

American College of Radiology ACR Appropriateness Criteria®

Clinical Condition:

Renal Failure

Variant 1:

Acute renal failure, unspecified.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
US kidneys	9	Preferably with Doppler methods.	None
MRA kidney	4	Newer techniques with gadolinium are very effective for renal artery evaluation.	None
NUC renal scintigraphy kidney	4	Global and differential function. Assess recoverability; distinguish from chronic.	IP
INV arteriography kidney (IADSA)	3	Potentially helpful in trauma, evaluation for renal artery occlusion. Consider aortography with CO2 to avoid nephrotoxicity of iodinated contrast.	IP
CT kidney	3	Potentially helpful in trauma. Noncontrast helical CT more sensitive than KUB for calculi.	Med
X-ray abdomen	2	Assess for calculi; however insensitive for 30% of calculi.	Low
INV voiding cystourethrography	2	See Anticipated Exceptions in the summary of the literature review.	IP
MRI kidney	1	See Anticipated Exceptions in the summary of the literature review.	None
X-ray intravenous urography	1	Problem of contrast nephrotoxicity.	Low
INV phlebography kidney	1	See Anticipated Exceptions in the summary of the literature review.	IP
<u>Rating Scale:</u> 1=Least appropriate, 9=Most appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

An 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 exams 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.

Clinical Condition:**Renal Failure****Variant 2:****Chronic renal failure.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
US kidneys	9	Preferably with Doppler methods.	None
MRA kidney	6	Noninvasive evaluation of renal arteries as cause of renal failure.	None
X-ray abdomen	3	Information about calcification, majority of calculi, occasionally renal size.	Low
INV voiding cystourethrography	3	If reflux is suspected. Particularly appropriate in children.	IP
NUC scintigraphy kidney	3	Global and differential renal function; prognosis for recovery.	Med
CT kidney	3	Potentially helpful in trauma. Helical noncontrast CT for calculi.	Med
INV arteriography kidney (IADSA)	2	Problem of contrast nephrotoxicity. CO2 aortography an option. Newer MRA techniques preferred.	IP
MRI kidney	1		None
INV phlebography kidney	1		IP
X-ray intravenous urography	1		Low
Rating Scale: 1=Least appropriate, 9=Most appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

An 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 exams 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.

RENAL FAILURE

Expert Panel on Urologic Imaging:
William H. Bush, Jr, MD¹; Peter L. Choyke, MD²;
Edward I. Bluth, MD³; David D. Casalino, MD⁴;
Isaac R. Francis, MD⁵; S. Zafar H. Jafri, MD⁶;
Akira Kawashima, MD, PhD⁷; Alan Kronthal, MD⁸;
Robert A. Older, MD⁹; Nicholas Papanicolaou, MD¹⁰;
Parvati Ramchandani, MD¹¹; Arthur T. Rosenfield, MD¹²;
Carl M. Sandler, MD¹³; Arthur J. Segal, MD¹⁴;
Clare Tempany, MD¹⁵; Martin I. Resnick, MD.¹⁶

Summary of Literature Review

Renal failure is defined as the inability of the kidney to maintain homeostasis leading to azotemia or the accumulation of nitrogenous wastes; however, exact biochemical or clinical criteria for this diagnosis are not defined clearly. "Renal failure" is distinguished from "renal insufficiency," where renal function is abnormal but capable of sustaining essential bodily functions [1]. Renal failure is defined as anuric when urine volume is less than 50 ml for 24 hours; oliguric when the volume is less than 500 ml for 24 hours; and nonoliguric when the volume is from 500-6,000 ml for 24 hours. Urine output above 6,000 ml is designated polyuric [2].

Causes of renal failure are conventionally separated into three categories: prerenal, intrarenal, and postrenal. Hypoperfusion is the cause of prerenal failure. Causes of intrarenal failure include acute tubular necrosis (ATN) and interstitial, glomerular, or small vessel disease. Obstruction is the usual postrenal cause of failure. Distinction between acute renal failure (ARF) and chronic renal failure (CRF) can often be made clinically [3]. However, many patients are first seen with markedly elevated serum creatinine of unknown duration, so that classification into ARF or CRF is not possible.

