 cm [49]. A draining vein that is greater than 0.5 to 0.6 cm deep to the skin surface may mature but be too deep for consistent cannulation, and the draining vein in these situations may require superficialization. Lastly, there should be at least 5 to 6 cm of straight vein to allow placement of the dialysis needles.

Venous branches are documented based on size and distance from the anastomosis. Large draining venous branches (accessory veins) may be surgically ligated to increase flow through the main draining vein to allow AVF maturation [55]. The venous drainage to the level of the medial subclavian vein may be evaluated if not done previously on a preoperative study because downstream central venous stenosis or thrombosis may inhibit AVF maturation.

Therapy for AVF dysfunction depends upon the underlying abnormality and its location. Treatment of stenosis in the anastomotic/juxta-anastomotic region relies primarily on balloon angioplasty. Persistent dysfunction after 2 to 3 weeks following angioplasty should encourage repeat ultrasound to evaluate for a second abnormality or insufficient dilatation. If there are accessory veins associated with stenosis, they are addressed by treating the underlying stenosis first. If no stenosis is present, the accessory veins can be treated with surgical ligation, coiled during angiography, or percutaneously occluded with minimally invasive image-guided ligation. For treatment of a deep draining vein, an incision can be made to allow the vein to rise closer to the surface, or superficial lipectomy can be performed. Successful superficialization may allow hemodialysis access maturation in 3 to 6 weeks [56].

### C. Upper-Extremity Examination for Graft Dysfunction

As part of a complete study, the graft should be evaluated with grayscale, color, and spectral Doppler. Graft failure that is due to thrombosis is easily diagnosed by physical examination, but ultrasound can be used. Differentiation of occlusive versus nonocclusive thrombosis can be made by color or power Doppler. In a graft, the venous anastomosis is the most common site of stenosis. A PSV ratio (anastomosis/graft 2 cm upstream) greater than 2:1 is used as a threshold to diagnose a 50% stenosis at the venous anastomosis, and a 3:1 ratio suggests a 75% stenosis [11,21]. If there is a borderline PSV ratio suggesting stenosis, PSV > 400 cm/s or visible narrowing greater than 50% can help make the diagnosis [27]. In another study, Doelman et al used PSV > 310 cm/s to detect stenosis with a sensitivity and specificity of 95% (20/21) and 100% (10/10), respectively, at the venous anastomosis. PSV measurement at the mid graft should be obtained. Likewise, the draining vein in the limb cranial to the graft should be evaluated with color Doppler for signs of narrowing or aliasing. In regions of suspected narrowing in the draining vein of a graft, a PSV ratio (stenosis versus inflow venous segment 2 cm) should be calculated with a 2:1 threshold ratio applied for diagnosis of stenosis in a manner similar to the draining vein of an AVF. The sites of any stenoses are documented, and the length of stenosis is noted. A normal color Doppler examination is useful because it precludes the need for further imaging [57].

The arterial anastomosis of a hemodialysis graft has more variability in flow velocity relative to the upstream feeding artery than in a fistula. A PSV ratio greater than 3:1 should raise concern for stenosis at the arterial anastomosis of a graft, but there is lower specificity than at other locations [21]. Using a threshold PSV > 310 cm/sec for detection of stenosis, the sensitivity and specificity has been reported to be ≤60, respectively, at the arterial anastomosis [29].

Normal blood flow volumes within grafts are commonly higher than in AVFs, but flow rates of 500 to 1,300 ml/min have been reported with graft stenosis. Blood flow volume less than 500 ml/min should lead to a fistulogram even if no anatomic etiology for the low blood flow volume is found.

The venous outflow should be followed into the subclavian vein to assess for stenosis. The central veins of the chest can also be examined. In the absence of any other etiology for access dysfunction, the central veins of the chest should be evaluated even if they were normal at evaluation prior to graft placement, especially if there is reason to suspect central venous stenosis, such as arm swelling, shoulder collaterals, or history of prolonged or multiple

subclavian or internal jugular vein catheterizations. In some patients, multiple stenoses may be present; persistent slow flow after treatment of an inflow stenosis may unmask a central abnormality. Close attention to detail is required because some central stenoses may be missed by sonographic evaluation [57].

Evaluation of the feeding artery should be performed in the same manner as done for AVF evaluation described above. Reversal of flow in the distal artery may occur and is often asymptomatic, similar to patients with AVFs.

