

**American College of Radiology
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®**

Clinical Condition: Non-invasive Clinical Staging of Bronchogenic Carcinoma

Variant 1: Non-small-cell lung carcinoma.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CT chest without IV contrast	9	Through adrenal glands.	☼ ☼ ☼
CT chest with IV contrast	9	Through adrenal glands. See text. There are pros and cons to the use of IV contrast. There is no strong scientific evidence to support the use of IV contrast.	☼ ☼ ☼
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	9	If a diagnostic chest CT has not yet been performed, obtain FDG-PET skull base to mid-thigh and CT chest with or without contrast. Can omit for staging pure ground glass neoplasms.	☼ ☼ ☼ ☼
MRI head without and with IV contrast	7	If neurological symptoms are present or asymptomatic with adenocarcinoma histology greater than 3 cm in size or mediastinal adenopathy.	O
MRI head without IV contrast	5	If gadolinium contraindicated.	O
X-ray chest	5	May be useful as a baseline comparison to help detect complications of therapy and other non-tumor related disease in follow-up.	☼
CT abdomen with IV contrast	5		☼ ☼ ☼
CT head with IV contrast	5	If MRI is contraindicated and neurological symptoms are present.	☼ ☼ ☼
Tc-99m bone scan whole body	5	Not necessary if PET has been done.	☼ ☼ ☼
CT head without IV contrast	3		☼ ☼ ☼
MRI chest without and with IV contrast	3	Useful for evaluating chest wall invasion, cardiac invasion, and for local staging of superior sulcus tumors.	O
MRI chest without IV contrast	2	Useful for evaluating chest wall invasion, cardiac invasion, and for local staging of superior sulcus tumors. If gadolinium contraindicated.	O
CT abdomen without IV contrast	1		☼ ☼ ☼
CT abdomen without and with IV contrast	1		☼ ☼ ☼ ☼
CT head without and with IV contrast	1		☼ ☼ ☼
CT chest without and with IV contrast	1	Through adrenal glands.	☼ ☼ ☼
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Clinical Condition: Non-invasive Clinical Staging of Bronchogenic Carcinoma

Variant 2: Small-cell lung carcinoma.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CT chest and abdomen with IV contrast	9		☼☼☼☼
MRI head without and with IV contrast	9		O
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	8	If a diagnostic chest CT has not yet been performed, obtain FDG-PET skull base to mid-thigh and CT chest with contrast.	☼☼☼☼
CT chest and abdomen without IV contrast	5	Use this procedure if contraindication to contrast. Also, consider MRI of abdomen instead of unenhanced CT of abdomen.	☼☼☼☼
MRI head without IV contrast	5	If gadolinium contraindicated.	O
X-ray chest	5	May be useful as a baseline comparison to help detect complications of therapy and other non-tumor related disease in follow-up.	☼
CT head with IV contrast	5	If MRI contraindicated and neurological symptoms are present.	☼☼☼
Tc-99m bone scan whole body	5	Not necessary if FDG-PET/CT has been performed.	☼☼☼
CT head without IV contrast	2		☼☼☼
MRI chest without and with IV contrast	2		O
MRI chest without IV contrast	2		O
CT head without and with IV contrast	1		☼☼☼
CT chest and abdomen without and with IV contrast	1		☼☼☼☼
Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

NON-INVASIVE CLINICAL STAGING OF BRONCHOGENIC CARCINOMA

Expert Panels on Thoracic Imaging and Radiation Oncology–Lung: James G. Ravenel, MD¹; Tan-Lucien H. Mohammed, MD²; Kenneth E. Rosenzweig, MD³; Mark E. Ginsburg, MD⁴; Jeffrey P. Kanne, MD⁵; Larry L. Kestin, MD⁶; Jacobo Kirsch, MD⁷; J. Anthony Parker, MD, PhD⁸; Andreas Rimner, MD⁹; Anthony G. Saleh, MD.¹⁰

Summary of Literature Review

Non–Small-Cell Lung Carcinoma

Staging

Staging of any tumor is done to determine the extent of disease. Staging information is important for two reasons: to determine prognosis and to select patients for surgical intervention and/or a different modality. The TNM staging system is widely used to classify lung tumors. In 2007 it was revised after epidemiologic evidence demonstrated differences in survival of several tumor features that warranted reclassification [1]. In the TNM classification, “T” indicates the features of the primary tumor, “N” indicates metastasis to regional lymph nodes, and “M” refers to the presence or absence of distant metastases. The most recent revision was performed by the International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer (IASLC).

The current IASLC 7th edition classification consist of four stages [1]. Stage I has been divided into two groups: IA and IB. Data have consistently shown a better outcome for patients with stage IA disease — that is, T1N0M0 — than for any other subset. Median survival time is 59 months for stage 1A compared with 48 months for stage 1B. Stage IB is defined as patients with T2a tumors. Stage II is also subdivided into A and B groups. Median survival time for patients with stage IIA disease — that is, T1 or T2a lesions with involved hilar nodes or T2b lesions without hilar nodes — is higher than for those with stage IIB disease (T2bN1M0 or T3N0M0).

