

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

Clinical Condition: Acute Abdominal Pain and Fever or Suspected Abdominal Abscess

Variant 1: Postoperative patient with fever.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CT abdomen and pelvis with contrast	8		High
CT abdomen and pelvis without contrast	7		High
US abdomen	6		None
MRI abdomen and pelvis with contrast	6		None
X-ray abdomen	5		Low
MRI abdomen and pelvis without contrast	5		None
X-ray colon water soluble contrast enema	4		Med
NUC gallium scan abdomen	4		High
X-ray upper GI series with small bowel follow-through	3		Med
NUC WBC scan abdomen pelvis	3		Med
INV angiography abdomen	2		IP
Rating Scale: 1=Least appropriate, 9=Most appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Variant 2: Postoperative patient with persistent fever and no abscess seen on CT scan within the last 7 days.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CT abdomen and pelvis with contrast	8		High
CT abdomen and pelvis without contrast	6		High
US abdomen	6		None
NUC WBC scan abdomen pelvis	6		Med
X-ray abdomen	5		Low
X-ray upper GI series with small bowel follow-through	5		Med
NUC gallium scan abdomen	5		High
MRI abdomen and pelvis without contrast	5		None
MRI abdomen and pelvis with contrast	5		None
X-ray colon water soluble contrast enema	4		Med
INV angiography abdomen	2		IP
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.

Clinical Condition:**Acute Abdominal Pain and Fever or Suspected Abdominal Abscess****Variant 3:****Patient presenting with fever, non-localizing abdominal pain, and no recent operation.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CT abdomen and pelvis with contrast	8		High
CT abdomen and pelvis without contrast	6		High
US abdomen	6		None
X-ray abdomen	6		Low
X-ray upper GI series with small bowel follow-through	5		Med
X-ray colon water soluble contrast enema	5		Med
NUC gallium scan abdomen	5		High
NUC WBC scan abdomen pelvis	5		Med
MRI abdomen and pelvis without contrast	5		None
MRI abdomen and pelvis with contrast	5		None
INV angiography abdomen	2		IP
Rating Scale: 1=Least appropriate, 9=Most appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

Variant 4:**Pregnant patient.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
US abdomen	8		None
MRI abdomen and pelvis without contrast	7		None
MRI abdomen and pelvis with contrast	7		None
CT abdomen and pelvis with contrast	5	Only after other studies without ionizing radiation have been utilized.	High
CT abdomen and pelvis without contrast	5		High
X-ray abdomen	4		Low
X-ray upper GI series with small bowel follow-through	2		Med
X-ray colon water soluble contrast enema	2		Med
NUC gallium scan abdomen	2		High
NUC WBC scan abdomen pelvis	2		Med
INV angiography abdomen	2		IP
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.

ACUTE ABDOMINAL PAIN AND FEVER OR SUSPECTED ABDOMINAL ABSCESS

Expert Panel on Gastrointestinal Imaging: Max Paul Rosen, MD, MPH¹; Robert L. Bree, MD, MHSA²; W. Dennis Foley, MD³; Spencer B. Gay, MD⁴; Seth N. Glick, MD⁵; Jay P. Heiken, MD⁶; James E. Huprich, MD⁷; Marc S. Levine, MD⁸; Pablo R. Ros, MD, MPH⁹; William P. Shuman, MD¹⁰; Frederick L. Greene, MD¹¹; Don C. Rockey, MD.¹²

Summary of Literature Review

Acute abdominal pain with fever raises clinical suspicion of an intra-abdominal abscess or other condition that may need immediate surgical or medical attention. Infection or other inflammatory conditions are the usual cause. In these circumstances, emergency imaging is often employed, in conjunction with other clinical information, to make a quick and accurate diagnosis. This is crucial, as proper diagnosis facilitates expeditious and appropriate therapy, thus improving patient outcome. This discussion is arbitrarily limited to illnesses affecting the region between the diaphragm and the upper pelvis and excludes both renal and flank pathology. Pediatric patients are not considered.

