

# Hip Pain AUC

## 2022 update

02/22/2022

### Appropriateness of advanced imaging procedures\* in patients with hip pain and the following clinical presentations or diagnoses:

\*Including MRI, CT, MR arthrography, CT arthrography, bone scan, SPECT and PET

Abbreviation list:

AAOS	American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons	MDCT	Multidetector computed tomography
ACR	American College of Radiology	MRI	Magnetic resonance imaging
ANZHR	Australian and New Zealand Hip Fracture Registry	NICE	National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
APTA	American Physical Therapy Association	OA	Osteoarthritis
AVN	Avascular necrosis	ON	Osteonecrosis
BOA	British Orthopaedic Association	PD	Proton density
CT	Computed tomography	PET	Positron emission tomography
DOD	Department of Defense	PLE	Provider Led Entity
EULAR	European League Against Rheumatism	SIGN	Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network
FAI	Femoral acetabular impingement	SPECT	Single-photon emission computerized tomography
		VA	Department of Veterans Affairs

# Appropriate Use Criteria: How to Use this Document

The RAYUS Quality Institute follows the recommendation framework defined by the Appraisal of Guidelines for Research & Evaluation (AGREE II), AMSTAR 2 (A Measurement Tool to Assess Systematic Reviews) and a modified version of the QUADAS-2 (Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies) to evaluate the strength of recommendations concerning advanced imaging. Considerations used to determine a recommendation are listed below.

**Primary recommendation (green):** Strong recommendation for imaging. There is confidence that the desirable effects of imaging outweigh its undesirable effects.

**Alternative recommendation (yellow):** Conditional recommendation for imaging. The desirable effects of imaging likely outweigh its undesirable effects, although some uncertainty may exist. Alternative imaging recommendations may be indicated with a contraindication to the primary recommendation, in specific clinical scenarios, or when the primary recommendation results are inconclusive or incongruent with the patient's clinical diagnosis. Case-by-case indications to consider have been noted in brackets when appropriate.

**Recommendation against imaging (red):** The test may not be accurate, may not be reliable, or the undesirable effects of imaging outweigh any desirable effects. Additionally, the recommendation may be impractical or not feasible in the targeted population and/or practice setting(s).

## Hip Pain AUC Summary:

- In most instances, **MRI (without contrast)** is the initial advanced imaging procedure of choice for hip pain. It is indicated for suspected labral or tendon tears, bursitis, and suspected occult or stress fractures not identified on initial radiographs.
  - The addition of MRI contrast can be helpful for imaging indeterminate or aggressive bone lesions noted on radiographs, or to evaluate equivocal or non-diagnostic findings on recent noncontrast MRI when osteomyelitis or osteonecrosis is suspected.
  - MRI is otherwise generally indicated for patients whose pain and dysfunction persists after four to six weeks of conservative therapy and who have normal or nondiagnostic radiographs.
- **MR arthrography** may increase the sensitivity of MRI for labral tears. It can also be useful in patients with unexplained pain that is unresponsive to conservative therapy. **CT arthrography** is generally reserved for patients unable to undergo MRI.
- **CT (without contrast)** is generally recommended for further evaluation of non-diagnostic findings on recent noncontrast MRI or for patients who are unable to undergo MRI. It can also be used in selected scenarios when surgical planning or evaluation of healing are necessary, or when the patient has increased or equivocal uptake on a previously performed bone scan.
- **Conventional radiographs** are commonly used for the initial evaluation of a suspected fracture, osteoarthritis, or other unexplained pain of suspected hip etiology.
- **Ultrasound**, while not defined as an advanced imaging modality, can be useful to assess suspected periarticular tendinopathy, tendon tears, and/or bursitis, particularly when MRI is not available. Its use should be limited to dedicated and trained experts.
- **Bone scan** can be useful for patients with suspected stress or occult fracture, osteonecrosis, or osteomyelitis for evaluating recent findings on noncontrast MRI, or when MRI is not available. It is also indicated whenever a possible metastatic lesion is suspected. The addition of SPECT or SPECT/CT, when available, may increase the specificity of a bone scan.

---

## Hip, buttock or thigh pain with suspected stress (fatigue), fragility (insufficiency), or occult fracture of the hip; radiographs normal or non-diagnostic:

- **Green** – MRI hip without IV contrast
- **Yellow** – CT hip without IV contrast  
[further evaluate non-diagnostic findings on recent\* MRI without IV contrast; or patient unable to undergo MRI; or patient has increased or equivocal uptake on previous bone scan; or evaluation of healing is necessary]
- **Yellow** – Bone scan (bone scan/SPECT or bone scan/SPECT/CT or planar bone scan)  
[further evaluate non-diagnostic findings on recent\* MRI without IV contrast; or patient unable to undergo MRI]
- **Red** – MRI hip with IV contrast; MRI hip without and with IV contrast; MR arthrography; CT hip with IV contrast; CT hip without and with IV contrast; CT arthrography; PET; Multiphase bone scan

\*Recent is typically defined as < 1 month (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

Level of Evidence: MRI: moderate; CT, bone scan, SPECT: low; MR with IV contrast, MR arthrography, CT arthrography, PET: PLE expert panel consensus opinion