Stage III is divided into IIIA and IIIB, where IIIB is considered unresectable disease, (ie, T4 and/or N3). In the current classification, tumors >7 cm or with invasion of the chest wall (T3) are considered to be potentially resectable in the absence of mediastinal adenopathy and provided that vital structures in the mediastinum, such as the great vessels, heart, and aerodigestive tract, are not involved. Satellite nodules in the same lobe are now considered T3 as well. The designation T4 is reserved for lesions with extensive invasion of a vertebral body, trachea, esophagus, heart, or great vessels, as well as tumors with satellite tumor nodule(s) within the ipsilateral nonprimary-tumor lobe of the lung. In the current system, patients with ipsilateral mediastinal and subcarinal nodal metastasis (N2) are also considered to have resectable cancer, although a benefit of surgery over definitive chemoradiotherapy has been difficult to prove [2]. For the most part, only patients with single-station ipsilateral mediastinal nodal disease fall into the potentially operable category. The N3 category refers to metastasis in the contralateral mediastinal, hilar, scalene, or supraclavicular lymph nodes. N3 disease is considered to be unresectable. While T4 tumors are generally said to be unresectable, selected T4N0M0 tumors may be considered for operation when there is limited involvement of a vertebral body, mediastinal fat, superior vena cava, or left atrium. In the current classification, stage IV includes patients with evidence of distant metastasis (M1), malignant nodules in the contralateral lung, pleural nodules, and malignant pleural or pericardial effusion.

A number of imaging modalities have been used in staging lung cancer. These have included standard and conventional tomography as well as computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and fluorine-18-2-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose positron emission tomography (FDG-PET). In all cases histologic confirmation of the tumor is mandatory, and in most cases the histologic proof should be confirmed for the lesion that established the highest stage of disease (an exception would be clear-cut evidence of multiple sites of metastatic disease). Any potential solitary metastatic lesion must be confirmed histologically prior to deeming a patient unresectable.

¹Principal Author, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, South Carolina. ²Panel Chair (Thoracic Imaging), Virginia Mason Medical Center, Seattle, Washington. ³Panel Chair (Radiation Oncology-Lung), Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, New York. ⁴Columbia University, New York, New York, Society of Thoracic Surgeons. ⁵University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, Wisconsin. ⁶21st Century Oncology/Michigan Healthcare Professionals, Farmington Hills, Michigan. ⁷Panel Vice-Chair (Thoracic Imaging), Cleveland Clinic, Weston, Florida. ⁸Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts, Society of Nuclear Medicine. ⁹Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, New York, New York. ¹⁰New York Methodist Hospital, Brooklyn, New York, American College of Chest Physicians.

The American College of Radiology seeks and encourages collaboration with other organizations on the development of the ACR Appropriateness Criteria through society representation on expert panels. Participation by representatives from collaborating societies on the expert panel does not necessarily imply society endorsement of the final document.

Reprint requests to: publications@acr.org

Chest Radiographs

The vast majority of primary lung cancers are initially detected on routine chest radiographs; however, there is little need for the chest radiograph when a tumor has been detected incidentally on CT examination performed for other purposes.

Computed Tomography

CT is the major imaging modality of choice in the initial evaluation of patients with suspected bronchogenic carcinoma. Numerous studies have shown that its value in staging is limited, because there are no morphologic criteria that would allow distinction between benign and malignant lymph nodes, but it does provide the anatomic basis to determine the most appropriate steps for diagnosis and management.

Traditionally, chest CT for staging of lung cancer is extended into the abdomen to include the adrenal glands. Whether this requires intravenous contrast material is debatable and has not been definitively addressed. For some the addition of contrast improves evaluation of the mediastinum. While it would appear advantageous to have contrast enhancement of the liver, it is rarely the sole site of disease at diagnosis and often visible with liver windows. At the same time unenhanced CT has the advantage of definitively characterizing incidental adrenal nodules. Much of this debate has been rendered moot by the use of FDG-PET/CT, and thus the use of intravenous contrast should be based on patient factors and the discretion of the interpreting radiologist.

Evaluation of Primary Tumor (the T Factor)

Computed Tomography

The distinction between T1 and T2 lesions is generally based on size and rarely impacts the choice of therapy. Imaging cannot reliably determine the presence of visceral pleural invasion for peripheral tumors. Confirming T3 or T4 status based on imaging alone, however, can be quite difficult. Features such as discrete bone destruction, rib erosion, or tumor adjacent to a mediastinal structure without associated fat plane are diagnostic of chest wall or mediastinal invasion. CT features of chest wall invasion include: >3 cm of contact with the pleural surface, pleural thickening, absent fat planes, and obtuse angle of tumor with the chest wall [3].

The specificity of any of these signs is relatively poor, as pleural reaction and inflammation may mimic neoplastic involvement, and localized chest pain remains a much more specific determinant of invasion [3-5]. Using thin collimation with coronal and sagittal reformation improves accuracy for both chest wall and mediastinal invasion [6]. In the absence of definitive signs of invasion, surgery may be necessary to confirm or exclude direct invasion.

