

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 2020 (Resolution 15) [\\*](#)

## **ACR–ACNM–SNMMI–SPR PRACTICE PARAMETER FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF RADIONUCLIDE CYSTOGRAPHY**

---

### **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 considering 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 variables such as the condition of the patient, limitations of available resources, or advances in knowledge or technology after publication of this document. However, a practitioner who employs an approach substantially different from the guidance in this document may consider documenting in the patient record information sufficient to explain the approach taken.

The practice of medicine involves the science, and 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 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

This practice parameter was revised collaboratively by the American College of Radiology (ACR), the American College of Nuclear Medicine (ACNM), the Society of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging (SNMMI), and the Society for Pediatric Radiology (SPR).

This practice parameter is intended to guide interpreting physicians in performing radionuclide cystography (RNC) in adult and pediatric patients. Properly performed imaging with radiopharmaceuticals provides a sensitive means of detecting, evaluating, and following certain conditions of the bladder and ureters. As with all scintigraphic examinations, correlation of findings with the results of other imaging and nonimaging procedures, as well as clinical information, is necessary for maximum diagnostic yield.

Application of this practice parameter should be in accordance with the [ACR-ACNM-SNMMI-SPR Practice Parameter for the Use of Radiopharmaceuticals in Diagnostic Procedures](#) [1].

RNC involves filling the urinary bladder with a radiopharmaceutical, either by direct (retrograde) administration via urethral catheter or by indirect (antegrade) drainage of an intravenously administered radiopharmaceutical excreted by the kidneys and subsequent imaging with a gamma camera.

## II. INDICATIONS

Clinical indications [2-4] for RNC in evaluating vesicoureteral reflux (VUR) include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Initial diagnosis in patients with female anatomy with urinary tract infection
2. Diagnosis in asymptomatic children with a family history of VUR
3. Diagnosis in renal transplant recipients
4. Diagnosis and follow-up in infants (including persistent antenatal hydronephrosis) and children with hydronephrosis
5. Follow-up examination to assess spontaneous resolution
6. Follow-up examination to evaluate resolution after antireflux procedures

For information on radiation risks to the fetus, see the [ACR-SPR Practice Parameter for Imaging Pregnant or Potentially Pregnant Patients with Ionizing Radiation](#) [5].

## III. QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

See the [ACR-ACNM-SNMMI-SPR Practice Parameter for the Use of Radiopharmaceuticals in Diagnostic Procedures](#) [1].

## IV. RADIOPHARMACEUTICALS

The direct (retrograde) technique (see Section VII.A.) employs technetium-99m (Tc-99m) sodium pertechnetate, Tc-99m sulfur colloid, or Tc-99m diethylenetriamine penta-acetic acid (DTPA). Tc-99m sodium pertechnetate should not be used in individuals who have undergone bladder augmentation with gastric or intestinal tissue. An administered activity of 7.4 to 37 MBq (0.2-1.0 mCi) is introduced aseptically into the urinary bladder via a urethral catheter. Administered activity in children should be as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) for diagnostic image quality. The North American Consensus Guidelines for Administered Radiopharmaceutical Activities in Children and Adolescents recommend no more than 37 MBq (1 mCi) for each cycle of filling in pediatric patients. No weight-based administered activity has been defined for RNC [6].

The indirect (antegrade) technique (see Section VII.B.) may employ Tc-99m mercaptoacetyltriglycine (MAG-3) or Tc-99m DTPA.

## V. SPECIFICATIONS OF THE EXAMINATION

The written or electronic request for radionuclide cystography should provide sufficient information to demonstrate the medical necessity of the examination and allow for its proper performance and interpretation.

Documentation that satisfies medical necessity includes 1) signs and symptoms and/or 2) relevant history (including known diagnoses). Additional information regarding the specific reason for the examination or a provisional diagnosis would be helpful and may at times be needed to allow for the proper performance and interpretation of the examination.

The request for the examination must be originated by a physician or other appropriately licensed health care provider. The accompanying clinical information should be provided by a physician or other appropriately licensed health care provider familiar with the patient's clinical problem or question and consistent with the state scope of practice requirements. (ACR Resolution 35 adopted in 2006 – revised in 2016, Resolution 12-b)

### A. Retrograde (Direct) Technique

#### 1. Patient preparation/catheterization

In patients with male anatomy, application of urethral anesthesia (eg, lidocaine jelly) before catheterization may decrease discomfort [7]. If direct measurement of the postvoid residual bladder volume is needed, adults and toilet-trained pediatric patients should be asked to void immediately before catheterization. Urine collected during catheterization represents the residual bladder volume [4]. Latex materials should be avoided and should not be used in patients with a known latex allergy or who are at high risk for latex allergy (eg, older patients with multiple surgical procedures of the spine or genitourinary tract). Sedation should be avoided because it precludes obtaining the voiding phase of the examination. Bladder catheterization should be performed by an individual trained in the procedure using aseptic technique and, if clinically desired, a urine specimen for analysis or culture can be obtained at this time.