### Notes concerning applicability and/or patient preferences:

Nuclear medicine studies fused with CT (or MRI) are not yet widely available, and therefore may have applicability or generalizability issues in the community outpatient setting (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

### Guideline and PLE expert panel consensus opinion summary:

#### **Overview**

Although they are not particularly sensitive, conventional radiographs should be the initial imaging study of choice for suspected insufficiency or fatigue fractures in the pelvis or hip (Bencardino et al [ACR] 2017\*; BOA 2014; SIGN 2009). However, the diagnosis of hip fracture is easily missed and, in a small minority of patients, the fracture may not be apparent on conventional radiographs (NICE 2017; SIGN 2009). Additionally, it is not advisable to wait more than ten days for repeat radiographs, as some stress fractures of the hip are high risk, and delays in diagnosis may increase the risk of nonunion, delayed union, displacement, and/or avascular necrosis (Bencardino et al [ACR] 2017; PLE expert panel consensus opinion). Therefore, MRI is the investigation of choice for suspected hip fracture that is not apparent on initial radiographs (NICE 2017). Other imaging modalities used to assist in the early detection of occult hip fractures may include CT or bone scan (NICE 2017; Bussieres et al 2007). The type of secondary imaging modality is often determined by considerations of access and availability of radiological expertise (NICE 2017).

#### **MRI**

At least 90% of proximal femoral fractures will be identified on radiographs, and therefore, MRI without IV contrast is reserved for second-line imaging in instances of negative radiographs with continued clinical suspicion for fracture, rather than first-line modality (Ross et al [ACR] 2019). Moderate evidence supports MRI as the advanced imaging exam of choice for diagnosis of presumed hip fracture not

apparent on initial radiographs or when there is doubt regarding the diagnosis (AAOS 2014, moderate recommendation; ANZHFR 2014: consensus-based recommendation; NICE 2017; SIGN 2009: grade D recommendation; Ross et al [ACR] 2019; Bencardino et al [ACR] 2017). MRI is usually considered the reference standard for this scenario, as numerous studies have found MRI to have the highest accuracy (100% sensitivity and 93%-100% specificity), depending on experience and skill of interpreting radiologist (NICE 2017). In addition to increased sensitivity for fracture detection, MRI can be useful for characterizing fracture morphology (Ross et al [ACR] 2019). With the diagnostic accuracy of noncontrast MRI approaching 100%, there is little need for addition of IV gadolinium contrast solely for the purposes of fracture detection (Ross et al [ACR] 2019).

## **CT**

Due to the quality of existing literature, potential harm with radiation exposure, and decreased sensitivity, CT is not recommended for initial evaluation of occult hip fracture (AAOS 2014; Bencardino et al [ACR] 2017). However, if MRI is not available within 24 hours, or is contraindicated, CT should be considered (ANZHFR 2014: consensus-based recommendation; NICE 2017; Bencardino et al [ACR] 2017). It may also play an adjunctive role when other modalities are equivocal (Bencardino et al [ACR] 2017).

## **Bone scan**

In current practice, the role of bone scanning as a secondary line of imaging in patients with contraindications to MRI has largely been usurped by CT (Ross et al [ACR] 2019). However, if MRI is not available or not feasible, a bone scan can be performed, as it is very sensitive for stress reactions (SIGN 2009: grade D recommendation). Yet bone scan is nonspecific, and supplemental imaging may still be required in areas of abnormal uptake to obtain a diagnosis and avoid false positives (Bencardino et al [ACR] 2017). Additionally, in elderly and osteoporotic patients, abnormalities may not show up on bone scan for several days following injury (Bencardino et al [ACR] 2017). When bone scan is used to evaluate for an occult fracture of the hip, SPECT technique should be used, if available, as it increases the specificity of the exam (Bencardino et al [ACR] 2017; PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

\*This guideline did not pass the AGREE II cutoff score, but was included for its direct relevance to this clinical scenario.

## Clinical notes:

- “Hip” insufficiency or fragility fractures refer to fractures of the proximal femur, acetabulum, and ischiopubic ring (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).
- Clinical features of stress fractures include exertional anterior hip pain, especially after an increase in training regimen, chronic repetitive overloads in athletes, or reduced mechanical bone properties (athletic amenorrhea, osteoporosis, corticosteroid use) (Bussièrès et al 2007).
- Clinical features of an osteoporotic femoral neck fracture include age > 65 years, onset before or after a fall, inability to walk, and display of shortening and external rotation (Bussièrès et al 2007).
- A high index of clinical suspicion for hip fracture is required in patients with a typical history – usually hip pain following trauma – as features such as the inability to bear weight or a shortened, abducted and externally rotated leg may be absent (NICE 2017; Bussièrès et al 2007).
- Radiographs should be the initial imaging study for most suspected abnormalities of the hip and pelvis (ACR-SPR-SSR Practice Parameter 2021).
- In patients with insufficiency fractures of the hip, consider dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry (DEXA) to assess for osteoporosis (Bussièrès et al 2007).