There are significant limitations in using serum creatinine as an accurate measure of renal function, including decreased muscle mass and poor nutritional status [4]. Creatinine clearance measures the ability of the glomerulus to filter creatinine from the plasma and approximates the glomerular filtration rate (GFR); there is

a reasonable correlation between the 2-hour and 24-hour creatinine clearance ($r = 0.85$), but the error in calculation may vary from 10%-27%. Creatinine clearance of less than 60 ml/min may be termed renal insufficiency; less than 30 ml/min is renal failure. End-stage renal disease (ESRD) implies CRF of a degree (ie, GFR<10-12 ml/min) such that life cannot be sustained long-term without dialysis. In ARF, the creatinine clearance is usually less than 25 ml/min. Unfortunately, creatinine clearance is often not helpful when the creatinine value is changing.

Acute renal failure can be broadly defined as a sudden decrease in renal function resulting in azotemia. It can develop in the setting of pre-existing renal insufficiency or can develop in a patient with previously normal kidneys [5]. In a patient with previously undiagnosed renal failure, initial evaluation of renal size by gray-scale ultrasonography (US) is most helpful. If the kidneys are small and echogenic, the process of long-standing evaluation by US helps to identify a correctable cause of renal failure such as obstruction. If hydronephrosis is present, retrograde or antegrade relief of the obstruction is usually undertaken. If no hydronephrosis is evident and the patient does not have hypertension or other history to suggest renal artery stenosis, further work-up of small, echogenic kidneys is not warranted. Conversely, if the kidneys are of normal size with or without increased echogenicity, this may represent reversible renal failure, most often ARF, and a more extensive evaluation is initiated. Scintigraphy with a tubular secretion agent (eg Hippuran, MAG-3) can help assess the level of renal function as well as the potential reversibility of the process causing the renal failure. Therefore, in addition to the history, physical examination, and laboratory analysis of serum and urine, ultrasonography and radionuclide scintigraphy are imaging tools that are used early in the evaluation of the patient with previously undiagnosed renal failure. If renal artery stenosis or occlusion is suspected, magnetic resonance angiography (MRA) techniques can be used to avoid nephrotoxic iodinated contrast media.

Acute Renal Failure

Over 75% of patients with ARF will have either prerenal azotemia (PRA) or ATN (parenchymal, intrarenal process) as the cause [3]. Prerenal causes of ARF relate to hypoperfusion or hypovolemia. Clinical suspicion of ARF usually leads to a fluid challenge with central monitoring and correction of the hypovolemic state, which in turn corrects the renal failure. A common exception to this approach is the patient with heart failure or liver failure. Acute renal artery occlusion in a solitary kidney or solitary functioning kidney is an uncommon cause of lack of response to the therapeutic trial of intravascular fluid;

¹Principal Author, University of Washington Medical Center, Seattle, Wash; ²Panel Chair, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md; ³Ochsner Foundation Hospital, New Orleans, La; ⁴Northwestern University, Chicago, Ill; ⁵University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich; ⁶William Beaumont Hospital, Royal Oak, Mich; ⁷Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn; ⁸W B & A Imaging, Rockville Md; ⁹University of Virginia Medical Center, Charlottesville, Va; ¹⁰Hospital of University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa; ¹¹Hospital of University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa; ¹²Yale-New Haven Hospital, New Haven, Conn; ¹³UT MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas; ¹⁴Rochester General Hospital, Rochester, NY; ¹⁵Brigham & Women's Hospital, Boston, Mass; ¹⁶University Hospital of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio, American Urological Association.

Reprint requests to: Department of Quality & Safety, American College of Radiology, 1891 Preston White Drive, Reston, VA 20191-4397.

An 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 exams 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.

imaging techniques are used to define the cause of hypoperfusion.

A high ratio of blood urea nitrogen (BUN) to creatinine (Cr) has long been considered a marker of PRA. In addition, a characteristic laboratory finding in PRA is avid sodium retention, with urine sodium concentration of less than 20 mEq/L [6]. Meta-analysis of various laboratory studies in an attempt to differentiate PRA from ATN reveals that most determinations (urine/plasma creatinine index, urine/plasma urea, or urinary sodium) are often nonspecific or unreliable [5]. Still, most experienced clinicians find that when urine output is less than 500 ml/24 hr, determination of urinary fractional excretion of sodium is helpful.