Grafts may have disruption/degeneration of the polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) material, and this may be directly visible on grayscale. There may be associated hematoma adjacent to the area of disruption. If disruption of the graft material is suspected, the finding can be further evaluated by Doppler to detect PSA or graft degeneration. A patent PSA will appear anechoic with or without associated mural thrombus with swirling of flow on color Doppler and a yin-yang appearance within the sac similar to the appearance of PSAs in other parts of the body.

#### D. Routine Sonographic Monitoring of Functional Access

Controversy remains in the literature as to whether or not aggressive routine monitoring and angioplasty of a hemodialysis access, especially in a graft, can prevent subsequent thrombosis and significantly extend patency and longevity [6,58-67]. A recent Cochrane analysis suggests that correction of surveillance-detected stenosis in absence of access dysfunction does not extend access longevity but may have promise in fistulas by reducing hospitalizations and catheter use [68]. Accordingly, recent “ACCF/ACR/AIUM/ASE/IAC/SCAI/SCVS/SIR/SVM/SVS/SVU 2013 Appropriate Use Criteria for Peripheral Vascular Ultrasound and Physiological testing Part II: Testing for Venous Disease and Evaluation of Hemodialysis Access: A Report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation Appropriate Use Criteria Task Force” guidelines suggest that routine surveillance is rarely appropriate for the asymptomatic functioning of hemodialysis AVF or AVG [69].

### V. WRITTEN REQUEST FOR THE EXAMINATION

The written or electronic request for postoperative hemodialysis access ultrasound 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). The provision of 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 – revised in 2016, Resolution 12-b)

### VI. DOCUMENTATION

Adequate documentation is essential for high-quality patient care. There should be a permanent record of the ultrasound examination and its interpretation. Comparison with prior relevant imaging studies may prove helpful. Images of all appropriate areas, both normal and abnormal, should be recorded. Variations from normal size should generally be accompanied by measurements. Images should be labeled with the patient identification, facility identification, examination date, and image orientation. An official interpretation (final report) of the ultrasound examination should be included in the patient’s medical record. Retention of the ultrasound examination images should be consistent both with clinical need and with relevant legal and local health care facility requirements.

Reporting should be in accordance with the [ACR Practice Parameter for Communication of Diagnostic Imaging Findings](#) [70].

## VII. EQUIPMENT SPECIFICATIONS

The sonographic evaluation of the peripheral veins and arteries should include both real-time imaging of the vessels and their contents and evaluation of the flow signals originating from within the lumen using grayscale as well as color and spectral Doppler with careful attention to the anastomoses and any area of perceived narrowing/stenosis or intraluminal echoes/thrombus. Grayscale imaging of the anastomosis is critical as color Doppler may obscure thrombus synechiae or overwrite focal narrowing, resulting in either overestimation or underestimation of stenosis. Real-time imaging should be conducted at the highest clinically appropriate frequency, realizing that there is a trade-off between resolution and beam penetration. This should usually be at a frequency of 7 MHz or greater, with the occasional need for a lower frequency transducer, such as during insonation of the central veins. To determine flow rates, higher resolution transducers are needed, preferably 9 to 15 MHz. In most cases, a linear transducer is preferable to obtain optimal images. The flow signals originating from within the lumen of the vessels should be evaluated with a Doppler frequency of 2.5 MHz or above. A display of the relative amplitude and direction of moving blood should be available.

Imaging and flow analysis are currently performed with duplex sonography using range gating in the center of the vessel and angle correction with a Doppler angle  $< 60^\circ$ . Color Doppler is used to detect aliasing that is indicative of stenosis and to facilitate the examination. Color and spectral Doppler are also useful for evaluation of PSA or nonocclusive thrombus. Appropriate gain and scale settings should be used. The wall filter should be chosen as appropriate for the vessel interrogated.

## 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 (<https://www.acr.org/Advocacy-and-Economics/ACR-Position-Statements/Quality-Control-and-Improvement>).

Equipment performance monitoring should be in accordance with the [ACR–AAPM Technical Standard for Diagnostic Medical Physics Performance Monitoring of Real Time Ultrasound Equipment](#) [71].

## 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 (<https://www.acr.org/Clinical-Resources/Practice-Parameters-and-Technical-Standards>) by the Committee on Practice Parameters – Ultrasound of the ACR Commission on Ultrasound in collaboration with the AIUM and the SRU.