Magnetic Resonance Imaging

MRI can aid in problem solving and is superior to CT for detecting involvement of the neural foramina, spinal canal, and brachial plexus in superior sulcus tumors. Surgery is contraindicated by local extension if the brachial plexus is involved above the level of T1, if more than 50% of a vertebral body is invaded, or if there is invasion of the trachea or esophagus. Invasion of the subclavian, common carotid and vertebral arteries, less than 50% vertebral body invasion, and extension into the neural foramina should be considered relative contraindications to surgery [7]. MRI can be useful in excluding chest wall involvement. When using cine MRI during free breathing, a finding of sliding between the tumor and mediastinum or chest wall has been shown to be diagnostic of lack of invasion. The converse, however, is not necessarily indicative of invasion, as adhesion and local inflammatory changes may also restrict tumor motion [8-10].

Evaluation of Nodal Metastasis (the N Factor)

Computed Tomography

Because size is the main criteria for malignancy, CT is a rather inaccurate modality for staging the mediastinum. A lymph node >1 cm in short-axis diameter is generally considered “positive” [11]. While there is no lower threshold that guarantees freedom from disease, the overall chance that a node harbors malignancy is influenced by size. For example, the prevalence of metastatic disease in lymph nodes is approximately 30% for nodes 10-15 mm in diameter and 67% for nodes >15 mm in diameter [12]. Among 43 studies conducted from 1991-2005, the sensitivities of CT for nodal disease ranged from 26%–86% and specificity ranged from 31%–97%, and a pooled sensitivity and specificity from a total of 5,111 patients in whom the prevalence of nodal disease was 28% were 51% and 86%, respectively [13]. CT does, however, provide anatomic relationships critical for interpreting FDG-PET studies and allows for selection of the most appropriate pathway for biopsy.

The location of the primary tumor has a strong and relatively predictable influence on the likely location of metastatic nodes. Right upper lobe tumors most often drain to right paratracheal nodes (2R and 4R), while right,

middle and lower lobe tumors most frequently drain to lower right paratracheal and subcarinal nodes (4R and 7R). On the left the common sites for nodal metastases for the left upper lobe include AP window and prevascular nodes (5L and 6L) and prevascular and subcarinal (6L and 7L) for the left lower lobe [14]. For lower lobe tumors the frequency of upper mediastinal lymph node involvement (levels 2, 4, 5, and 6) is greater for tumors in the superior segment (64%) versus basal segments (36%) [15].

The preoperative detection of N2 disease generally renders a patient unsuitable for primary surgery treatment. Depending on the extent of N2 disease and other factors, patients may receive either neoadjuvant therapy in an attempt to clear the mediastinal disease prior to surgery or primary chemotherapy and radiation therapy with curative intent. The choice should be guided by histologic confirmation and an enlarged mediastinal lymph node alone by CT is insufficient to make a patient inoperable. While FDG-PET/CT is becoming the mainstay of preoperative staging (see below), if it is not performed and a negative CT alone is used, up to 30% of patients will eventually be shown to have positive mediastinal lymph nodes [16,17].

Magnetic Resonance Imaging

MRI is not typically used for mediastinal staging, although abnormal lymph nodes can be detected using this technique. A lack of standardization of protocols, however, makes comparison of results difficult.

Most protocols use a short-tau inversion recovery (STIR) sequence, and with it MRI may approach the accuracy of FDG-PET/CT for detecting nodal metastases [18]. In another study, quantitative analysis of STIR images using a lymph node saline ratio was found to be more sensitive and specific compared to PET/CT [19]. Studies using diffusion weighted sequences have mixed results [20,21]. Overall, the number of studies and subjects is too small to determine if MRI has any relevant role in mediastinal staging.

Positron Emission Tomography/Computed Tomography

Integrated FDG-PET/CT imaging outperforms CT alone, FDG-PET alone, conventional visual correlation, or superimposition of CT and FDG-PET acquired individually [22-25]. Pooling all FDG-PET studies (many without the CT component) resulted in a sensitivity of 74% and a specificity of 85% in 2,865 patients with a prevalence of mediastinal disease of 29% [13]. In particular, specificity may be further degraded in areas endemic for granulomatous disease [26]. Even when the results of CT and FDG-PET are negative, the false negative rate in the mediastinum ranges from 8%–16% [27,28]. Much of the reason for the large variance in studies is due to the lack of a reproducible cut-off for benign and malignant nodes across studies. Sensitivity is often enhanced when qualitative evaluation is used, whereas it tends to suffer when quantitative measures are used.

For lung neoplasms presenting as a pure ground glass nodule, there does not appear to be added benefit to adding FDG-PET/CT to the staging evaluation. For part-solid nodules the value of FDG-PET/CT is generally related to the size of the solid core and is suggested for part-solid nodules ≥ 8 mm [29]. In a recent study of part solid nodules with $>50\%$ ground glass component, there were no true positive mediastinal nodes or distant disease detected by FDG-PET/CT [30]. Further research is needed to determine whether the indication for FDG-PET/CT staging should be based on percentage of ground glass or absolute diameter of the solid core.