The range of pathology that can produce abdominal pain and fever with or without abscess is very broad. It includes pneumonia, hepatobiliary disease, complicated pancreatic processes, gastrointestinal perforation or inflammation, bowel obstruction or infarction, abscesses anywhere in the abdomen, and tumor—among others. Of all patients who present to an emergency room with abdominal pain, about one-third never have a diagnosis established, one-third have appendicitis, and one-third have some other documented pathology. In the “other” category, the most common causes include (in order of frequency): acute cholecystitis, small bowel obstruction, pancreatitis, renal colic, perforated peptic ulcer, cancer, and diverticulitis [1]. When fever is also present, the need for quick, definitive diagnosis is considerably heightened.

A variety of clinical presentations occur in patients with acute abdominal pain accompanied by fever. This review concentrates on the evaluation of patients with acute diffuse abdominal pain, HIV-positive patients with acute abdominal pain and patients with suspected abdominal

abscess. Other Appropriateness Criteria[®] topics address acute right upper quadrant pain, acute right lower quadrant pain, and acute left lower quadrant pain. Imaging evaluation varies slightly among patients with different clinical presentations. In general, computed tomography (CT) is the most important modality in evaluating patients with abdominal pain, more so in those with fever. Two reports have found CT superior to clinical evaluation for finding the cause of abdominal pain. CT was correct in 90%-95% of cases, while clinical evaluation was correct in 60%-76% of cases [2,3]. Additionally, the use of CT in patients with acute abdominal pain increases the emergency department clinician’s level of certainty and reduces hospital admissions by 24% [4]. The presence of a white blood count (WBC) >11.5 has been correlated with a positive abdominal CT, and the combination of WBC >11.5, male sex, and age less than 25 years has been shown to correlate with a diagnosis of appendicitis [5]. Abdominal CT without the use of oral or IV contrast has been advocated as an alternative to abdominal radiographs for evaluating appendicitis [1,6]; however, the use of contrast agents greatly increases the spectrum of detectable pathology [4].

Acute diffuse abdominal pain with fever can be caused by conditions that ordinarily instigate more localized pain. These conditions include complicated appendicitis, complicated acute calculous or acalculous cholecystitis, bile duct obstruction with infectious cholangitis, hepatitis, hepatic abscess, pancreatitis with or without infection, pyelonephritis or renal infarction, renal stones, omental infarction, epiploic appendagitis, mesenteric adenitis, and diverticulitis [7]. Other conditions that typically present with diffuse abdominal pain and fever include bowel obstruction, bowel ischemia or infarction, gut perforation from ulcer or tumor, diffuse colitis, typhlitis and other gastrointestinal infections, small bowel inflammatory disease, abdominal abscess, intraperitoneal or retroperitoneal hemorrhage, and diffuse malignancy [8,9]. Less common cases of abdominal pain include tuberculous peritonitis [10].

Again, radiographs may provide useful information about bowel gas pattern or free air, but they offer no incremental information if CT is performed. Sonography may be useful in selected conditions, including cholecystitis, cholangitis, liver abscess, diverticulitis, appendicitis, and small bowel inflammation, where it may be used to assess activity of Crohn’s disease. While ultrasound (US) may be able to detect portions of an abscess or malignancy (such as lymphoma), it is blind to many areas of the abdomen, particularly in the presence of increased bowel gas or free air. The shortcomings of

¹Review Author, Beth Israel Hospital, Boston, Mass; ²Panel Chair, Radia Medical Imaging, Everett, Wash; ³Froedtert Hospital East, Milwaukee, Wis; ⁴University of Virginia Health Science Center, Charlottesville, Va; ⁵Presbyterian Medical Center, Philadelphia, Pa; ⁶Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology, St. Louis, Mo; ⁷Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn; ⁸Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa; ⁹Brigham & Women’s Hospital, Boston, Mass; ¹⁰University of Washington, Seattle, Wash; ¹¹Carolinas Medical Center, Charlotte, NC, American College of Surgeons; ¹²University of Texas, Southwest Medical Center, Dallas, Texas, American Gastroenterological 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.