### Imaging notes:

- Cross-sectional imaging of the hip for insufficiency fracture should also include the sacrum and pelvis. Sacral fractures commonly occur in this population and may result in groin/hip pain (Bencardino et al [ACR] 2017; PLE expert panel consensus opinion).
- MRI for suspected fracture should include T1 and fluid sensitive sequences (STIR or T2 fat saturation) (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).
- Limited MR protocols (T1 coronal and STIR coronal images of the pelvis/hips) can be used in emergent settings to exclude a hip fracture (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).
- When CT is used, the “as low as reasonably achievable radiation dose” principle should be adhered to (e.g., Mayo-Smith et al 2014).

### Evidence update (2016-present):

#### **High Level of Evidence**

Haj-Mirzaian et al (2020), in a systematic review and meta-analysis, estimated the frequency of radiographically occult hip fracture in elderly patients and determined diagnostic performance of CT and bone scanning with MRI as the reference standard. Studies were included if patients were clinically suspected to have hip fracture but without radiographic evidence (including absence of any definite fracture or only presence of isolated greater trochanter [GT] fracture). The pooled rate of occult fracture, diagnostic performance of CT and bone scanning, and strength of evidence (SOE) were assessed. A total of thirty-five studies were identified (n = 2992 patients; mean age, 76.8 years). The frequency of occult fracture was 39% (1110 of 2835 patients; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 35%-43%) in studies of patients with no definite radiographic fracture and 92% (134 of 157 patients; 95% CI: 83%-98%) in studies of patients with radiographic evidence of isolated GT fracture (moderate SOE). CT and bone scanning yielded comparable diagnostic performance in detecting radiographically occult hip fracture (P = .67), with a sensitivity of 79% and 87%, respectively (low SOE). The authors conclude that elderly patients with acute hip pain and negative or equivocal findings on radiography have a high frequency of occult hip fractures. Therefore, the performance of advanced imaging (preferably MRI) may be clinically appropriate in all such patients.

#### **Moderate Level of Evidence**

Wilson et al (2020), in a systematic review and meta-analysis, evaluated the diagnostic accuracy of limited MRI protocols for detecting radiographically occult proximal femoral fracture. Articles of radiographically occult proximal femoral fractures compared with multiparametric MRI with or without clinical outcome as the reference standard were included. Eleven studies with 938 patients and 247 proximal femoral fractures met inclusion criteria, and five were included in the meta-analysis. The pooled and weighted summary sensitivity and specificity and the area under the summary ROC curve for limited MRI protocols in detecting radiographically occult hip fractures were 99% (95% CI, 91–100%), 99% (95% CI, 97–100%), and 1 (95% CI, 0.99–1), respectively. The aggregate sensitivity and specificity values for a single-plane T1-weighted sequence only, STIR sequence only, T1-weighted and STIR sequences, and T2-weighted sequence only were as follows: 97% (89/92) and 100% (76/76), 99% (126/127) and 99% (865/873), 100% (118/118) and 99% (867/874), and 86% (51/59) and 97% (137/141), respectively. Sensitivity was 100% (58/58) when images were acquired on 3-T scanners only and 99% (284/288) when interpreted only by certified radiologists. The mean scanning time for limited MRI protocols was less than 5 minutes. The authors conclude that limited protocols can be used as a standard of care in these patients; a protocol of coronal T1-weighted and STIR sequences is 100% sensitive.

**Low Level of Evidence**

Haims et al (2021) retrospectively evaluated the negative predictive value of CT for occult hip or pelvis fracture in the setting of negative radiographs among elderly patients (n = 237; age > 65) presenting to the emergency department. There were a total of 81 cases with a negative index CT, as determined by 2 musculoskeletal radiologists, and with some form of imaging follow-up (MRI, CT, or radiographs) performed within the following 18 months. A total of eight (9.9%) patients had a fracture on follow-up imaging, with three involving the femoral neck or intertrochanteric femur. The negative predictive value of the index CT was 90.1%, which improved to 96.3% among surgically relevant fracture cases. The authors conclude that while CT for occult hip fracture has a high negative predictive value, there are cases not detected with surgical implications.

---

## Hip pain with suspected labral tear (with or without femoral acetabular impingement syndrome):

- **Green** – MRI hip without IV contrast
- **Green** – MR arthrography hip
- **Yellow** – CT arthrography hip  
[patient unable to undergo MRI]
- **Yellow** – CT bilateral hips without IV contrast (with 3D reformations)  
[pre-surgical planning is necessary]
- **Red** – MRI hip with IV contrast; MRI without and with IV contrast; CT hip with IV contrast; CT hip without and with IV contrast; bone scan; SPECT; PET

Level of Evidence: MRI, MR arthrography: moderate; CT, CT arthrography: low; bone scan, SPECT, PET: PLE expert panel consensus opinion

### Notes concerning applicability and/or patient preferences:

Femoral acetabular impingement (FAI) is a clinical syndrome typically seen in younger patients. It is rare for patients over age 65 to present with primary FAI, and MR arthrography may not always be appropriate in this group (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