### Collaborative Subcommittee

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

#### ACR

Mark E. Lockhart, MD, MPH, Chair  
Nirvikar Dahiya, MD, MBBS, FAIUM  
Michelle L. Robbin, MD

#### AIUM

Laurence Needleman, MD, FACR  
Marsha Neumyer, BS, RVT, FSVU, FSDMS, FAIUM  
Victoria Teodoresca, MD, MBA

#### SRU

Lauren Alexander, MD  
Leslie M. Scutt, MD, FACR



### Committee on Practice Parameters – Ultrasound

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

Sheila Sheth, MD, FACR, Chair  
Marcela Böhm-Velez, MD, FACR  
Kaleigh Burke, MD  
Nirvikar Dahiya, MD, MBBS, FAIUM  
Christopher Fung, MD  
Helena Gabriel, MD

Jamie Hui, MD  
Stephen I. Johnson, MD  
David U. Kim, MD  
Harriet J. Paltiel, MD  
Henrietta K. Rosenberg, MD, FACR  
Jason M. Wagner, MD

Beverly G. Coleman, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Ultrasound  
Jacqueline Anne Bello, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Quality and Safety  
Matthew S. Pollack, MD, FACR, Chair, Committee on Practice Parameters and Technical Standards  
Mary S. Newell, MD, FACR, Vice Chair, Committee on Practice Parameters and Technical Standards

### Comments Reconciliation Committee

Timothy Crummy, MD, FACR – Chair  
Elaine Lewis, MD, FACR – Co-Chair  
Lauren Alexander, MD  
Carol Barnewolt, MD  
Jacqueline A. Bello, MD, FACR  
George Berdejo, RVT, BA  
Bryann Bromley, MD  
Beverly G. Coleman, MD, FACR  
Nirvikar Dahiya, MBBS  
Richard Duszak, Jr., MD, FACR  
Mark E. Lockhart, MD MPH  
Laurence Needleman, MD, FACR

Marsha Neumyer, BS, RVT, FSVU, FSDMS, FAIUM  
Mary S. Newell, MD, FACR  
Beverley Newman, MB, BCh, BSc, FACR  
Matthew S. Pollack, MD, FACR  
Margarita Revzin, MD  
Michelle L. Robbin, MD  
Sheila Sheth, MD, FACR  
Leslie M. Scoutt, MD, FACR  
Timothy L. Swan, MD, FACR  
Victoria Teodoresca, MD, MBA  
Jade J Wong-You-Cheong, MD

## REFERENCES

1. National Kidney Foundation. End Stage Renal Disease in the United States. 2016; Available at: <https://www.kidney.org/news/newsroom/factsheets/End-Stage-Renal-Disease-in-the-US>. Accessed May 8, 2018.
2. American Journal of Kidney Diseases. III. NKF-K/DOQI Clinical Practice Guidelines for Vascular Access: update 2000. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 2001;37(1 Suppl 1):S137-181.
3. (NIDDK) NIDaDaKD. Kidney and urologic diseases statistics for the United States: National Kidney and Urologic Diseases Information Clearinghouse (NKUDIC). 2001.
4. Foundation NK. KDOQI Clinical Practice Guidelines and Clinical Practice Recommendations for 2006 Updates: Hemodialysis adequacy, peritoneal dialysis adequacy and vascular access. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 2006;48:S1-S322.
5. Suri RS, Larive B, Sherer S, et al. Risk of vascular access complications with frequent hemodialysis. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2013;24(3):884-930.
6. Chan KE, Pflederer TA, Steele DJ, et al. Access survival amongst hemodialysis patients referred for preventive angiography and percutaneous transluminal angioplasty. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2011;6(11):2669-2680.
7. Farber A, Imrey PB, Huber TS, et al. Multiple preoperative and intraoperative factors predict early fistula thrombosis in the Hemodialysis Fistula Maturation Study. *J Vasc Surg*. 2016;63(1):163-170 e166.
8. Besarab A, Sullivan KL, Ross RP, Moritz MJ. Utility of intra-access pressure monitoring in detecting and correcting venous outlet stenoses prior to thrombosis. *Kidney Int*. 1995;47(5):1364-1373.
9. Cayco AV, Abu-Alfa AK, Mahnensmith RL, Perazella MA. Reduction in arteriovenous graft impairment: results of a vascular access surveillance protocol. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 1998;32(2):302-308.
10. McCarley P, Wingard RL, Shyr Y, Pettus W, Hakim RM, Ikizler TA. Vascular access blood flow monitoring reduces access morbidity and costs. *Kidney Int*. 2001;60(3):1164-1172.
11. Older RA, Gizienski TA, Wilkowski MJ, Angle JF, Cote DA. Hemodialysis access stenosis: early detection with color Doppler US. *Radiology*. 1998;207(1):161-164.