While FDG-PET is not an endpoint in the staging workup, FDG-PET scans can decrease the number of futile thoracotomies by 20% [31-33]. The PLUS study [33] randomized stage I-III patients who were potentially operable to FDG-PET or no PET and showed a reduction in the “futile” thoracotomy rate (thoracotomy performed in patients with unresectable disease) by 20% (41% without FDG-PET vs 21% with FDG-PET). This was confirmed in the randomized controlled trial by Fischer et al where the addition of FDG-PET/CT to conventional staging reduced the rate of futile thoracotomies by 17% (52% without FDG-PET/CT compared to 35% with FDG-PET/CT) [31]. However, for clinical 1A patients, the yield of FDG-PET in preventing nontherapeutic pulmonary resection appears to be $<10\%$ [34]. Thus, the ultimate success of FDG-PET in the mediastinum may be to spare advanced-stage patients extensive surgery.

It is clear that FDG-PET must be interpreted in the context of CT findings to maximize utility. The value of FDG-PET in staging the mediastinum depends on the CT findings [35,36]. If the CT scan was positive by CT criteria, sensitivity increased to 100% and specificity decreased to 78%. In the setting of a negative CT scan, FDG-PET showed 82% sensitivity and 93% specificity [35]. Modeling for size in combination with FDG-PET, the likelihood of malignancy in an FDG-PET negative node is 5% when the nodule is 10-15 mm in diameter and 21% when it is >15 mm in diameter. Conversely, the likelihood of malignancy in an FDG-PET positive node is 62% when it is 10-15 mm in diameter and 90% when it is >15 mm in diameter [12]. Moreover, the use of FDG-PET

combined with CT can be critical in defining the most appropriate site for hilar and mediastinal lymph node biopsy.

For the FDG-PET negative mediastinum, there appear to be several caveats that can guide the decision about whether further mediastinal staging is necessary. A retrospective study of FDG-PET false negative results found that occult metastases were more likely to occur with increasing T-stage, central tumors, adenocarcinoma histology, and higher primary tumor standard uptake volume (SUV) (>6), although the actual number of false negative lymph nodes in this study was small (n=16) [37]. Other groups have found that in addition to these features, upper-lobe tumors and those with N1 positive disease also have a relatively high rate of occult disease in the mediastinum with histologic staging [38,39].

In summary, an FDG-PET negative mediastinum has an extremely high negative predictive value in small (T1a), peripheral tumors with a low primary tumor SUV and no significant activity in the hilar lymph nodes. Under these conditions it seems reasonable to proceed to surgery without prior pathological staging of the mediastinum.

Evaluation of Distant Metastasis (the M Factor)

Adrenal Glands

Adrenal nodules are a common incidental finding in the general population and in patients with lung cancer, but a density measurement of <10 Hounsfield units (HU) virtually assures the diagnosis of benign adenoma [40]. If the measurement is >10 HU or if the initial study was performed with intravenous contrast, several techniques may be used to potentially rule in benignity. These include evaluating CT washout criteria, CT histogram analysis, MRI with in-phase and out-of-phase imaging, and FDG-PET/CT [41,42]. While all these techniques can potentially rule in a benign lesion, their specificity is insufficient to rule in malignancy. Thus when the adrenal is the sole potential site of metastatic disease, biopsy is necessary to confirm its presence.

Liver

The liver is rarely the sole site of metastatic disease at time of diagnosis, occurring in approximately 3% of cases [43]. As most chest CT scans will cover the majority of the liver, dedicated hepatic imaging is generally not indicated. While FDG-PET has not been formally evaluated for imaging of liver metastasis related to lung cancer, experience in other malignancies suggests that it can accurately detect liver metastases by focal uptake greater than the background of the liver [44]. When findings are discordant or indeterminate, MRI and biopsy are appropriate strategies to evaluate liver lesions.

Bone

While bone scintigraphy is quite sensitive for detecting osseous metastases, the false positive rate approaches 40%. Since fewer than 5% of lung cancer patients have occult bone metastases at presentation [45], routine bone scintigraphy is probably not warranted. Several studies have shown FDG-PET to have a similar sensitivity and accuracy, with improved specificity and negative predictive value [46-48]. Thus, if whole-body FDG-PET has already been performed, bone scintigraphy should be considered unnecessary.

Central Nervous System

In the absence of neurological symptoms, cerebral metastases are unusual, and the routine staging of subjects with a normal clinical examination yields positive findings in less than 10% of patients [49-51]. Of the various histologic subtypes, adenocarcinoma and large-cell carcinoma are most frequently associated with asymptomatic cerebral metastases [52]. Cerebral imaging is therefore used more effectively in patients with neurologic symptoms or prior to resection of T2 tumors or planned resection of IIIA disease.

Small-Cell Lung Carcinoma

Small-cell lung carcinoma (SCLC) is an aggressive neoplasm of neuroendocrine cell origin with a distinct biologic behavior and is therefore grouped separately from other primary lung neoplasms. SCLC represents about 15%–25% of all lung cancers and tends to occur in patients younger than those with the other lung cancers. SCLC mostly originates in the submucosa of proximal airways such as the lobar bronchi, or main bronchi while a small percentage (<5%) originate in the peripheral areas of the lung. The tumor itself is highly cellular and has a limited fibrotic or inflammatory response. Consequently, the tumor spreads rapidly through the lymphatics and blood vessels at an early stage, resulting in early nodal and distant metastatic deposits [53,54]. From a practical standpoint, SCLC may be thought of as a “systemic” disease at the time of diagnosis.