### Guideline and PLE expert panel consensus opinion summary:

Initial advanced imaging investigations for labral tear and femoroacetabular impingement include unenhanced MRI and MR arthrography. MRI has a reported high accuracy (89%-95%) in detecting labral tears (Enseki et al [APTA] 2014), and the use of high-resolution 3T MRI may improve visualization and obviate the need for intra-articular contrast (Mintz et al [ACR] 2016). Currently, the most common imaging procedure used to confirm the diagnosis of intra-articular pathology, such as labral tears or chondral lesions, is MR arthrography (Enseki et al [APTA] 2014). Compared to the gold standard of arthroscopic visual inspection, MR arthrography has a reported sensitivity of 71%-100% and a reported specificity of 44%-71% in detecting labral tears (Enseki et al [APTA] 2014). It has also been reported to have a high accuracy (90%) in patients undergoing diagnostic arthroscopy for labral resection (Bussi eres et al 2007: grade D recommendation). CT arthrography can be useful for patients who cannot undergo MR imaging (PLE expert panel consensus opinion). CT may be used to determine the osseous architecture of the hip and provide additional information for purposes of surgical planning (Enseki et al [APTA] 2014). If CT is obtained for surgical planning, the examination should include 3D reformations (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

### Clinical notes:

- Clinical features of labral tear and femoroacetabular impingement typically include “knife sharp” groin pain, painful giving way syndrome, locking, painful clunk or snapping hip, and painful apprehension and impingement tests (Bussi eres et al 2007).
- Radiographs should be the initial imaging study for most suspected abnormalities of the hip and pelvis (*ACR-SPR-SSR Practice Parameter* 2021; Enseki et al [APTA] 2014).
- An anteroposterior radiograph of the pelvis and a lateral femoral neck view of the symptomatic hip should initially be performed to obtain an overview of the hips, to identify cam or pincer morphologies, and to identify other causes of hip pain. Where further assessment of hip

morphology and associated cartilage and labral lesions is desired, cross-sectional imaging is appropriate (Griffin et al 2016).

- Radiographic evidence of femoroacetabular impingement is common in active patients with hip complaints. Descriptive studies based on retrospective observations report that osseous abnormalities were present in up to 87% of patients presenting with labral tears (Enseki et al [APTA] 2014).
- Many asymptomatic patients have imaging evidence of cam and pincer FAI. Frank et al, in a 2015 systematic review of 2114 asymptomatic subjects assessed by MR or radiographs, found that 37% had cam FAI measurements and 67% had pincer FAI measurements. Of those undergoing MR, 68% had labral tears (Frank et al 2015). *Note: The PLE expert panel thought that this paper was important. It underscores the concept that FAI is a clinical syndrome and that FAI morphologic features are only important in young patients presenting with the appropriate symptoms and clinical signs. Conversely, the presence of these features in asymptomatic patients does not invalidate their importance in the treatment of patients with femoral acetabular impingement syndrome.*
- Chondral lesions are an important component of the pathology related to FAI and labral tears, with a strong correlation between chondral loss/delamination adjacent to labral tears in patients with cam FAI (Enseki et al [APTA] 2014). The integrity of the articular cartilage is of paramount importance to the health of the hip (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).
- Morphology is better characterized on cross-section imaging, either CT or MRI. This is particularly important if surgery is being considered (Griffin et al 2016).
- Intra-articular hip injection can be performed with local anesthetic, with or without cortisone, to determine if the patient's symptoms are arising from the hip. Local anesthetic can be injected at the time of MR arthrography or CT arthrography if indicated (Mintz et al [ACR] 2016; Enseki et al [APTA] 2014).

#### Imaging notes:

- Cartilage specific sequences (PD, PD fat saturation or T2 fat saturation) should be part of any MRI or MR arthrography examination of the hip in patients being evaluated for an acetabular tear or femoral acetabular impingement (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).
- The presence of subchondral marrow edema and subchondral cyst has an adverse effect on the prognosis of patients with FAI. Any MRI or MR arthrography obtained for labral tears or femoral acetabular impingement should include a fluid-sensitive sequence (STIR or T2 fat saturation) in the coronal plane (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

#### Evidence update (2014-present):

##### **High Level of Evidence**

Frank et al (2015), in a systematic review, addressed the incidence of radiographic findings suggestive of FAI in asymptomatic individuals. The prevalence of an asymptomatic cam deformity was 37%-54.8% in athletes, versus 23.1% in the general population. The prevalence of asymptomatic hips with pincer deformity was 67% (range 61%-76% between studies). Only 7 studies reported on labral injury, which was found on MRI without intra-articular contrast in 68% of hips. The authors concluded FAI morphologic features and labral injuries are common in asymptomatic patients.

##### **Moderate Level of Evidence**

Chopra et al (2018) compared the diagnostic accuracy of conventional 3T MRI vs. 1.5T MR arthrography in 68 consecutive patients (median age 32 years) with FAI. All patients underwent both MRI and MR



arthrography, and two blinded MSK radiologists scored images for internal derangement, including labral and cartilage abnormality. A total of 39 (57%) patients subsequently underwent hip arthroscopy, and surgical results and radiology findings were analyzed. Results found both readers had higher (but not statistically significant) sensitivities for detecting labral tears with 3T MRI. For acetabular cartilage defect, both readers had higher (statistically significant) sensitivities using 3T MRI ( $p=0.02$ ). Both readers had a slightly higher (not statistically significant) sensitivity for detecting delamination with 1.5T MR arthrography. The authors conclude that conventional 3T MRI is equivalent to 1.5T MR arthrography in detecting acetabular labral tears and possibly superior to 1.5T MR arthrography in detecting a acetabular cartilage defects in patients with suspected FAI. 3T MRI is equivalent to 1.5T MR arthrography for diagnosing cartilage delamination.