US are partially offset by its lack of ionizing radiation, particularly in younger patients. In women with pelvic inflammatory disease (PID), pelvic US can be especially useful in identifying the presence of a tubo-ovarian abscess (TOA) [11]. With CT of the abdomen and pelvis in a young adult, there is a small risk of the radiation causing a fatal cancer, which some believe may be as high as one in 2,000 patients [12]. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) offers imaging without ionizing radiation and has been shown to provide clinically useful information for rapid diagnosis of the following gynecological emergencies: ovarian hemorrhage, ectopic pregnancy, tumor rupture, torsion, hemorrhage, infarction, and pelvic inflammatory disease [13].

In patients with high-grade bowel obstruction, CT sensitivity varies from 86%-100%, with slightly lower sensitivity reported for low-grade obstruction [14-16]. In this regard, CT considerably outperforms the combination of clinical evaluation and radiographs [15]. CT also has the ability to identify and localize the cause of obstruction in 73%-95% of cases [14-16]. Additionally, it can identify closed-loop obstruction (sensitivity 79%) and associated strangulation (sensitivity 67%) [17]. For intestinal ischemia, reported sensitivity of CT varies from 65%-86% [18,19] based on findings of vessel thrombosis, intramural or portal gas, and lack of bowel wall enhancement. For intestinal infarction, CT (sensitivity 82%) considerably outperforms radiography plus US (sensitivity 28%) [20]. In gut perforation, while radiographs are sensitive to small volumes of free air, CT is more sensitive to even smaller volumes and can detect additional loculated air or air in the mesenteric root [21]. Other CT findings include extravasation of oral contrast, mesenteric edema, or phlegmonous mass adjacent to a site of perforation.

In patients with Crohn's disease or inflammatory colitis, the presence of fever raises the question of associated abscess or phlegmon, although CT is the procedure of choice for the diagnosis of abscess, regardless of cause [22,23]. The accuracy of US in detecting abscess formation among patients with known Crohn's disease has been reported to be 86.9% compared to 91.8% for CT [24]. In addition, CT can show the extent of any related fistulas or sinus tracts [23,25]. However, the diagnostic accuracy of US and barium studies in detecting internal fistulas has been reported to be similar: 85.2% for US and 84.8% for barium studies [24]. Pseudomembranous colitis may have fever without abscess; CT findings are present in the colon in 88% of cases [26]. While Tc 99m HMPAO white cell-labeled scanning has a high sensitivity for inflammatory bowel disease (91%-98%) and may have some role in diagnosing appendicitis in older patients [27-29], it does not do as well as CT in detecting the complications of

abscess and fistula [30]. Rarely, diffuse tumors such as lymphomas or metastases may present with abdominal pain and fever; again, CT is the procedure of choice due to its ability to assess well all node groups and organs.

Acute Abdominal Pain with Fever in the HIV-Positive Patient

Common causes of acute diffuse abdominal pain with fever in the HIV-positive patient are more diverse than they are in other patients. In addition to more usual conditions, typhlitis, intramural gut hemorrhage, and small bowel or colonic perforation with associated abscess may occur. The liver and biliary tree may be involved with HIV-related cholangiopathy, hepatic abscesses, or hepatic bacillary angiomatosis, a peliosis-like condition. The spleen is subject to focal infarction or abscess [31]. Gut mucosal disease may include GI tuberculosis, ulcerating colitis cytomegalovirus (CMV), clostridium difficile, histoplasmosis, candida, mycobacterium avium complex (MAC)-related enteritis, and opportunistic bowel infection (cryptosporidiosis, giardia, Isospora, and strongyloides). Tumors with adenopathy and bowel involvement include Kaposi's sarcoma and lymphoma of gut, either of which may lead to bowel obstruction, pneumatosis intestinalis, perforation, or intussusception [32].