12. Asif A, Leon C, Orozco-Vargas LC, et al. Accuracy of physical examination in the detection of arteriovenous fistula stenosis. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2007;2(6):1191-1194.
13. Leon C, Orozco-Vargas LC, Krishnamurthy G, et al. Accuracy of physical examination in the detection of arteriovenous graft stenosis. *Semin Dial*. 2008;21(1):85-88.
14. Malik J, Slavikova M, Malikova H, Maskova J. Many clinically silent access stenoses can be identified by ultrasonography. *J Nephrol*. 2002;15(6):661-665.
15. Beathard GA, Arnold P, Jackson J, Litchfield T. Aggressive treatment of early fistula failure. *Kidney Int*. 2003;64(4):1487-1494.
16. Roberts AB, Kahn MB, Bradford S, et al. Graft surveillance and angioplasty prolongs dialysis graft patency. *J Am Coll Surg*. 1996;183(5):486-492.
17. Sands JJ, Jabyac PA, Miranda CL, Kapsick BJ. Intervention based on monthly monitoring decreases hemodialysis access thrombosis. *Asaio J*. 1999;45(3):147-150.
18. Turmel-Rodrigues L, Pengloan J, Blanchier D, et al. Insufficient dialysis shunts: improved long-term patency rates with close hemodynamic monitoring, repeated percutaneous balloon angioplasty, and stent placement. *Radiology*. 1993;187(1):273-278.
19. American College of Radiology. ACR–SPR–SRU practice parameter for performing and interpreting diagnostic ultrasound examinations. 2017; Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/US-Perf-Interpret.pdf>. Accessed January 9, 2018.
20. Robbin ML, Chamberlain NE, Lockhart ME, et al. Hemodialysis arteriovenous fistula maturity: US evaluation. *Radiology*. 2002;225(1):59-64.
21. Robbin ML, Oser RF, Allon M, et al. Hemodialysis access graft stenosis: US detection. *Radiology*. 1998;208(3):655-661.
22. Rajan DK, Bunston S, Misra S, Pinto R, Lok CE. Dysfunctional autogenous hemodialysis fistulas: outcomes after angioplasty--are there clinical predictors of patency? *Radiology*. 2004;232(2):508-515.
23. Quencer KB, Arici M. Arteriovenous Fistulas and Their Characteristic Sites of Stenosis. *American Journal of Roentgenology*. 2015;205(4):726-734.
24. Asif A, Gadalean FN, Merrill D, et al. Inflow stenosis in arteriovenous fistulas and grafts: a multicenter, prospective study. *Kidney Int*. 2005;67(5):1986-1992.
25. Khan FA, Vesely TM. Arterial problems associated with dysfunctional hemodialysis grafts: evaluation of patients at high risk for arterial disease. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2002;13(11):1109-1114.
26. Chao A, Daley T, Gruenewald S ea. Duplex ultrasound criteria for assessment of stenoses in radiocephalic hemodialysis fistulas. *Journal of Vascular Technology*. 2001;6:203-208.
27. Lockhart ME, Robbin ML. Hemodialysis access ultrasound. *Ultrasound Q*. 2001;17(3):157-167.
28. Grogan J, Castilla M, Lozanski L, Griffin A, Loth F, Bassiouny H. Frequency of critical stenosis in primary arteriovenous fistulae before hemodialysis access: should duplex ultrasound surveillance be the standard of care? *J Vasc Surg*. 2005;41(6):1000-1006.
29. Doelman C, Duijm LE, Liem YS, et al. Stenosis detection in failing hemodialysis access fistulas and grafts: comparison of color Doppler ultrasonography, contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance angiography, and digital subtraction angiography. *J Vasc Surg*. 2005;42(4):739-746.
30. Gallego Beuter JJ, Hernandez Lezana A, Herrero Calvo J, Moreno Carriles R. Early detection and treatment of hemodialysis access dysfunction. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. 2000;23(1):40-46.
31. Cheung AK, Imrey PB, Alpers CE, et al. Intimal Hyperplasia, Stenosis, and Arteriovenous Fistula Maturation Failure in the Hemodialysis Fistula Maturation Study. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2017;28(10):3005-3013.
32. Lui EY, Steinman AH, Cobbold RS, Johnston KW. Human factors as a source of error in peak Doppler velocity measurement. *J Vasc Surg*. 2005;42(5):972-979.
33. Moreno Sanchez T, Martin Hervas C, Sola Martinez E, Moreno Rodriguez F. Value of doppler ultrasonography in the study of hemodialysis peripheral vascular access dysfunction. *Radiologia*. 2014;56(5):420-428.
34. Wo K, Morrison BJ, Harada RN. Developing Duplex Ultrasound Criteria for Diagnosis of Arteriovenous Fistula Stenosis. *Ann Vasc Surg*. 2017;38:99-104.
35. Singh P, Robbin ML, Lockhart ME, Allon M. Clinically immature arteriovenous hemodialysis fistulas: effect of US on salvage. *Radiology*. 2008;246(1):299-305.
36. Obialo CI, Tagoe AT, Martin PC, Asche-Crowe PE. Adequacy and survival of autogenous arteriovenous fistula in African American hemodialysis patients. *Asaio J*. 2003;49(4):435-439.
37. Teodorescu V, Gustavson S, Schanzer H. Duplex ultrasound evaluation of hemodialysis access: a detailed protocol. *Int J Nephrol*. 2012;2012:508956.