#### 2. Radiopharmaceutical infusion

The radiopharmaceutical is administered aseptically into the bladder through the urethral catheter and then sterile normal saline is infused until the bladder reaches its estimated capacity with the patient either lying supine or in the sitting or semirecumbent position. Bladder capacity (in mL) in children can be approximated with a reference table [8] or calculated as follows [9]:

$$\begin{aligned} < 1 \text{ year of age: weight in kg} \times 7 \\ > 1 \text{ year of age: (age + 2)} \times 30 \end{aligned}$$

During infusion, the saline container typically is placed no more than 100 cm above the tabletop. Warming the saline solution to room or body temperature and infusing at a slow rate may improve the patient's comfort. Alternatively, in adults, the radiopharmaceutical may be added to 500 mL of sterile normal saline for infusion. Patients with a neuropathic bladder might require more than 500 mL.

A cyclic (more than one filling and voiding) examination may increase sensitivity for both children and adults [10] and can be considered in patients with a high pretest probability of having reflux. Repeat filling and voiding cycles are obtained with the catheter remaining in place for all cycles.

#### 3. Image acquisition

In all patients during filling, the pelvis and abdomen are imaged continuously in the posterior projection, with the patient lying supine. During voiding, images are obtained continuously, either in the seated upright position in adults and toilet-trained children who are able to sit on the bedpan or in the supine position in patients who are unable to sit. A low-energy collimator should be used.

If reflux occurs during filling of the bladder, the volume at which reflux occurred should be recorded. The end of the filling phase usually is indicated by a reduction or cessation of the infusate's rate of flow or by achieving maximum bladder capacity [4].

When the bladder fills to maximum capacity, the patient should be instructed to void with continuous image acquisition until the bladder is empty. Postvoid posterior images of the bladder should be obtained in either the supine or upright position after bladder emptying is complete. If the patient cannot void upon request or if the patient voids incompletely, the bladder should be emptied via the urinary catheter.

#### 4. Processing

For visual analysis of digital images, a consistent image display technique capable of contrast enhancement and cine mode should be used to maximize the sensitivity of the test. Quantification of reflux during the bladder-filling phase and during the voiding phase may be achieved using region-of-interest (ROI) analysis, with ROI placed over the kidneys and the ureters.

For quantification of postvoid residual volumes, prevoid and postvoid images of the bladder should be acquired anteriorly or posteriorly. ROIs are drawn over the bladder on both the pre- and postvoid images. The volume of voided urine is recorded. Residual volume (RV) can be estimated by the following formulas:

$$RV \text{ (mL)} = \frac{(\text{voided vol [mL]} \times (\text{postvoid bladder ROI count}))}{(\text{prevoid bladder ROI count}) - (\text{postvoid bladder ROI count})}$$

RV may be calculated if the volume to which the bladder was filled is known. The equation then becomes:

$$RV \text{ (mL)} = \frac{(\text{prevoid bladder vol [mL]} \times (\text{postvoid bladder ROI count}))}{\text{prevoid bladder ROI count}}$$

#### 5. Interpretation

The degree of reflux is estimated using a visual grading scale with RNC grades 1 to 3 as below [4,11-13]:

<b>RNC Grades</b>	<b>Finding</b>	<b>Analogous Radiographic Grades</b>
1 (Mild)	Activity limited to ureter	I
2 (Moderate)	Activity reaching the renal collecting system	II and III
3 (Severe)	Activity in dilated renal collecting system and ureter	IV and V

Careful review of available previous radiographic, ultrasound, and radionuclide examinations will add to the accuracy of interpretation of the current examination.

The presence of incomplete drainage of refluxed radiotracer, particularly from a dilated renal pelvis, after complete voiding and/or drainage of the bladder should be noted because it could be indicative of coincident ureteropelvic junction obstruction.