Historically, SCLC was stratified by a two-stage system as defined by the IASLC. The first stage included patients with the disease restricted to one hemithorax with regional lymph node metastases, including ipsilateral

hilar, ipsilateral and contralateral mediastinal, ipsilateral and contralateral supraclavicular, and ipsilateral pleural effusion independent of cytology [55]. The second stage comprised patients with more extensive disease. The practical effect of this was to divide patients into one of two treatment groups, chemotherapy and radiotherapy for limited disease and chemotherapy alone for extensive disease. Based on further analysis of resected small-cell carcinomas, the IASLC has found sufficient prognostic variability using the TNM system, to warrant replacing the previous staging system [56]. For surgically resected SCLC (n=349), there is a marked survival enhancement (>2 years) for both stage T1a and N0 cases compared with other surgically resected SCLCs [56]. Moreover, the 5-year survival rate for resected stage I tumors is 57%. The overall 5-year survival rate for all surgically resected “limited disease” is 34.5%, compared to the 12%–25% for traditional chemoradiotherapy [53].

CT is generally the first study performed in the evaluation of suspected SCLC on chest radiograph. The use of intravenous contrast may be helpful in evaluating the extent of disease and the relationship to mediastinal vascular structures. Although this will not necessarily change the staging, it may help determine the need for palliative radiation therapy in patients with distant metastatic disease. When metastatic disease is present, abdominal organs are involved in up to 60% of cases, with the adrenal gland and liver as the most frequent sites of disease [57,58]. Because of this high frequency, a dedicated CT of the abdomen with contrast should also be obtained as part of routine staging [59].

FDG-PET/CT is often helpful during the staging process. Its main value lies in its ability to upstage patients with extensive disease to stage II and thus spare them from unnecessary therapy. Studies have shown that FDG-PET/CT results in a stage shift of up to 17% of cases [60]. In prospective series this results in approximately 8% of subjects upstaged by the detection of metastatic disease when compared to traditional staging [61,62]. Additionally, detection of additional involved nodes may allow for the appropriate adjustment of the radiation therapy plan in up to 25% of cases [63,64].

Due to the high incidence of brain metastases, routine imaging of the central nervous system is warranted. Cerebral metastases have been said to be present in up to 10% of individuals at the time of diagnosis [65,66].

Bone is considered to be the most common site of metastatic disease overall (35% of cases), and therefore bone scintigraphy has generally been part of the initial staging evaluation [67]. Bone scintigraphy can be omitted from staging when FDG-PET/CT is performed.

Summary

- For non–small-cell lung cancer, minimum staging should include a CT scan of the thorax and FDG-PET.
- Imaging of the CNS should be performed in symptomatic and high risk cases of non–small-cell lung cancer.
- For small-cell lung cancer staging should consist of CT of the chest and abdomen, FDG-PET, and imaging of the CNS; preferably with MRI.
- Histologic confirmation of the highest radiologic stage is appropriate particularly for single site suspected nodal or extra-thoracic disease.

Relative Radiation Level Information

Potential adverse health effects associated with radiation exposure are an important factor to consider when selecting the appropriate imaging procedure. Because there is a wide range of radiation exposures associated with different diagnostic procedures, a relative radiation level (RRL) indication has been included for each imaging examination. The RRLs are based on effective dose, which is a radiation dose quantity that is used to estimate population total radiation risk associated with an imaging procedure. Patients in the pediatric age group are at inherently higher risk from exposure, both because of organ sensitivity and longer life expectancy (relevant to the long latency that appears to accompany radiation exposure). For these reasons, the RRL dose estimate ranges for pediatric examinations are lower as compared to those specified for adults (see Table below). Additional information regarding radiation dose assessment for imaging examinations can be found in the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® [Radiation Dose Assessment Introduction](#) document.

Relative Radiation Level Designations		
Relative Radiation Level*	Adult Effective Dose Estimate Range	Pediatric Effective Dose Estimate Range
○	0 mSv	0 mSv
⊛	<0.1 mSv	<0.03 mSv
⊛ ⊛	0.1-1 mSv	0.03-0.3 mSv
⊛ ⊛ ⊛	1-10 mSv	0.3-3 mSv
⊛ ⊛ ⊛ ⊛	10-30 mSv	3-10 mSv
⊛ ⊛ ⊛ ⊛ ⊛	30-100 mSv	10-30 mSv

*RRL assignments for some of the examinations cannot be made, because the actual patient doses in these procedures vary as a function of a number of factors (eg, region of the body exposed to ionizing radiation, the imaging guidance that is used). The RRLs for these examinations are designated as “Varies”.

Supporting Documents

For additional information on the Appropriateness Criteria methodology and other supporting documents go to www.acr.org/ac.