CT with oral, IV, and (frequently) rectal contrast is almost always the procedure of choice in an HIV-positive patient with acute abdominal pain and fever [32-35]. Supplemental barium studies of the mucosa of the stomach, small bowel, and colon may add additional information to that obtained from CT, particularly when mucosal lesions are small and fine. If there is any chance of gut perforation, barium should not be used. Occasionally, US of the biliary tree and gallbladder may be useful in evaluating HIV-related cholangiopathy. If CT is performed, radiographs have little incremental value. The use of radionuclide scanning in this subgroup has not been reported.

Suspected Abdominal Abscess

Patients suspected of having abdominal abscesses may present in a number of ways: with fever, with diffuse or localized abdominal pain, or with a history of a condition that may predispose to abdominal abscesses, such as recent surgery and inflammatory bowel disease, pancreatitis, etc. Imaging studies that have been used to detect abdominal abscesses include: radiographs (supine and upright, and occasionally decubitus views); nuclear medicine studies such as gallium, indium, or technetium tagged leukocyte studies; US; CT; and more recently MRI. Unfortunately, much of the literature for radiography, gallium and indium leukocytes scintigraphy, and CT scanning is more than a decade old. The current literature has recently focused on the role of CT in

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.

percutaneous drainage of abdominal abscesses. The implication is that CT scan is already the primary means of making the diagnosis of abdominal abscess.

CT scanning has been shown to be the first and best test for diagnosing of intra-abdominal abscess in patients who have recently had abdominal surgery, and in patients with localizing signs for abscess [36]. Among intensive care unit (ICU) patients with sepsis of unknown origin, CT of the torso revealed the source of sepsis in 5 of 38 patients, and CT of the abdomen and pelvis revealed the source of sepsis in 7 of 45 patients [37]. The CT scan can be very helpful in determining whether a patient with pancreatitis has developed a pancreatic abscess and can occasionally be useful in detecting abscess formation in patients with diverticulitis or Crohn's disease [38-41]. However, its sensitivity in detecting abscesses in this latter group of patients is reduced compared with the other categories mentioned above [42]. Although CT scans can be quite accurate in detecting abnormalities of the psoas, the differentiation of psoas abscesses from other psoas lesions is difficult when only imaging criteria are used [43].

US is often useful in specific cases, but when compared with CT scanning, the results are usually of lower sensitivity and specificity [44-46]. This is especially true in bacterial infections of the kidney [47]. Gallium scanning and indium and technetium leukocyte scanning are often useful when the CT scan is negative or equivocal [48-50]. Nuclear scintigraphy affords the possibility of whole-body imaging and the detection of sites of infection beyond the abdominal region. The literature on technetium-labeled leukocytes suggests a very high sensitivity and specificity for abdominal abscesses as well, although there are no adequate recent comparisons with CT [51,52]. Although gallium is excreted in the GI tract, making it a poor choice for the primary imaging of abdominal abscesses, among patients with persistent fever following colorectal surgery, the diagnostic accuracy for GA-67 in detecting occult abscesses has been reported to be as high as 91.2% (compared to diagnostic accuracy of 97.1% for CT among the same patients) [53]. One study suggests that MRI is an accurate examination for detecting abdominal abscesses [54].

There is little current information on radiography's role in detecting abdominal abscesses. Some reports suggest that radiographs may be useful, but this is far from proven [55].

Patients without previous surgery or with a low clinical suspicion of abscess are effectively evaluated with CT, and may also be studied with indium- or technetium-labeled leukocytes to search for infection or inflammation [56].