Duplex Doppler sonography has been suggested to distinguish acute prerenal failure from ATN (intrarenal failure). Compared with traditional gray scale ultrasonography, which shows normal kidneys in most patients with ATN, duplex Doppler sonography shows an elevated resistive index (RI) in 96% of patients with ATN; false negatives include nephrotoxic drug-induced ATN [7]. Acute tubular necrosis has a higher RI than prerenal ARF, but there is some overlap in that 20% of patients with prerenal ARF had resistive indices over 0.75. Hepatorenal syndrome is a distinct form of prerenal failure that is associated with an elevated RI [7]. Tubulointerstitial causes of intrarenal ARF usually have an elevated RI. Acute glomerular-based processes will often have a normal RI, whereas chronic glomerular processes typically show an elevated RI [8]. Consequently, Doppler sonography cannot replace renal biopsy. Although there is a weak linear relationship between the RI and serum Cr, the RI returns to normal before serum Cr in ARF; RI may be useful in predicting the course of ARF [9].

Trauma presents a unique constellation of prerenal, intrarenal, and/or postrenal causes of ARF. In major trauma centers, body computed tomography (CT) is used increasingly for initial abdominal trauma assessment of causes of renal failure such as renal artery occlusion, kidney trauma, and clot obstruction occurring bilaterally or in a solitary kidney. Nephrotoxic drugs and ATN following prolonged shock with precipitation of hemoglobin and/or myoglobin in the tubules are other causes of ARF that may cause abnormal CT findings [2].

Obstruction is an uncommon cause of ARF but may occur in the oncology patient, the trauma patient, or the patient with a solitary kidney [7,8]. Gray-scale ultrasonography is the most effective way to exclude subacute or chronic obstruction. Regular gray-scale US is not accurate in the minimally dilated obstructive situation, such as with retroperitoneal metastatic tumor or idiopathic retroperitoneal fibrosis, where ureter encasement

interferes with peristalsis; in one series, 4%-5% of patients with obstruction showed minimal or no upper tract dilation [10]. Duplex Doppler sonography is less effective in acute obstruction since obstruction for longer than 6 hours is necessary to show a consistently elevated RI; false negatives (ie, normal RI) occur in patients who are examined earlier than 6 hours after the onset of obstruction [11]. Furthermore, RI measurements are often normal in patients with acute intermittent obstruction. The patient with a renal transplant can present with acute renal failure. Because Platt et al [12] found an elevated RI in 85% of transplanted kidneys with obstruction, a normal RI should argue strongly against obstruction, unless a ureteral leak is also present. In addition to obstruction, an elevated RI can also be found in rejection and ATN; therefore, RI measurements are not useful in the differential diagnosis of these entities.

After US excludes obstruction, it is suggested that renal scintigraphy with technetium-labeled MAG-3 or I-131 labeled OIH be performed. Progressive parenchymal accumulation without significant excretion is suggestive of ATN. Absent uptake suggests more serious conditions such as acute cortical necrosis and acute glomerulonephritis. In acute renal failure, GFR is more affected than renal blood flow, hence Tc 99m DTPA accumulation is decreased, and this agent is less able to distinguish acute from chronic renal disease. Quantitative studies with the tubular agents I-131 OIH or Tc 99m MAG-3, however, can be used [13,14]. These methods assess effective renal plasma flow (ERPF) and the degree of renal function, and they also have prognostic significance. Patients with ERPF greater than 125 ml/min and good uptake usually completely recover or markedly improve. Acute tubular necrosis, hepatorenal syndrome, and acute interstitial nephritis belong in the category with good prognosis. Patients with low uptake have a poor prognosis and eventually require dialysis or transplantation.

Clinical evaluation and volume replacement resolve the majority of pre-renal causes of renal failure. Ultrasonography evaluates for obstruction and renal size, and it can provide a measure of renal perfusion. Some suggest that duplex Doppler sonography can supplant radionuclide scintigraphy, MRA, or contrast angiography in evaluating the renal arteries; however, these results have not been reproduced in many centers. Newer MRA techniques offer improved images of the main and segmental renal arteries [15]. Magnetic resonance imaging can also provide direct assessment of renal blood flow [52]. Scintigraphy is useful for renal perfusion and for determining ERPF, which helps assess recoverability of function in ARF. Computed tomography is used to evaluate the trauma patient and supplement technically

An 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 exams 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.

unsatisfactory or equivocal sonography. Excretory urography has no role in investigating ARF.