#### 6. Instructions to patient/parent

The radiation exposure to the bladder is low and well within accepted diagnostic imaging levels. It can be further reduced by complete drainage of any unvoided activity and by encouraging hydration and voiding after the examination. Instruction to drink fluids by mouth for several hours with frequent voiding following the examination should be given to the patient, parent, or caregiver.

## B. Indirect (Antegrade) Technique

This test usually is performed as the final part of a dynamic renal scan. No additional radiotracer is administered beyond what was already administered for renal scintigraphy (see the [ACR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Renal Scintigraphy](#) [14]), which can be combined with this technique.

The advantages of the indirect technique are that it is noninvasive (ie, does not require catheterization) and it provides information about renal function. A disadvantage of the indirect technique is a lower sensitivity than direct RNC because a) the bladder may only partially fill, b) reflux can be detected only during the voiding phase, and c) it may be difficult to differentiate between reflux and residual antegrade excretion [15-17]. Use of ROIs over the collecting systems and time-activity curves may enhance the sensitivity of indirect RNC for detecting vesicoureteral reflux. Indirect cystography should not be used if the patient has not been toilet trained or has impaired renal function [12,15-17].

## VI. DOCUMENTATION

Reporting should be in accordance with the [ACR Practice Parameter for Communication of Diagnostic Imaging Findings](#) [18].

The report should include the radiopharmaceutical used, the administered activity, and route of administration as well as any other pharmaceuticals administered, including their dose and route of administration.

## VII. EQUIPMENT SPECIFICATIONS

Equipment performance monitoring should be in accordance with the [ACR–AAPM Technical Standard for Nuclear Medical Physics Performance Monitoring of Gamma Cameras](#) [19].

A gamma camera with a low-energy all-purpose/general all-purpose (LEAP/GAP) or high-resolution collimator (LEHR) may be desirable. If the clinical question relates to vesicoureteral reflux, the field of view (FOV) must be large enough to include both the bladder and kidneys. For infants and small children, magnification may be used if a large FOV camera head (400 mm) is employed.

A  $64 \times 64$  acquisition matrix is sufficient for detectors up to 400 mm in diameter. For larger detectors, a  $128 \times 128$  matrix is needed. A framing rate of 10 to 30 seconds per frame is suggested during the filling phase of the study and no more than 5 seconds per frame during micturition. The collimator face and the entire imaging field must be protected from radiopharmaceutical contamination using plastic-backed absorbent pads or other similar material. Plans for collection, disposal, storage, or decontamination of radioactive urine and materials must be considered.

## VIII. RADIATION SAFETY

Radiologists, medical physicists, non-physician radiology providers, radiologic technologists, and all supervising physicians have a responsibility for safety in the workplace by keeping radiation exposure to staff, and to society as a whole, "as low as reasonably achievable" (ALARA) and to assure that radiation doses to individual patients are appropriate, taking into account the possible risk from radiation exposure and the diagnostic image quality necessary to achieve the clinical objective. All personnel who work with ionizing radiation must understand the key principles of occupational and public radiation protection (justification, optimization of protection, application of dose constraints and limits) and the principles of proper management of radiation dose to patients (justification, optimization including the use of dose reference levels). [https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/PUB1775\\_web.pdf](https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Publications/PDF/PUB1775_web.pdf)

Facilities and their responsible staff should consult with the radiation safety officer to ensure that there are policies and procedures for the safe handling and administration of radiopharmaceuticals in accordance with ALARA principles. These policies and procedures must comply with all applicable radiation safety regulations and conditions of licensure imposed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and by applicable state, local,

or other relevant regulatory agencies and accrediting bodies, as appropriate. Quantities of radiopharmaceuticals should be tailored to the individual patient by prescription or protocol, using body habitus or other customized method when such guidance is available.

Nationally developed guidelines, such as the [ACR's Appropriateness Criteria®](#), should be used to help choose the most appropriate imaging procedures to prevent unnecessary radiation exposure.

Additional information regarding patient radiation safety in imaging is available from the following websites – Image Gently® for children ([www.imagegently.org](http://www.imagegently.org)) and Image Wisely® for adults ([www.imagewisely.org](http://www.imagewisely.org)). These advocacy and awareness campaigns provide free educational materials for all stakeholders involved in imaging (patients, technologists, referring providers, medical physicists, and radiologists).