References

1. Mindelzun RE, Jeffrey RB. Unenhanced helical CT for evaluating acute abdominal pain: a little more cost, a lot more information. *Radiology* 1997; 205(1):43-45.
2. Taourel P, Baron MP, Pradel J, Fabre JM, Seneterre E, Bruel JM. Acute abdomen of unknown origin: impact of CT on diagnosis and management. *Gastrointest Radiol* 1992; 17(4):287-291.
3. Siewert B, Raptopoulos V, Mueller MF, Rosen MP, Steer M. Impact of CT on diagnosis and management of acute abdomen in patients initially treated without surgery. *AJR* 1997; 168(1):173-178.
4. Rosen MP, Sands DZ, Longmaid HE, Reynolds KF, Wagner M, Raptopoulos V. Impact of abdominal CT on the management of patients presenting to the emergency department with acute abdominal pain. *AJR* 2000; 174(5):1391-1396.
5. Roth C, Tello R, Sutherland K, Ptak T. Prediction rule for the etiology of vague abdominal pain in the emergency room: utility for imaging triage. *Invest Radiol* 2002; 37(10):552-556.
6. Lane MJ, Liu DM, Huynh MD, Jeffrey RB Jr, Mindelzun RE, Katz DS. Suspected acute appendicitis: nonenhanced helical CT in 300 consecutive patients. *Radiology* 1999; 213(2):341-346.
7. Son HJ, Lee SJ, Lee JH, et al. Clinical diagnosis of primary epiploic appendagitis: differentiation from acute diverticulitis. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2002; 34(4):435-438.
8. Urban BA, Fishman EK. Tailored helical CT evaluation of acute abdomen. *Radiographics* 2000; 20(3):725-749.
9. Gore RM, Miller FH, Pereles FS, Yaghmai V, Berlin JW. Helical CT in the evaluation of the acute abdomen. *AJR* 2000; 174(4):901-913.
10. Vardareli E, Kebapci M, Saricam T, Pasaoglu O, Acikalin M. Tuberculous peritonitis of the wet ascitic type: clinical features and diagnostic value of image-guided peritoneal biopsy. *Dig Liver Dis* 2004; 36(3):199-204.
11. Varras M, Polyzos D, Perouli E, Noti P, Pantazis I, Akrivis Ch. Tubo-ovarian abscesses: spectrum of sonographic findings with surgical and pathological correlations. *Clin Exp Obstet Gynecol* 2003; 30(2-3):117-121.
12. Roebuck DJ, Metreweli C. Radiation risk in CT for acute abdominal pain. *Radiology* 1998; 209(1):287-288.
13. Nishino M, Hayakawa K, Iwasaku K, Takasu K. Magnetic resonance imaging findings in gynecological emergencies. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2003; 27(4):564-570.
14. Megibow AJ, Balthazar EJ, Cho KC, Medwid SW, Birnbaum BA, Noz ME. Bowel obstruction: evaluation with CT. *Radiology* 1991; 180(2):313-318.
15. Frager D, Medwid SW, Baer JW, Mollinelli B, Friedman M. CT of small-bowel obstruction: value in establishing the diagnosis and determining the degree and cause. *AJR* 1994; 162(1):37-41.
16. Maglinte DD, Reyes BL, Harmon BH, et al. Reliability and role of plain film radiography and CT in the diagnosis of small-bowel obstruction. *AJR* 1996; 167(6):1451-1455.
17. Balthazar EJ, Birnbaum BA, Megibow AJ, Gordon RB, Whelen CA, Hulnick DH. Closed-loop and strangulating intestinal obstruction: CT signs. *Radiology* 1992; 185(3):769-775.
18. Taourel PG, Deneuille M, Pradel JA, Regent D, Bruel JM. Acute mesenteric ischemia: diagnosis with contrast-enhanced CT. *Radiology* 1996; 199(3):632-636.
19. Lund EC, Han SY, Holley HC, Berland LL. Intestinal ischemia. Comparison of plain radiographic and computed tomographic findings. *Radiographics* 1988; 8(6):1083-1108.
20. Klein HM, Lensing R, Klosterhalfen B, Tons C, Gunther RW. Diagnostic imaging of mesenteric infarction. *Radiology* 1995; 197(1):79-82.
21. Jeffrey RB, Federle MP, Wall S. Value of computed tomography in detecting occult gastrointestinal perforation. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 1983; 7(5):825-827.
22. Jacobs JE, Birnbaum BA. CT of inflammatory disease of the colon. *Semin Ultrasound CT MR* 1995; 16(2):91-101.