Chronic Renal Failure

Chronic renal failure (CRF) often presents insidiously and is characterized by a steady decrease in GFR. Causes of CRF that lead to ESRD and result in transplantation are (in decreasing frequency): chronic glomerulonephritis, diabetic nephropathy, hypertensive nephropathy, polycystic renal disease, chronic pyelonephritis, and renal calculi [16].

The most common causes of CRF in children are chronic glomerulonephritis and pyelonephritis [17]. Ultrasound best differentiates between obstruction and intrinsic parenchymal disease. In children with small-scarred kidneys, voiding cystourethrography (VCUG) is performed. For adults with ESRD and urinary tract infection (UTI) or calculi, evaluation with VCUG, urodynamics, and retrograde pyelography is also advised [16,18].

Patients with ESRD on dialysis develop cysts, hemorrhage, and neoplasia. Evaluation for cystic change in these patients is done optimally with CT, which showed 60% of cysts, whereas sonography showed only 18% [19]. Although solid renal masses in these patients were shown equally well by sonography and CT, the ability of CT to detect acquired cystic disease and the need to follow for possible neoplasm warrants use of CT as screening after 3 years of dialysis [19]. Early enhanced CT is recommended [20]. In acquired cystic disease, follow-up imaging with CT seems advisable only in selected populations [21]. Alternatively MRI and ultrasound can be used.

Analgesic nephropathy accounts for about 3% of patients on chronic dialysis and often results in papillary necrosis. Calcification along the papillary line and a “wavy” renal contour are the most common radiographic findings. Evaluation of calcification and renal contour is effectively done with renal tomography and sonography, but most easily with noncontrast CT [22]. Noncontrast helical CT is also more sensitive and specific than plain radiography for ureteral calculi [23].

Hypertensive nephropathy is now one of the most common causes of ESRD and in one study accounted for 25% of all patients [24]. Atherosclerotic renal artery stenosis presenting as CRF accounted for 14% of patients older than 50 in another study [25]. Reports on the ability of duplex Doppler sonography to detect renal artery stenosis (RAS) vary widely; some reports are as high as 90%, whereas others show poor results [7, 25-27]. Over one-third of patients evaluated with earlier Doppler methodology had an unsatisfactory exam [28]. With use

of a posterior or posterolateral translumbar approach and analysis of intrarenal vessel waveforms, duplex Doppler sonography has been reported to detect significant (over 70%) RAS as a cause of renal failure, with a sensitivity of 95% and specificity of 97% [29-31]. Examinations were almost always technically feasible and accomplished within half an hour [31]. The study by Kliewer et al [32] found it effective in evaluating RAS, but only when the renal artery stenosis (RAS) was 80% or greater. Usually, high-grade stenoses are associated with renal failure. A subsequent study was not able to reproduce results adequately to support the use of duplex Doppler sonography as a screening test for RAS [33]. Duplex Doppler sonography for diagnosis of RAS is very operator-dependent [34].

Renal scintigraphy with technetium 99m DTPA and an angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor (ACEI) has high sensitivity and specificity in detecting RAS in patients with normal or near-normal renal function. Its utility is also reported preserved in patients with renal insufficiency [35,36]. However, it becomes less accurate in patients with renal failure because DTPA is a pure glomerular agent and there is a variable response to ACEI in patients with low baseline renal function (eg, GFR less than 15 ml/min) [37]. On the other hand, scintigraphy with technetium 99m MAG-3, because it is secreted by the tubules as well as filtered by glomeruli, is similar to iodine 131 Hippuran; it is more effective in patients with renal failure [13,14,37]. However, scintigraphy with ACEI does not indicate the presence of RAS, but only activation of the renin-angiotension system; conversely, a negative test does not exclude RAS but only absence of activation [38]. Global and differential renal function can be used to estimate prognosis for recovery. Whereas visualization of the kidney is nonspecific, nonvisualization of the kidneys indicates a poor prognosis.

Magnetic resonance angiography is able to demonstrate, with high sensitivity and specificity, atherosclerotic narrowing of the orifice and proximal renal artery [38-40]. Aortic or proximal renal artery disease is the usual culprit when atherosclerosis causes renal failure, making MRA a helpful imaging modality [53]. Newer ultrafast MRA techniques using intravenous gadolinium agents during breath-held imaging provide excellent images of the entire renal artery and often the segmental branches [15,41,42]. Gadolinium agents have less nephrotoxicity than conventional iodinated contrast media and, therefore, are available when contrast-enhanced imaging is necessary [43,44]. Angiography with iodinated contrast material and digital subtraction (DSA) technique remains the gold standard, but its use must be carefully considered because of the risk of contrast nephrotoxicity. Some institutions use carbon dioxide as the “contrast” agent and

An 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 exams 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.

thereby can avoid the toxicity associated with iodinated contrast media.