38. Nassar GM, Nguyen B, Rhee E, Achkar K. Endovascular treatment of the "failing to mature" arteriovenous fistula. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2006;1(2):275-280.
39. Sivanesan S, How TV, Bakran A. Characterizing flow distributions in AV fistulae for haemodialysis access. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 1998;13(12):3108-3110.
40. Sessa C, Pecher M, Maurizi-Balzan J, et al. Critical hand ischemia after angioaccess surgery: diagnosis and treatment. *Ann Vasc Surg*. 2000;14(6):583-593.
41. Huber TS, Larive B, Imrey PB, et al. Access-related hand ischemia and the Hemodialysis Fistula Maturation Study. *J Vasc Surg*. 2016;64(4):1050-1058 e1051.
42. Malik J, Slavikova M, Maskova J. Dialysis access-associated steal syndrome: the role of ultrasonography. *J Nephrol*. 2003;16(6):903-907.
43. Hodgkiss-Harlow KD, Bandyk DF. Interpretation of arterial duplex testing of lower-extremity arteries and interventions. *Semin Vasc Surg*. 2013;26(2-3):95-104.
44. Allon M, Lockhart ME, Lilly RZ, et al. Effect of preoperative sonographic mapping on vascular access outcomes in hemodialysis patients. *Kidney Int*. 2001;60(5):2013-2020.
45. Miller PE, Tolwani A, Luscly CP, et al. Predictors of adequacy of arteriovenous fistulas in hemodialysis patients. *Kidney Int*. 1999;56(1):275-280.
46. Won T, Jang JW, Lee S, Han JJ, Park YS, Ahn JH. Effects of intraoperative blood flow on the early patency of radiocephalic fistulas. *Ann Vasc Surg*. 2000;14(5):468-472.
47. Dember LM, Beck GJ, Allon M, et al. Effect of clopidogrel on early failure of arteriovenous fistulas for hemodialysis: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. 2008;299(18):2164-2171.
48. Robbin ML, Greene T, Cheung AK, et al. Arteriovenous Fistula Development in the First 6 Weeks after Creation. *Radiology*. 2016;279(2):620-629.
49. Ferring M, Henderson J, Wilming T. Accuracy of early postoperative clinical and ultrasound examination of arteriovenous fistulae to predict dialysis use. *J Vasc Access*. 2014;15(4):291-297.
50. Itoga NK, Ullery BW, Tran K, et al. Use of a proactive duplex ultrasound protocol for hemodialysis access. *J Vasc Surg*. 2016;64(4):1042-1049 e1041.
51. Lee T, Chauhan V, Krishnamoorthy M, et al. Severe venous neointimal hyperplasia prior to dialysis access surgery. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2011;26(7):2264-2270.
52. Robbin ML, Greene T, Allon M, et al. Prediction of Arteriovenous Fistula Clinical Maturation from Postoperative Ultrasound Measurements: Findings from the Hemodialysis Fistula Maturation Study. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2018;29(11):2735-2744.
53. Zhu YL, Ding H, Fan PL, Gu QL, Teng J, Wang WP. Is Brachial Artery Blood Flow Measured by Sonography During Early Postoperative Periods Predictive of Arteriovenous Fistula Failure in Hemodialysis Patients? *J Ultrasound Med*. 2016;35(9):1985-1992.
54. Back MR, Maynard M, Winkler A, Bandyk DF. Expected flow parameters within hemodialysis access and selection for remedial intervention of nonmaturing conduits. *Vasc Endovascular Surg*. 2008;42(2):150-158.
55. Beathard GA, Settle SM, Shields MW. Salvage of the nonfunctioning arteriovenous fistula. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 1999;33(5):910-916.
56. Sheth RA, Sheth AU. A Primer on Hemodialysis From an Interventional Radiology Perspective. *Tech Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2017;20(1):9-13.
57. Dumars MC, Thompson WE, Bluth EI, Lindberg JS, Yoselevitz M, Merritt CR. Management of suspected hemodialysis graft dysfunction: usefulness of diagnostic US. *Radiology*. 2002;222(1):103-107.
58. Dember LM, Holmberg EF, Kaufman JS. Value of static venous pressure for predicting arteriovenous graft thrombosis. *Kidney Int*. 2002;61(5):1899-1904.
59. Dember LM, Holmberg EF, Kaufman JS. Randomized controlled trial of prophylactic repair of hemodialysis arteriovenous graft stenosis. *Kidney Int*. 2004;66(1):390-398.
60. Malik J, Slavikova M, Svobodova J, Tuka V. Regular ultrasonographic screening significantly prolongs patency of PTFE grafts. *Kidney Int*. 2005;67(4):1554-1558.
61. Robbin ML, Oser RF, Lee JY, Heudebert GR, Mennemeyer ST, Allon M. Randomized comparison of ultrasound surveillance and clinical monitoring on arteriovenous graft outcomes. *Kidney Int*. 2006;69(4):730-735.
62. Shahin H, Reddy G, Sharafuddin M, Katz D, Franzwa BS, Dixon BS. Monthly access flow monitoring with increased prophylactic angioplasty did not improve fistula patency. *Kidney Int*. 2005;68(5):2352-2361.
63. White JJ, Bander SJ, Schwab SJ, et al. Is percutaneous transluminal angioplasty an effective intervention for arteriovenous graft stenosis? *Semin Dial*. 2005;18(3):190-202.