Saied et al (2017), in systematic review and meta-analysis, aimed to detect the accuracy of conventional MRI (cMRI), direct MR arthrography and indirect MR arthrography for the diagnosis of chondral and labral lesions in FAI. A total of 21 studies ( $n = 828$  patients; mean age 34 years), using surgical comparison as the reference test, were included, with 12 studies included for meta-analysis. For labral lesions, the pooled sensitivity, specificity and area under the curve (AUC) were 0.864, 0.833, and 0.88 for cMRI and 0.91, 0.58, and 0.92 for direct MR arthrography. In chondral lesions, the pooled sensitivity, specificity and AUC were 0.76, 0.72, and 0.75 for cMRI and 0.75, 0.79, and 0.83 for direct MR arthrography. The sensitivity and specificity for indirect MR arthrography were 0.722 and 0.917. The authors conclude that diagnostic test accuracy of direct MR arthrography was superior to cMRI for detection of labral and chondral lesions. Promising results were found for indirect MR arthrography, but further studies will need to fully assess its diagnostic accuracy.

Reiman et al (2017), in a systematic review and meta-analysis, summarized and evaluated the diagnostic accuracy and clinical utility of various imaging modalities and injection techniques relevant to hip FAI/acetabular labral tear (ALT). A total of 25 articles were included: no studies investigating FAI qualified for meta-analysis; twenty articles on ALT qualified for meta-analysis. Positive imaging findings increased the probability that a labral tear existed by a minimal to small degree with use of MRI/MR arthrography and ultrasound, and by a moderate degree for CT arthrography. Negative imaging findings decreased the probability that a labral tear existed by a minimal degree with use of MRI and ultrasound, a small to moderate degree with MR arthrography, and a moderate degree with CT arthrography. The meta-analysis showed that CT arthrography demonstrated the strongest overall diagnostic accuracy, with pooled sensitivities of 0.91 (95% CI: 0.83-0.96) and pooled specificities of 0.89 (95% CI: 0.74-0.97).

### **Low Level of Evidence**

Saied et al (2019), in a retrospective study, assessed the reliability of direct MR arthrography and conventional MRI in diagnosing labral lesions in patients with symptoms of femoroacetabular impingement (FAI). Imaging and surgical data were collected from 5 high-volume centers, with a total of 490 patients included. Preoperative imaging findings were compared with actual surgical findings regarding labral condition in order to assess the effectiveness of MRI and MR arthrography. Results found accuracy to be slightly higher for MRI (71.4%) compared to MR arthrography (68.2%), while MR arthrography had higher sensitivity (74.4%,) compared to MRI (66.9%). The authors conclude that MRI and MR arthrography may both be useful for diagnosing acetabular labral lesions.

Neumann et al (2019) retrospectively sought to validate *scoring hip osteoarthritis with MRI (SHOMRI)* gradings in preoperative hip MRI with intra-arthroscopic evaluation of intraarticular hip abnormalities. Preoperative non-arthrographic 3.0-T MRIs of 39 patients (40 hips) with femoroacetabular impingement (FAI) syndrome, refractory to conservative measures, that underwent hip arthroscopy were

retrospectively assessed by two radiologists for chondrolabral abnormalities and compared with intra-arthroscopic findings as the reference standard. Arthroscopically accessible regions were compared with the corresponding SHOMRI subregions and assessed for presence and grade of cartilaginous pathologies in the acetabulum and femoral head. 58.8% of surgical cases showed chondral defects. SHOMRI scoring showed a sensitivity of 95.7% and specificity of 84.8% in detecting cartilage lesions. Labral tears were present in all cases and the MR readers identified 92.5% correctly. ICC showed good interobserver agreement of 86.3% (95% CI 80.0-90.6%). The authors conclude that SHOMRI grading of the hip proves to be a reliable and precise method to assess chondrolabral hip joint abnormalities.

Annabell et al (2018) analyzed the sensitivity and specificity of non-contrast 3T MRI in identifying intra-articular hip pathology in 68 patients (71 hips). Two MSK radiologists reported data independently, and all arthroscopies were performed by a single surgeon. Accuracy of MRI for ligamentum teres tears, labral damage, and chondral rim lesions was 85.92% for each instance. Sensitivity/specificity of MRI was 91.2%/47% for ligamentum teres tears, 90.2%/70% for labral damage, and 91.4%/61.5% for chondral rim lesions. MRI findings most consistent with labral tears include presence of linear high signal traversing the articular surface into the labrum, presence of intra-labral fluid signal, and loss of homogenous low signal triangular morphology. The authors conclude that tears and synovitis of the ligamentum teres as potential sources of hip pain can be accurately identified on conventional non-arthrographic MRI. However, MRI has poor specificity and negative predictive value, and thus, a negative MRI result may warrant further investigation.