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.

23. Gore RM, Balthazar EJ, Ghahremani GG, Miller FH. CT features of ulcerative colitis and Crohn's disease. *AJR* 1996; 167(1):3-15.
24. Maconi G, Sampietro GM, Parente F, et al. Contrast radiology, computed tomography and ultrasonography in detecting internal fistulas and intra-abdominal abscesses in Crohn's disease: a prospective comparative study. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2003; 98(7):1545-1555.
25. Fukuya T, Hawes DR, Lu CC, Barloon TJ. CT of abdominal abscess with fistulous communication to the gastrointestinal tract. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 1991; 15(3):445-449.
26. Fishman EK, Kavuru M, Jones B, et al. Pseudomembranous colitis: CT evaluation of 26 cases. *Radiology* 1991; 180(1):57-60.
27. Giaffer MH, Tindale WB, Holdsworth D. Value of technetium-99m HMPAO-labeled leukocyte scintigraphy as an initial screening test in patients suspected of having inflammatory bowel disease. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 1996; 8(12):1195-1200.
28. Arndt JW, Grootsholten MI, van Hogezaand RA, Griffioen G, Lamers CB, Pauwels EK. Inflammatory bowel disease activity assessment using technetium-99m-HMPAO leukocytes. *Dig Dis Sci* 1997; 42(2):387-393.
29. Lin WY, Kao CH, Lin HT, Wang YL, Wang SJ, Liu TJ. 99Tcm-HMPAO-labelled white blood cell scans to detect acute appendicitis in older patients with an atypical clinical presentation. *Nucl Med Commun* 1997; 18(1):75-78.
30. Kolkman JJ, Falke TH, Roos JC, et al. Computed tomography and granulocyte scintigraphy in active inflammatory bowel disease: comparison with endoscopy and operative findings. *Dig Dis Sci* 1996; 41(4):641-650.
31. Bernabeu-Wittel M, Villanueva JL, Pachon J, et al. Etiology, clinical features and outcome of splenic microabscesses in HIV-infected patients with prolonged fever. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 1999; 18(5):324-329.
32. Wyatt SH, Fishman EK. The acute abdomen in individuals with AIDS. *Radiol Clin North Am* 1994; 32(5):1023-1043.
33. Merine DS, Fishman EK, Jones B, Nussbaum AR, Simmons T. Right lower quadrant pain in the immunocompromised patient: CT findings in 10 cases. *AJR* 1987; 149(6):1177-1179.
34. Kuhlman JE, Fishman EK. Acute abdomen in AIDS: CT diagnosis and triage. *Radiographics* 1990; 10(4):621-634.
35. Wu CM, Davis F, Fishman EK. Radiological evaluation of the acute abdomen in the patient with acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS): the role of CT scanning. *Semin Ultrasound CT MR* 1998; 19(2):190-199.
36. Porter JA, Loughry CW, Cook AJ. Use of the computerized tomographic scan in the diagnosis and treatment of abscesses. *Am J Surg* 1985; 150(2):257-262.
37. Barkhausen J, Stoblen F, Dominguez-Fernandez E, Henseke P, Muller RD. Impact of CT in patients with sepsis of unknown origin. *Acta Radiol* 1999; 40(5):552-555.
38. Labs JD, Sarr MG, Fishman EK, Siegelman SS, Cameron JL. Complications of acute diverticulitis of the colon: improved early diagnosis with computerized tomography. *Am J Surg* 1988; 155(2):331-335.