References

1. Groome PA, Bolejack V, Crowley JJ, et al. The IASLC Lung Cancer Staging Project: validation of the proposals for revision of the T, N, and M descriptors and consequent stage groupings in the forthcoming (seventh) edition of the TNM classification of malignant tumours. *J Thorac Oncol*. 2007;2(8):694-705.
2. Albain KS, Swann RS, Rusch VW, et al. Radiotherapy plus chemotherapy with or without surgical resection for stage III non-small-cell lung cancer: a phase III randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2009;374(9687):379-386.
3. Glazer HS, Duncan-Meyer J, Aronberg DJ, Moran JF, Levitt RG, Sagel SS. Pleural and chest wall invasion in bronchogenic carcinoma: CT evaluation. *Radiology*. 1985;157(1):191-194.
4. Pearlberg JL, Sandler MA, Beute GH, Lewis JW, Jr., Madrazo BL. Limitations of CT in evaluation of neoplasms involving chest wall. *J Comput Assist Tomogr*. 1987;11(2):290-293.
5. Pennes DR, Glazer GM, Wimbish KJ, Gross BH, Long RW, Orringer MB. Chest wall invasion by lung cancer: limitations of CT evaluation. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1985;144(3):507-511.
6. Higashino T, Ohno Y, Takenaka D, et al. Thin-section multiplanar reformats from multidetector-row CT data: utility for assessment of regional tumor extent in non-small cell lung cancer. *Eur J Radiol*. 2005;56(1):48-55.
7. Bruzzi JF, Komaki R, Walsh GL, et al. Imaging of non-small cell lung cancer of the superior sulcus: part 2: initial staging and assessment of resectability and therapeutic response. *Radiographics*. 2008;28(2):561-572.
8. Akata S, Kajiwara N, Park J, et al. Evaluation of chest wall invasion by lung cancer using respiratory dynamic MRI. *J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol*. 2008;52(1):36-39.
9. Sakai S, Murayama S, Murakami J, Hashiguchi N, Masuda K. Bronchogenic carcinoma invasion of the chest wall: evaluation with dynamic cine MRI during breathing. *J Comput Assist Tomogr*. 1997;21(4):595-600.
10. Seo JS, Kim YJ, Choi BW, Choe KO. Usefulness of magnetic resonance imaging for evaluation of cardiovascular invasion: evaluation of sliding motion between thoracic mass and adjacent structures on cine MR images. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2005;22(2):234-241.
11. Glazer GM, Gross BH, Quint LE, Francis IR, Bookstein FL, Orringer MB. Normal mediastinal lymph nodes: number and size according to American Thoracic Society mapping. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1985;144(2):261-265.
12. de Langen AJ, Raijmakers P, Riphagen I, Paul MA, Hoekstra OS. The size of mediastinal lymph nodes and its relation with metastatic involvement: a meta-analysis. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg*. 2006;29(1):26-29.
13. Silvestri GA, Gould MK, Margolis ML, et al. Noninvasive staging of non-small cell lung cancer: ACCP evidenced-based clinical practice guidelines (2nd edition). *Chest*. 2007;132(3 Suppl):178S-201S.
14. Cerfolio RJ, Bryant AS. Distribution and likelihood of lymph node metastasis based on the lobar location of nonsmall-cell lung cancer. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2006;81(6):1969-1973; discussion 1973.