64. Allon M, Robbin ML. Hemodialysis vascular access monitoring: current concepts. *Hemodial Int.* 2009;13(2):153-162.
65. Paulson WD, Moist L, Lok CE. Vascular access surveillance: an ongoing controversy. *Kidney Int.* 2012;81(2):132-142.
66. Tonelli M, James M, Wiebe N, Jindal K, Hemmelgarn B. Ultrasound monitoring to detect access stenosis in hemodialysis patients: a systematic review. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2008;51(4):630-640.
67. Malik J, Kudlicka J, Novakova L, Adamec J, Malikova H, Kavan J. Surveillance of arteriovenous accesses with the use of duplex Doppler ultrasonography. *J Vasc Access.* 2014;15 Suppl 7:S28-32.
68. Ravani P, Quinn RR, Oliver MJ, et al. Preemptive Correction of Arteriovenous Access Stenosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2016;67(3):446-460.
69. Gornik HL, Gerhard-Herman MD, Misra S, et al. ACCF/ACR/AIUM/ASE/IAC/SCAI/SCVS/SIR/SVM/SVS/SVU 2013 appropriate use criteria for peripheral vascular ultrasound and physiological testing part II: testing for venous disease and evaluation of hemodialysis access: a report of the american college of cardiology foundation appropriate use criteria task force. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2013;62(7):649-665.
70. 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 9, 2018.
71. American College of Radiology. ACR–AAPM technical standard for diagnostic medical physics performance monitoring of real time ultrasound equipment. 2016; Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/US-Equip.pdf>. Accessed January 9, 2018.

---

\*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

2007 (Resolution 28)

Revised 2014 (Resolution 24)

Revised 2019 (Resolution 31)

Amended 2019 (Resolution 23)