39. Abrosetti P, Robert J, Witzig JA. Incidence, outcome, and proposed management of isolated abscesses complicating acute left-sided colonic diverticulitis. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1992; 35(11):1072-1076.
40. Crass RA, Meyer AA, Jeffrey RB. Pancreatic abscess: impact of computerized tomography on early diagnosis and surgery. *Am J Surg* 1985; 150(1):127-131.
41. Rotman N, Chevret S, Pezet D, et al. Prognostic value of early computed tomographic scans in severe acute pancreatitis. *J Am Coll Surg* 1994; 179(5):538-544.
42. Heavey LR, Glazer GM, Francis IR, Fugenschuh D, Jasinski R. Abscesses with enteric communication: a potential pitfall in computed tomography. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 1987; 11(3):470-473.
43. Lenchick L, Dovgan DJ, Kier R. CT of the iliopsoas compartment: value in differentiating tumor, abscess, and hematoma. *AJR* 1994; 162(1):83-86.
44. Field TC, Pickleman J. Intra-abdominal abscess unassociated with prior operation. *Arch Surg* 1985; 120(7):821-824.
45. Dobrin PB, Gully PH, Greenlee HB, et al. Radiologic diagnosis of an intra-abdominal abscess. Do multiple tests help? *Arch Surg* 1986; 121(1):41-46.
46. Lundstedt C, Hederstrom E, Brismar J, Holmin T, Strand SE. Prospective investigation of radiologic methods in the diagnosis of intra-abdominal abscesses. *Acta Radiol Diagn* 1986; 27(1):49-54.
47. Soulen MC, Fishman EK, Goldman SM, Gatewood OM. Bacterial renal infection: role of CT. *Radiology* 1989; 171(3):703-707.
48. Jasinski RW, Glazer GM, Francis IR, Harkness RL. CT and ultrasound in abscess detection at specific anatomic sites: a study of 198 patients. *Comput Radiol* 1987; 11(1):41-47.
49. Goldman M, Ambrose NS, Droic Z, Hawker RJ, McCollum C. Indium-111-labeled leucocytes in the diagnosis of abdominal abscess. *Br J Surg* 1987; 74(3):184-186.
50. Baba AA, McKillop JH, Cuthbert GF, Neilson W, Gray HW, Anderson JR. Indium 111 leucocyte scintigraphy in abdominal sepsis. Do the results affect management? *Eur J Nucl Med* 1990; 16(4-6):307-309.
51. Lantto EH, Lantto TJ, Vorne M. Fast diagnosis of abdominal infections and inflammations with Technetium-99m-HMPAO labeled leukocytes. *J Nucl Med* 1991; 32(11):2029-2034.
52. Lantto EH. Leucocytes labeled with 99mTC-HMPAO in the detection of abdominal abscesses. *Eur J Surg* 1991; 157(8):469-472.
53. Tsai SC, Chao TH, Lin WY, Wang SJ. Abdominal abscesses in patients having surgery: an application of Ga-67 scintigraphic and computed tomographic scanning. *Clin Nucl Med* 2001; 26(9):761-764.
54. Hagggett PJ, Moore NR, Shearman JD, Travis SP, Jewell DP, Mortensen NJ. Pelvic and perineal complications of Crohn's disease: assessment using magnetic resonance imaging. *Gut* 1995; 36(3):407-410.
55. Field S, Guy PJ, Upsdell SM, Scourfield AE. The erect abdominal radiograph in the acute abdomen: should its routine use be abandoned? *Br Med J (Clin Res Ed)* 1985; 290(6486):1934-1936.
56. Paling MR, Gouse JC. Efficacy of abdominal computed tomography in evaluation of possible abdominal abscess. *J Comput Tomogr* 1986; 10(2):111-114.

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.