15. Watanabe S, Suzuki K, Asamura H. Superior and basal segment lung cancers in the lower lobe have different lymph node metastatic pathways and prognosis. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2008;85(3):1026-1031.
16. Herth FJ, Ernst A, Eberhardt R, Vilman P, Dienemann H, Krasnik M. Endobronchial ultrasound-guided transbronchial needle aspiration of lymph nodes in the radiologically normal mediastinum. *Eur Respir J.* 2006;28(5):910-914.
17. Wallace MB, Ravenel J, Block MI, et al. Endoscopic ultrasound in lung cancer patients with a normal mediastinum on computed tomography. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2004;77(5):1763-1768.
18. Plathow C, Aschoff P, Lichy MP, et al. Positron emission tomography/computed tomography and whole-body magnetic resonance imaging in staging of advanced nonsmall cell lung cancer--initial results. *Invest Radiol.* 2008;43(5):290-297.
19. Ohno Y, Koyama H, Nogami M, et al. Whole-body MR imaging vs. FDG-PET: comparison of accuracy of M-stage diagnosis for lung cancer patients. *J Magn Reson Imaging.* 2007;26(3):498-509.
20. Pauls S, Schmidt SA, Juchems MS, et al. Diffusion-weighted MR imaging in comparison to integrated [(1)(8)F]-FDG PET/CT for N-staging in patients with lung cancer. *Eur J Radiol.* 2012;81(1):178-182.
21. Usuda K, Zhao XT, Sagawa M, et al. Diffusion-weighted imaging is superior to positron emission tomography in the detection and nodal assessment of lung cancers. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2011;91(6):1689-1695.
22. Antoch G, Stattaus J, Nemat AT, et al. Non-small cell lung cancer: dual-modality PET/CT in preoperative staging. *Radiology.* 2003;229(2):526-533.
23. Aquino SL, Asmuth JC, Alpert NM, Halpern EF, Fischman AJ. Improved radiologic staging of lung cancer with 2-[18F]-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose-positron emission tomography and computed tomography registration. *J Comput Assist Tomogr.* 2003;27(4):479-484.
24. Cerfolio RJ, Ojha B, Bryant AS, Raghuvver V, Mountz JM, Bartolucci AA. The accuracy of integrated PET-CT compared with dedicated PET alone for the staging of patients with nonsmall cell lung cancer. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2004;78(3):1017-1023; discussion 1017-1023.
25. Lardinois D, Weder W, Hany TF, et al. Staging of non-small-cell lung cancer with integrated positron-emission tomography and computed tomography. *N Engl J Med.* 2003;348(25):2500-2507.
26. Sit AK, Sihoe AD, Suen WS, Cheng LC. Positron-emission tomography for lung cancer in a tuberculosis-endemic region. *Asian Cardiovasc Thorac Ann.* 2010;18(1):33-38.
27. Al-Sarraf N, Aziz R, Gately K, et al. Pattern and predictors of occult mediastinal lymph node involvement in non-small cell lung cancer patients with negative mediastinal uptake on positron emission tomography. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2008;33(1):104-109.
28. Herth FJ, Eberhardt R, Krasnik M, Ernst A. Endobronchial ultrasound-guided transbronchial needle aspiration of lymph nodes in the radiologically and positron emission tomography-normal mediastinum in patients with lung cancer. *Chest.* 2008;133(4):887-891.
29. Naidich DP, Bankier AA, Macmahon H, et al. Recommendations for the Management of Subsolid Pulmonary Nodules Detected at CT: A Statement from the Fleischner Society. *Radiology.* 2013;266(1):304-317.
30. Kim TJ, Park CM, Goo JM, Lee KW. Is there a role for FDG PET in the management of lung cancer manifesting predominantly as ground-glass opacity? *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2012;198(1):83-88.
31. Fischer B, Lassen U, Mortensen J, et al. Preoperative staging of lung cancer with combined PET-CT. *N Engl J Med.* 2009;361(1):32-39.
32. Reed CE, Harpole DH, Posther KE, et al. Results of the American College of Surgeons Oncology Group Z0050 trial: the utility of positron emission tomography in staging potentially operable non-small cell lung cancer. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2003;126(6):1943-1951.
33. van Tinteren H, Hoekstra OS, Smit EF, et al. Effectiveness of positron emission tomography in the preoperative assessment of patients with suspected non-small-cell lung cancer: the PLUS multicentre randomised trial. *Lancet.* 2002;359(9315):1388-1393.
34. Kozower BD, Meyers BF, Reed CE, Jones DR, Decker PA, Putnam JB, Jr. Does positron emission tomography prevent nontherapeutic pulmonary resections for clinical stage IA lung cancer? *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2008;85(4):1166-1169; discussion 1169-1170.
35. Gould MK, Kuschner WG, Rydzak CE, et al. Test performance of positron emission tomography and computed tomography for mediastinal staging in patients with non-small-cell lung cancer: a meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med.* 2003;139(11):879-892.
36. Kelly RF, Tran T, Holmstrom A, Murar J, Segurolo RJ, Jr. Accuracy and cost-effectiveness of [18F]-2-fluoro-deoxy-D-glucose-positron emission tomography scan in potentially resectable non-small cell lung cancer. *Chest.* 2004;125(4):1413-1423.