Urinary obstruction as a cause of CRF is best evaluated by US. If azotemia is secondary to obstructive uropathy, hydronephrosis will almost always be demonstrable. Ultrasound has sensitivity approaching 100% in moderate to severe hydronephrosis. There may be a false positive rate of up to 26%, caused by such entities as vesicoureteral reflux, full bladder, renal sinus cysts, and normal vessels in the renal sinus; however, vascular structures causing confusion can be resolved with duplex Doppler sonography or color duplex Doppler sonography [45]. When kidneys fail secondary to chronic obstruction, resistive indices may return to normal [10].

Newer and future techniques of determining renal function in patients with renal failure include determination of clearance of small doses (10 ml) of nonradioactive low osmolar contrast media (LOCM) (iohexol), dynamic MR imaging with gadolinium DTPA, and MR imaging with ultrasmall particles of iron oxide (USPIO) [42,46-51].

Chronic renal failure is often due to intrinsic renal disease such as diabetes and/or hypertension. Obstruction is the most important cause to be excluded initially, and this is done best by US. If RAS is a possible consideration, various modalities are available. Although angiography is the gold standard, it usually requires potentially nephrotoxic contrast medium. Radionuclide scintigraphy is helpful in measuring ERPF and defining renal artery compromise, though ACEI-modified renography becomes less effective in patients with renal failure. Duplex Doppler sonography, even using newer techniques, has not proved to be a reliable method to screen for RAS, but does seem to be effective in identifying high-grade stenoses; newer MRA techniques with gadolinium now rival arteriography for evaluating the renal artery; and because ischemic nephropathy is a significant contributor to renal failure, MRA is assuming a more prominent role in evaluation.

Summary

1. Ultrasound is the first imaging study for evaluating the patient with previously undiagnosed renal failure. It helps the clinician separate chronic ESRD from potentially reversible ARF or CRF by defining renal size, echogenicity, presence or absence of hydronephrosis, and cystic disease. Duplex Doppler sonography can define renal flow; however, the specific utility of duplex Doppler sonography in evaluating the patient with renal failure needs further investigation.

2. Radionuclide scintigraphy provides an assessment of global and differential renal function and potential reversibility of renal failure.
3. If the US is equivocal for obstruction or cystic disease, add CT.
4. Computed tomography is of value in the trauma patient with ARF.
5. If the blood pressure is elevated or in the clinical setting of prominent peripheral atherosclerotic vascular disease, add MRA when duplex Doppler sonography or ACEI scintigraphy is positive or nondiagnostic in the patient with renal failure who is not a candidate for contrast angiography.

Anticipated Exceptions

Although body coil MRI or renal phlebography may be indicated to evaluate for renal vein thrombosis as an unusual cause of ARF, newer MRA techniques are suggested. Voiding cystourethrography may be indicated if vesicoureteral reflux is suspected as a contributing factor in ARF.