Radiation exposures or other dose indices should be periodically measured by a Qualified Medical Physicist in accordance with the applicable ACR Technical Standards. Monitoring or regular review of dose indices from patient imaging should be performed by comparing the facility's dose information with national benchmarks, such as the ACR Dose Index Registry and relevant publications relying on its data, applicable ACR Practice Parameters, NCRP Report No. 172, Reference Levels and Achievable Doses in Medical and Dental Imaging: Recommendations for the United States or the Conference of Radiation Control Program Director's National Evaluation of X-ray Trends; 2006, 2009, amended 2013, revised 2023 (Res. 2d).

## **IX. 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 *ACR Position Statement on Quality Control and 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>).

## **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 and Technical Standards – Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging of the ACR Commission on Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging and the Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology of the ACR Commission on Pediatric Radiology in collaboration with the ACNM, the SNMMI, and the SPR.

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

### ACR

Andrew T. Trout, MD, Chair  
Adina L. Alazraki, MD  
Susan E. Sharp, MD

### ACNM

Lorraine E. De Blanche, MD  
Bital Savir-Baruch, MD

### SNMMI

Frederick D. Grant, MD  
Massoud Majd, MD, FACR  
Helen R. Nadel, MD

### SPR

Deepa R. Biyyam, MBBS  
Maria R. Ponisio, MD  
S. Ted Treves, MD, FSNMMI

Committee on Practice Parameters and Technical Standards – Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging  
(ACR Committee responsible for sponsoring the draft through the process)

Kevin P. Banks, MD, Co-Chair	Andrew Kaiser, MD
Richard K. J. Brown, MD, FACR, Co-Chair	Jeffrey S. Kempf, MD, FACR
Munir V. Ghesani, MD, FACR, Co-Chair Vice Chair	Jennifer J. Kwak, MD
Rathan M. Subramaniam, MD, PhD, MPH, Co-Chair Vice Chair	Justin G. Peacock, MD
Easma A. Akin, MD, FACR	Syam P. Reddy, MD
Alexandru C. Bageac, MD, MBA	Eric M. Rohren, MD, PhD
Twyla B. Bartel, DO, MBA	Levi Sokol, MD
Elizabeth H. Dibble, MD	Andrew T. Trout, MD
K. Elizabeth Hawk, MD, MS, PhD	Stephanie P. Yen, MD
Eric Hu, MD	

Committee on Practice Parameters – Pediatric Radiology  
(ACR Committee responsible for sponsoring the draft through the process)

Beverley Newman, MB, BCh, BSc, FACR, Chair	Jason Higgins, DO
Terry L. Levin, MD, FACR, Vice Chair	Jane Sun Kim, MD
John B. Amodio, MD, FACR	Jessica Kurian, MD
Tara M. Catanzano, MB, BCh	Matthew P. Lungren, MD, MPH
Harris L. Cohen, MD, FACR	Helen R. Nadel, MD
Kassa Darge, MD, PhD	Erica Poletto, MD
Dorothy L. Gilbertson-Dahdal, MD	Richard B. Towbin, MD, FACR
Lauren P. Golding, MD	Andrew T. Trout, MD
Safwan S. Halabi, MD	Esben S. Vogelius, MD

Don C. Yoo, MD, FACR, Chair of the Commission Nuclear Medicine and Nuclear Medicine  
Richard A. Barth, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Pediatric Radiology  
Jacqueline Anne Bello, MD, FACR, Chair, Commission on Quality and Safety  
Mary S. Newell, MD, FACR, Chair, Committee on Practice Parameters and Technical Standards

Comments Reconciliation Committee

Madelene Lewis, MD, Chair	Amy L. Kotsenas, MD, FACR
Adam Specht, MD, FACR, Co-Chair	Paul A. Larson, MD, FACR
Adina L. Alazraki, MD	Terry L. Levin, MD, FACR
Helena R. Balon, MD	Massoud Majd, MD
Kevin P. Banks, MD	Helen R. Nadel, MD
Twyla B. Bartel, DO, MBA	Mary S. Newell, MD, FACR
Richard A. Barth, MD, FACR	Beverley Newman, MB, BCh, BSc, FACR
Jacqueline Anne Bello, MD, FACR	Maria R. Ponisio, MD
Deepa R. Biyyam, MBBS	Bital Savir-Baruch, MD
David Brandon, MD	Susan E. Sharp, MD
Richard K.J. Brown, MD, FACR	Rathan M. Subramaniam, MD, PhD, MPH
Lorraine E. De Blanche, MD, FACNM	S. Ted Treves, MD, FSNMMI
Richard Duszak Jr., MD, FACR	Andrew T. Trout, MD
Munir V. Ghesani, MD, FACR	Carl Wesolowski, MD
Frederick D. Grant, MD	Don C. Yoo, MD, FACR
Jane Sun Kim, MD	