Grace et al (2018) utilized the *Scoring Hip Osteoarthritis with Magnetic Resonance Imaging (SHOMRI)* system to assess intraarticular pathology in 43 symptomatic FAI patients and correlated the *SHOMRI* scores with chondrolabral changes found during hip arthroscopy. Prior to surgery, radiographs, and MRI were obtained and all patients completed the *Hip disability and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (HOOS)* questionnaire. Each MRI was graded using the *SHOMRI* system. Scores were then correlated with intraoperative cartilage and labral grades, preoperative radiographic findings, and *HOOS* scores. *SHOMRI* total scores correlated with intraoperative femoral cartilage grade ( $\rho = 0.42$ ;  $p = 0.002$ ), acetabular cartilage grade ( $\rho = 0.30$ ;  $p = 0.046$ ), and labral tear grade ( $\rho = 0.42$ ;  $p = 0.003$ ) as well as with preoperative Tönnis grade ( $\rho = 0.37$ ,  $p = 0.013$ ), *HOOS* pain score ( $\rho = -0.33$ ;  $p = 0.039$ ), *HOOS* ADL score ( $\rho = -0.39$ ;  $p = 0.007$ ), and *HOOS* sports score ( $\rho = -0.30$ ;  $p = 0.037$ ). The authors conclude that the *SHOMRI* system showed significant correlation with arthroscopic findings and radiographic gradings and clinical symptoms in patients with FAI.

---

## Hip pain with suspected periarticular tendinopathy, tendon tear, and/or bursitis:

- **Green** – MRI hip without IV contrast
- **Yellow** – CT hip without IV contrast  
[patient unable to undergo MRI and ultrasound expertise is not available]
- **Red** – MRI hip with IV contrast; MRI hip without and with IV contrast; MR arthrography; CT hip with IV contrast; CT hip without and with IV contrast; CT arthrography; bone scan; SPECT; PET

Level of Evidence: MRI, CT and bone scan: very low; MR arthrography, CT arthrography, PET: PLE expert panel consensus opinion

Notes concerning applicability and/or patient preferences: Where expertise is available, ultrasound has been shown to be accurate in the evaluation of periarticular tendons and bursitis of the hip (Mintz et al [ACR] 2016; PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

### Guideline and PLE expert panel consensus opinion summary:

For the clinical diagnoses of strain, tendinitis, tendinosis, or other abnormalities involving the surrounding soft tissue of the hip, noncontrast MRI is the primary imaging modality, as it is both highly sensitive and specific (Mintz et al [ACR] 2016; Bussi eres et al 2007: grade D recommendation). It is particularly useful in detecting musculotendinous pathologies, such as iliopsoas tendinopathy or chronic/recurrent bursitis (Enseki et al [APTA] 2014; Bussi eres et al 2007: grade D recommendation). CT is less sensitive than MRI or ultrasound for evaluation of soft tissue, and should only be considered if the patient is unable to undergo MRI and ultrasound expertise is also not available (Mintz et al [ACR] 2016; PLE expert panel consensus opinion). Nuclear medicine does not currently play a role in the workup of these conditions (Mintz et al [ACR] 2016).

### Clinical notes:

- Radiographs should be the initial imaging study for most suspected abnormalities of the hip and pelvis (*ACR-SPR-SSR Practice Parameter* 2021).
- If the patient is unable to undergo MRI, ultrasound should be considered to evaluate for periarticular tendinopathy, tendon tear and/or bursitis (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).
- Ultrasound is useful to evaluate periarticular musculotendinous abnormalities, although the accuracy may vary significantly depending on user expertise and experience. Ultrasound is also useful to guide periarticular injections and can be useful to diagnose dynamic abnormalities such as snapping iliopsoas tendons (Mintz et al [ACR] 2016).
- In nontraumatic trochanteric and iliopsoas bursitis, ultrasound is an easy-to-perform and fast alternative. However, it fails to demonstrate iliopsoas bursitis in about 40% of cases (Bussi eres et al 2007).
- Image-guided bursal and/or periarticular tendon injections with local anesthetic, with or without cortisone, can be useful for diagnostic and therapeutic purposes in patients with suspected periarticular tendon and bursal abnormalities (Mintz et al [ACR] 2016).

Evidence update (2015-present): No articles identified in the 2022 update that have impact on the guideline summary and recommendations listed above.

---

## Osteoarthritis of the hip on conventional radiography with any of the following

- **New-onset severe pain**
- **Significant change in symptoms**
- **Pain that is disproportionate to findings on repeat radiography**
- **Pre-surgical planning is necessary:**
  - **Green** – MRI hip without IV contrast
  - **Yellow** – CT hip without IV contrast  
[patient unable to undergo MRI]
  - **Yellow** – CT arthrography hip  
[patient unable to undergo MRI]
  - **Yellow** – Bone scan (bone scan/SPECT or bone scan/SPECT/CT or planar bone scan)  
[patient unable to undergo MRI]
  - **Red** – MRI hip with IV contrast; MRI without and with IV contrast; MR arthrography; CT hip with IV contrast; CT hip without and with IV contrast; PET; Multiphase bone scan

Level of Evidence: MRI: moderate; CT, CT arthrography, bone scan: low; MRI with IV contrast, MR arthrography, SPECT, PET: PLE expert panel consensus opinion

### Notes concerning applicability and/or patient preferences:

Nuclear medicine studies fused with CT (or MRI) are not yet widely available, and therefore may have applicability or generalizability issues in the community outpatient setting (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