References

1. Davidson AJ, Hartman DS. Radiology of the kidney and urinary tract. Philadelphia, Pa: WB Saunders Co.; 1994:777-790.
2. Stene JK. Renal failure in the trauma patient. *Crit Care Clin* 1990; 6(1):111-119.
3. Rose BD. Acute renal failure—prerenal disease versus ATN. In: Rose BD, ed. Pathophysiology of renal disease. 2nd ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill; 1987:63-117.
4. Becker JA. Evaluation of renal function. *Radiology* 1991; 179(2):337-338.
5. Kellen M, Aronson S, Roizen MF, et al. Predictive and diagnostic tests of renal failure: a review. *Anesth Analg* 1994; 78(1):134-142.
6. Adcox MJ, Collins B, Zager RA. The differential diagnosis of acute renal failure. *Contemp Issues Nephrol* 1992; 25:73-117.
7. Platt JF, Rubin JM, Ellis JH. Acute renal failure: possible role of duplex Doppler US in distinction between acute prerenal failure and acute tubular necrosis. *Radiology* 1991; 179(2):419-423.
8. Platt JF. Duplex Doppler evaluation of native kidney dysfunction: obstructive and nonobstructive disease. *AJR* 1992; 158(5): 1035-1042.
9. Yoon DY, Kim SH, Kim HD, et al. Doppler sonography in experimentally induced acute renal failure in rabbits: resistive index versus serum creatinine levels. *Invest Radiol* 1995; 30(3):168-172.
10. Spital A, Valvo JR, Segal AJ. Nondilated obstructive uropathy. *Urology* 1988; 31(6):478-482.
11. Platt JF, Rubin JM, Ellis JH. Acute renal obstruction: evaluation with intrarenal duplex Doppler and conventional US. *Radiology* 1993; 186(3):685-688.
12. Platt JF, Ellis JH, Rubin JM. Renal transplant pyelocaliectasis: role of duplex Doppler US in evaluation. *Radiology* 1991; 179(2):425-428.
13. Fresco GF, DiGiorgio F, Curti GL. Simultaneous estimation of glomerular filtration rate and renal plasma flow. *J Nucl Med* 1995; 36(9):1701-1706.
14. Taylor A Jr, Manatunga A, Morton K, et al. Multicenter trial validation of a camera-based method to measure Tc-99m mercaptoacetyltriglycine, or Tc-99m MAG3, clearance. *Radiology* 1997; 204(1):47-54.

An 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 exams 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.