## REFERENCES

1. American College of Radiology. ACR-ACNM-SNMMI-SPR Practice Parameter for the Use of Radiopharmaceuticals in Diagnostic Procedures Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Radiopharmaceuticals.pdf?la=en>. Accessed February 1, 2023.
2. Canivet E, Wampach H, Brandt B, et al. Assessment of radioisotopic micturating cystography for the diagnosis of vesicoureteric reflux in renal transplant recipients with acute pyelonephritis. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 1997;12:67-70.
3. Gelfand MJ, Koch BL, Elgazzar AH, Gylys-Morin VM, Gartside PS, Torgerson CL. Cyclic cystography: diagnostic yield in selected pediatric populations. *Radiology* 1999;213:118-20.
4. Treves ST, Grant FD. Vesicoureteral reflux and radionuclide cystography. In: Treves ST, Fahey FH, Grant FD, eds. *Pediatric Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging*. 4th ed. New York, NY: Springer; 2014:335-54.
5. American College of Radiology. ACR-SPR Practice Parameter for Imaging Pregnant or Potentially Pregnant Patients with Ionizing Radiation. Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Pregnant-Pts.pdf?la=en>. Accessed February 1, 2019.
6. Treves ST, Gelfand MJ, Fahey FH, Parisi MT. 2016 Update of the North American Consensus Guidelines for Pediatric Administered Radiopharmaceutical Activities. *J Nucl Med* 2016;57:15N-18N.
7. Gerard LL, Cooper CS, Duethman KS, Gordley BM, Kleiber CM. Effectiveness of lidocaine lubricant for discomfort during pediatric urethral catheterization. *J Urol* 2003;170:564-7.
8. Treves ST, Zurakowski D, Bauer SB, Mitchell KD, Nichols DP. Functional bladder capacity measured during radionuclide cystography in children. *Radiology* 1996;198:269-72.
9. Fairhurst JJ, Rubin CM, Hyde I, Freeman NV, Williams JD. Bladder capacity in infants. *J Pediatr Surg* 1991;26:55-7.
10. Joaquim AI, de Godoy MF, Burdmann EA. Cyclic Direct Radionuclide Cystography in the Diagnosis and Characterization of Vesicoureteral Reflux in Children and Adults. *Clin Nucl Med* 2015;40:627-31.
11. Gelfand MJ, Strife JL, Hertzberg VS. Low-grade vesicoureteral reflux. Variability in grade on sequential radiographic and nuclear cystograms. *Clin Nucl Med* 1991;16:243-6.
12. Jana S, Blafox MD. Nuclear medicine studies of the prostate, testes, and bladder. *Semin Nucl Med* 2006;36:51-72.
13. Zhang G, Day DL, Loken M, Gonzalez R. Grading of reflux by radionuclide cystography. *Clin Nucl Med* 1987;12:106-9.
14. American College of Radiology. ACR-SPR practice parameter for the performance of renal scintigraphy. Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/RenalScint.pdf?la=en>. Accessed February 1, 2019.
15. Conway JJ, Kruglik GD. Effectiveness of direct and indirect radionuclide cystography in detecting vesicoureteral reflux. *J Nucl Med* 1976;17:81-3.
16. De Sadeleer C, De Boe V, Keuppens F, Desprechins B, Verboven M, Piepsz A. How good is technetium-99m mercaptoacetyl triglycine indirect cystography? *Eur J Nucl Med* 1994;21:223-7.
17. Piepsz A, Ham HR. Pediatric applications of renal nuclear medicine. *Semin Nucl Med* 2006;36:16-35.
18. American College of Radiology. ACR practice parameter for communication of diagnostic imaging findings. Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/CommunicationDiag.pdf?la=en>. Accessed February 1, 2019.
19. American College of Radiology. ACR-AAPM technical standard for nuclear medical physics performance monitoring of gamma cameras. Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/Gamma-Cam.pdf?la=en>. Accessed February 1, 2019.

---

\*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

1996 (Resolution 12)

Revised 2000 (Resolution 26)

Revised 2005 (Resolution 24)

Amended 2006 (Resolution 17, 35)

Revised 2010 (Resolution 25)

Amended 2012 (Resolution 8 – title)

Amended 2014 (Resolution 39)

Revised 2015 (Resolution 47)

Revised 2020 (Resolution 15)  
Amended 2023 (Resolution 2c, 2d)