### Guideline and PLE expert panel consensus opinion summary:

Imaging is typically not required to make the diagnosis in patients with typical presentation of osteoarthritis (Sakellariou et al [EULAR] 2017: Level of Evidence III-IV). However, in atypical presentations, it may be recommended to help confirm the diagnosis of and/or make alternative or additional diagnoses (Sakellariou et al [EULAR] 2017: Level of Evidence, IV). Imaging is also recommended if there is unexpected rapid progression of symptoms or change in clinical characteristics to determine if this relates to osteoarthritis or an additional diagnosis (Sakellariou et al [EULAR] 2017: Level of Evidence III-IV). Conventional radiography should be the initial study for the evaluation of hip pain, and may be useful for the detection and evaluation of arthritis (Mintz et al [ACR] 2016; Bussières et al 2007: grade D recommendation). To make additional diagnoses, soft tissues are best imaged by US or MRI, and bone by CT or MRI (Sakellariou et al [EULAR] 2017: Level of Evidence III-IV). In general, the VA/DOD suggests against obtaining magnetic resonance imaging for the diagnosis of osteoarthritis of the hip (VA/DOD 2020: “weak against” recommendation). However, some surgeons may elect to obtain MRI occasionally to answer specific clinical or surgical questions on a case-by-case basis (VA/DOD 2020).

### Clinical notes:

- Clinical features of osteoarthritis typically include age  $\geq$  40 years, hip pain only with possible protective limp, activity-induced symptoms, improvement with rest, stiffness in the morning or with periods of inactivity, and significant decrease in pain with weight loss and exercise in patients aged > 60 years (Bussières et al 2007).

- Clinicians must distinguish symptomatic osteoarthritis from other entities that can cause hip pain, including inflammatory (e.g., rheumatoid and psoriatic) arthritis, infectious and crystalline (e.g., gout, pseudogout) arthritis, and soft tissue lesions (Katz et al 2021).
- Radiographs should be the initial imaging study for most suspected abnormalities of the hip and pelvis (*ACR-SPR-SSR Practice Parameter* 2021). Hip radiographs typically include an anteroposterior view and a lateral view. Weight bearing is not necessary. The interrater and intrarater reliabilities of hip radiographs for detecting joint space narrowing are high (Katz et al 2021).

Evidence update (2013-present):

**Low Level of Evidence**

Crim et al (2019), in a retrospective study, assessed the concordance of radiographic assessment of osteoarthritis severity with findings of gross and microscopic evaluation analysis in the preoperative assessment for hip arthroplasty. Radiology and pathology reports from 953 consecutive femoral head resections were reviewed to establish correlation of findings. In 83 cases, MRI images were also available for review. Both radiologists and pathologists prospectively used a four-grade scale of absent, mild, moderate, or severe osteoarthritis. Radiographs showed severe osteoarthritis in 62.3% of patients, moderate in 20%, and no/mild in 17.7%. Observed agreement between radiology and pathology findings was 90%. There were significant discrepancies between radiography grade and pathology grade in 2.2% of cases. Observed agreement between radiography and MRI was 78%. The authors conclude that radiography findings are a reliable indicator of severity of osteoarthritis.

Nguyen et al (2018), in a prospective study, assessed clinical significance of increased FDG uptake on PET/CT in joints (65 patients) for evaluation of symptomatic OA and prediction of progression. Patients completed the *Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC)* questionnaire to assess joint pain, stiffness, and physical function. Standardized uptake values (SUVs) were measured in hip, knee, AC and GH joints. Scout PET/CT images were evaluated for OA using the Kellgren/Lawrence (K/L) system. Patients were followed for five years to determine progression of OA (follow-up imaging or surgical intervention). SUV of hip ( $r=0.260$ ,  $p=0.0027$ ) joints correlated with WOMAC overall scores and SUV of hip ( $r=0.203$ ,  $p=0.0199$ ) joints also correlated with K/L scores. SUV ROC AUC was 0.678 for hip for symptomatic OA detection. The authors conclude that FDG PET/CT may be helpful with localization of painful abnormalities in the inflamed regions of joints, which could potentially be used to direct individualized treatment in moderate and severe OA.

---

**Unexplained pain (hip, groin, buttock, thigh, knee) of suspected hip etiology that is unresponsive to 4-6 weeks of conservative therapy; radiographs normal or nondiagnostic:**

- **Green** – MRI hip without IV contrast
- **Yellow** – MR arthrography hip
- **Yellow** – CT arthrography hip  
[patient unable to undergo MRI]
- **Yellow** – Bone scan (bone scan/SPECT or bone scan/SPECT/CT or planar bone scan)  
[further evaluate non-diagnostic findings on recent\* MRI without IV contrast; or patient unable to undergo MRI]
- **Yellow** – CT hip without IV contrast  
[patient unable to undergo MRI; or pre-surgical planning is necessary; or patient has increased or equivocal uptake on previous bone scan]
- **Red** – MRI hip with and without IV contrast; MRI hip with IV contrast; CT hip with IV contrast; CT hip without and with IV contrast; PET; Multiphase bone scan

\*Recent is typically defined as < 1 month (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

Level of Evidence: MRI, MR arthrography: very low; CT, CT arthrography, bone scan, SPECT, PET: PLE expert panel consensus opinion