15. Tello R, Thomson KR, Witte D, et al. Standard dose Gd-DTPA dynamic MR of renal arteries. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 1998; 8(2):421-426.
16. Kabler RL, Cerny JC. Pre-transplant urologic investigation and treatment of end stage renal disease. *J Urol* 1983; 129(3):475-478.
17. Frankel DG, Narla D. Imaging of children with chronic renal failure. *J Pediatr* 1996; 129(2):s33-s38.
18. Confer DJ, Banowsky LH. The urological evaluation and management of renal transplant donors and recipients. *J Urol* 1980; 124:305-310.
19. Taylor AJ, Cohen EP, Erickson SJ, et al. Renal imaging in long-term dialysis patients: a comparison of CT and sonography. *AJR* 1989; 153(4): 765-767.
20. Takebayashi S, Hidai H, Chiba T, et al. Using helical CT to evaluate renal cell carcinoma in patients undergoing hemodialysis: value of early enhanced images. *AJR* 1999; 172(2):429-433.
21. Levine E. Acquired cystic kidney disease. In: Pollack HM, McClellan BL, eds. *Clinical Urography*. Philadelphia, Pa: WB Saunders Co; 2000:1343-1358.
22. de Broe ME, Elseviens MM. Analgesic nephropathy—still a problem? *Nephron* 1993; 64(4):505-513.
23. Levine JA, Neitlich J, Verga M, et al. Ureteral calculi in patients with flank pain: correlation of plain radiography with unenhanced helical CT. *Radiology* 1997; 204(1):27-31.
24. Zucchelli P, Zuccala A. The diagnostic dilemma of hypertensive nephrosclerosis: the nephrologist's view. *Am J Kidney Dis* 1993; 21(5 Suppl 2):87-91.
25. Scoble JE, Maher EH, Hamilton G, et al. Atherosclerotic renovascular disease causing renal impairment—a case for treatment. *Clin Nephrol* 1989; 31(3): 119-122.
26. Stansby G, Hamilton G, Scoble J. Atherosclerotic renal artery stenosis. *Br J Hosp Med*. 1993; 49(6):388-395.
27. Taylor DC, Kettler MD, Moneta GL, et al. Duplex ultrasound scanning in the diagnosis of renal artery stenosis: a prospective evaluation. *J Vasc Surg* 1988; 7(2):363-369.
28. Berland LL, Koslin DB, Routh WD, Keller FS. Renal artery stenosis: prospective evaluation of diagnosis with color duplex US compared with angiography. Work in progress. *Radiology* 1990; 174(2):421-423.
29. Middleton WD. Doppler US evaluation of renal artery stenosis: past, present, and future. *Radiology* 1992; 184(2):307-308.
30. Stavros AT, Parker SH, Yakes WF, et al. Segmental stenosis of the renal artery: pattern recognition of tardus and parvus abnormalities with duplex sonography. *Radiology* 1992; 184(2):487-492.
31. Schwerk WB, Resrepo IK, Stellwaag M, et al. Renal artery stenosis: grading with image-directed Doppler US evaluation of renal resistive index. *Radiology* 1994; 190(3):785-790.
32. Kliewer MA, Tupler RH, Carroll BA, et al. Renal artery stenosis: analysis of Doppler waveform parameters and tardus-parvus pattern. *Radiology* 1993; 189(3):779-787.
33. Kliewer MA, Tupler RH, Hertzberg BS, et al. Doppler evaluation of renal artery stenosis: interobserver agreement in the interpretation of waveform morphology. *AJR* 1994; 162(6):1371-1376.
34. Aitchison F, Page A. Diagnostic imaging of renal artery stenosis. *J Hum Hypertens* 1999; 13(9):595-603.
35. Chen CC, Hoffer PB, Vahjen G, et al. Patients at high risk for renal artery stenosis: a simple method of renal scintigraphic analysis with Tc. 99m DTPA and captopril. *Radiology* 1990; 176(2):365-370.
36. Setaro JF, Chen CC, Hoffer PB, Black HR. Captopril renography in the diagnosis of renal artery stenosis and the prediction of improvement with revascularization: the Yale Vascular Center experience. *Am J Hypertens* 1991; 4(12 Pt 2):698S-705S.
37. Davidson RA, Wilcox CS. Newer tests for the diagnosis of renovascular disease. *JAMA* 1992; 268(23):3353-3358.
38. Zuccala A, Zucchelli P. Ischemic nephropathy: diagnosis and treatment. *J Nephrol* 1998; 11(6):318-324.
39. Debatin JF, Spritzer CE, Grist TM, et al. Imaging of the renal arteries: value of MR angiography. *AJR* 1991; 157(5):981-990.
40. Kim D, Edelman RR, Kent KC, et al. Abdominal aorta and renal artery stenosis: evaluation with MR angiography. *Radiology* 1990; 174(3 Pt 1):727-731.
41. Christensson A. Renovascular disease and renal insufficiency—diagnosis and treatment. *Scand J Urol Nephrol* 1999; 33(6):400-405.
42. Bakker J, Beek FJ, Beutler JJ, et al. Renal artery stenosis and accessory renal arteries: accuracy of detection and visualization with gadolinium-enhanced breath-hold MR angiography. *Radiology* 1998; 207(2):497-504.
43. Bellin MF, Deray G, Assogba U, et al. Gd-DTPA: evaluation of its renal tolerance in patients with chronic renal failure. *Magn Reson Imaging* 1992; 10(1):115-118.
44. Prince MR, Arnoldus C, Frisoli JK. Nephrotoxicity of high-dose gadolinium compared with iodinated contrast. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 1996; 6(1):162-166.
45. Scola FH, Cronan JJ, Schepps B. Grade I hydronephrosis: pulsed doppler US evaluation. *Radiology* 1989; 171(2):519-520.
46. Gaspari F, Perico N, Ruggenti P, et al. Plasma clearance of nonradioactive iohexol as a measure of glomerular filtration rate. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 1995; 6(2):257-263.
47. Sterner G, Frennby B, Hultberg B, et al. Iohexol clearance for GFR-determination in renal failure—single or multiple plasma sampling? *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 1996; 11(3):521-525.
48. Furukawa A, Murata K, Morita R. Evaluation of renal function using Gd-DTPA dynamic MR Imaging. *Nippon Igaku Hoshasen Gakkai Zasshi* 1996; 56(5):264-274.
49. Knesplova L, Krestin GP. Magnetic resonance in the assessment of renal function. *Eur Radiol* 1998; 8(2):201-211.
50. Dalla-Palma L, Panzetta G, Pozzi-Mucelli RS, et al. Dynamic magnetic resonance imaging in the assessment of chronic medical nephropathies with impaired renal function. *Eur Radiol* 2000; 10(2):280-286.
51. Laissy JP, Benerbous S, Idee JM, et al. MR assessment of iodinated contrast-medium induced nephropathy in rats using ultrasmall particles of iron oxide. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 1997; 7(1):164-170.
52. Dagher PC, Herget-Rosenthal S, Ruehm SG, et al. Newly developed techniques to study and diagnose acute renal failure. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2003; 14(8):2188-2198. Review.
53. Myers DL, Poole LJ, Imam K, et al. Renal artery stenosis by three-dimensional magnetic resonance angiography in type 2 diabetics with uncontrolled hypertension and chronic renal insufficiency: prevalence and effect on renal function. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2003; 41(2):351-359.

An 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 exams 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.