37. Lee PC, Port JL, Korst RJ, Liss Y, Meherally DN, Altorki NK. Risk factors for occult mediastinal metastases in clinical stage I non-small cell lung cancer. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2007;84(1):177-181.
38. Cerfolio RJ, Bryant AS, Eloubeidi MA. Routine mediastinoscopy and esophageal ultrasound fine-needle aspiration in patients with non-small cell lung cancer who are clinically N2 negative: a prospective study. *Chest.* 2006;130(6):1791-1795.
39. Hishida T, Yoshida J, Nishimura M, Nishiwaki Y, Nagai K. Problems in the current diagnostic standards of clinical N1 non-small cell lung cancer. *Thorax.* 2008;63(6):526-531.
40. Boland GW, Lee MJ, Gazelle GS, Halpern EF, McNicholas MM, Mueller PR. Characterization of adrenal masses using unenhanced CT: an analysis of the CT literature. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1998;171(1):201-204.
41. Choyke PL. ACR Appropriateness Criteria on incidentally discovered adrenal mass. *J Am Coll Radiol.* 2006;3(7):498-504.
42. Vikram R, Yeung HD, Macapinlac HA, Iyer RB. Utility of PET/CT in differentiating benign from malignant adrenal nodules in patients with cancer. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2008;191(5):1545-1551.
43. Kagohashi K, Satoh H, Ishikawa H, Ohtsuka M, Sekizawa K. Liver metastasis at the time of initial diagnosis of lung cancer. *Med Oncol.* 2003;20(1):25-28.
44. Delbeke D, Martin WH, Sandler MP, Chapman WC, Wright JK, Jr., Pinson CW. Evaluation of benign vs malignant hepatic lesions with positron emission tomography. *Arch Surg.* 1998;133(5):510-515; discussion 515-516.
45. Little AG, Stitik FP. Clinical staging of patients with non-small cell lung cancer. *Chest.* 1990;97(6):1431-1438.
46. Cheran SK, Herndon JE, 2nd, Patz EF, Jr. Comparison of whole-body FDG-PET to bone scan for detection of bone metastases in patients with a new diagnosis of lung cancer. *Lung Cancer.* 2004;44(3):317-325.
47. Gayed I, Vu T, Johnson M, Macapinlac H, Podoloff D. Comparison of bone and 2-deoxy-2-[18F]fluoro-D-glucose positron emission tomography in the evaluation of bony metastases in lung cancer. *Mol Imaging Biol.* 2003;5(1):26-31.
48. Hsia TC, Shen YY, Yen RF, Kao CH, Changlai SP. Comparing whole body 18F-2-deoxyglucose positron emission tomography and technetium-99m methylene diophosphate bone scan to detect bone metastases in patients with non-small cell lung cancer. *Neoplasma.* 2002;49(4):267-271.
49. Cole FH, Jr., Thomas JE, Wilcox AB, Halford HH, 3rd. Cerebral imaging in the asymptomatic preoperative bronchogenic carcinoma patient: is it worthwhile? *Ann Thorac Surg.* 1994;57(4):838-840.
50. Colice GL, Birkmeyer JD, Black WC, Littenberg B, Silvestri G. Cost-effectiveness of head CT in patients with lung cancer without clinical evidence of metastases. *Chest.* 1995;108(5):1264-1271.
51. Ferrigno D, Buccheri G. Cranial computed tomography as a part of the initial staging procedures for patients with non-small-cell lung cancer. *Chest.* 1994;106(4):1025-1029.
52. Mintz BJ, Tuhim S, Alexander S, Yang WC, Shanzer S. Intracranial metastases in the initial staging of bronchogenic carcinoma. *Chest.* 1984;86(6):850-853.
53. Jackman DM, Johnson BE. Small-cell lung cancer. *Lancet.* 2005;366(9494):1385-1396.
54. Sher T, Dy GK, Adjei AA. Small cell lung cancer. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2008;83(3):355-367.
55. Stahel RA, Ginsberg R, Havemann K, et al. Staging and prognostic factors in small cell lung cancer: a consensus report. *Lung Cancer.* 1989;5(4-6):119-126.
56. Vallieres E, Shepherd FA, Crowley J, et al. The IASLC Lung Cancer Staging Project: proposals regarding the relevance of TNM in the pathologic staging of small cell lung cancer in the forthcoming (seventh) edition of the TNM classification for lung cancer. *J Thorac Oncol.* 2009;4(9):1049-1059.
57. Mirvis SE, Whitley NO, Aisner J, Moody M, Whitacre M, Whitley JE. Abdominal CT in the staging of small-cell carcinoma of the lung: incidence of metastases and effect on prognosis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1987;148(5):845-847.
58. Whitley NO, Mirvis SE. Abdominal CT in the staging of small cell carcinoma of the lung. *Crit Rev Diagn Imaging.* 1989;29(2):103-116.
59. Simon GR, Turrisi A. Management of small cell lung cancer: ACCP evidence-based clinical practice guidelines (2nd edition). *Chest.* 2007;132(3 Suppl):324S-339S.
60. Fischer BM, Mortensen J, Langer SW, et al. A prospective study of PET/CT in initial staging of small-cell lung cancer: comparison with CT, bone scintigraphy and bone marrow analysis. *Ann Oncol.* 2007;18(2):338-345.
61. Bradley JD, Dehdashti F, Mintun MA, Govindan R, Trinkaus K, Siegel BA. Positron emission tomography in limited-stage small-cell lung cancer: a prospective study. *J Clin Oncol.* 2004;22(16):3248-3254.

62. Brink I, Schumacher T, Mix M, et al. Impact of [18F]FDG-PET on the primary staging of small-cell lung cancer. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2004;31(12):1614-1620.
63. Bradley J, Thorstad WL, Mutic S, et al. Impact of FDG-PET on radiation therapy volume delineation in non-small-cell lung cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2004;59(1):78-86.
64. van Loon J, Offermann C, Bosmans G, et al. 18FDG-PET based radiation planning of mediastinal lymph nodes in limited disease small cell lung cancer changes radiotherapy fields: a planning study. *Radiother Oncol*. 2008;87(1):49-54.
65. Giannone L, Johnson DH, Hande KR, Greco FA. Favorable prognosis of brain metastases in small cell lung cancer. *Ann Intern Med*. 1987;106(3):386-389.
66. Hirsch FR, Paulson OB, Hansen HH, Larsen SO. Intracranial metastases in small cell carcinoma of the lung. Prognostic aspects. *Cancer*. 1983;51(3):529-533.
67. Adjei AA, Marks RS, Bonner JA. Current guidelines for the management of small cell lung cancer. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 1999;74(8):809-816.

The ACR Committee on Appropriateness Criteria and its expert panels have developed criteria for determining appropriate imaging examinations for diagnosis and treatment of specified medical condition(s). These criteria are intended to guide radiologists, radiation oncologists and referring physicians in making decisions regarding radiologic imaging and treatment. Generally, the complexity and severity of a patient's clinical condition should dictate the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Only those examinations generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.