Notes concerning applicability and/or patient preferences:

Nuclear medicine studies fused with CT (or MRI) are not yet widely available, and therefore may have applicability or generalizability issues in the community outpatient setting (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

Guideline and PLE expert panel consensus opinion summary:

Radiographs of the pelvis and hip should be the first test ordered for the evaluation of patients with chronic hip pain (Mintz et al [ACR] 2016; Enseki et al [APTA] 2014). Clinicians should also consider a course of conservative management prior to advanced imaging (Enseki et al [APTA] 2014; PLE expert panel consensus opinion). While some guidelines note that a trial of conservative therapy is 4 weeks (e.g., Bussières et al 2007), the PLE expert panel recommended 6 weeks as a more appropriate interval to allow initial therapeutic interventions to show effectiveness (PLE expert panel consensus opinion). Following normal or equivocal radiographs, advanced imaging investigations for the evaluation of patients with chronic hip pain unresponsive to conservative therapy include MRI without contrast and MR arthrography (Bussières et al 2007: grade D recommendation; Mintz et al [ACR] 2016). MRI hip without IV contrast is typically the most appropriate modality to exclude the hip as a source of pain in patients presenting with chronic hip pain and low back, pelvic, or knee pathology (Mintz et al [ACR] 2016). While MRI provides better detail for assessing soft tissue integrity, MR arthrography (or CT arthrography if MR imaging is contraindicated) can be used for the assessment of intra-articular structures (Enseki et al [APTA] 2014; PLE expert panel consensus opinion). CT can be useful to assess osseous architecture of the hip and assist with pre-surgical planning (Enseki et al [APTA] 2014). Tc-99m bone scanning can be considered if better localization of symptoms is necessary (PLE expert panel consensus opinion). Bone scan can also be used to identify insufficiency or fragility fractures and early avascular necrosis (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

#### Clinical notes:

- Hip, buttock, groin and medial thigh pain may arise from the hip, spine, sacroiliac joints and knee, or from abdominal disorders (BOA 2014; Mintz et al [ACR] 2016).
- Radiographs should be the initial imaging study for most suspected abnormalities of the hip and pelvis (ACR-SPR-SSR Practice Parameter 2021).
- Intra-articular hip injection can be performed with local anesthetic, with or without cortisone, to determine if the patient's symptoms are arising from the hip. Local anesthetic can be injected at the time of MR arthrography or CT arthrography, if indicated (Mintz et al [ACR] 2016).
- Anesthetic injection can be considered in patients with chronic hip pain unresponsive to conservative therapy (Bussi eres et al 2007: grade D recommendation; Mintz et al [ACR] 2016).

#### Imaging notes:

- MRI protocol of an ipsilateral hip should include two sequences of the entire bony pelvis to include T1 and water sensitive sequences (STIR or T2 fat saturation) (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

#### Evidence update (2014s-present):

##### **Low Level of Evidence**

Keeney et al (2014), in a retrospective study, evaluated a number of parameters including the clinical indications that most commonly influence treatment decisions and likelihood that hip MRI influences treatment decisions separate from conventional radiographs. The authors concluded that although MRI can be valuable for diagnosing or staging specific conditions, it is not cost-effective as a screening tool for hip pain that is not supported by history, clinical examination, and conventional radiographic findings in patients between 40 and 80 years of age.

Neiman et al (2016), in a retrospective study, evaluated the prevalence of non-suspected pathologies revealed by hip MR arthrography in 229 patients (mean age 36.5; age range 18-67 years). The authors reported significant non-targeted pathologies in 76/229 (33%) MR arthrography, including athletic pubalgia, sacroiliitis, fractures, and muscle/tendon abnormalities. Physical examination/pain level could not differentiate between patients with and without non-suspected pathologies.

---

## Hip pain with suspected avascular necrosis (osteonecrosis):

- **Green** – MRI hip without IV contrast
- **Yellow** – MRI hip with IV contrast or MRI hip without and with IV contrast  
[further evaluate non-diagnostic findings on recent\* MRI without IV contrast]
- **Yellow** – Bone scan (bone scan/SPECT or bone scan/SPECT/CT or planar bone scan)  
[patient unable to undergo MRI]
- **Yellow** – CT bilateral hips without IV contrast  
[patient unable to undergo MRI; or pre-surgical planning is necessary]
- **Red** – MR arthrography; CT arthrography; CT hip with IV contrast; CT hip without and with IV contrast; PET

\*Recent is typically defined as < 1 month (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

Level of Evidence: MRI: moderate; CT, bone scan, SPECT: low; MR arthrography, CT arthrography, PET: PLE expert panel consensus opinion

### Notes concerning applicability and/or patient preferences:

Nuclear medicine studies fused with CT (or MRI) are not yet widely available, and therefore may have applicability or generalizability issues in the community outpatient setting (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

### Guideline and PLE expert panel consensus opinion summary:

In patients with hip pain who are at risk for avascular necrosis, radiographs should be the initial imaging examination (Murphey et al [ACR] 2015). MRI is the most sensitive and specific imaging modality for the detection of avascular necrosis and is useful when radiographs are normal, especially in high-risk patients (Bussi eres et al 2007: grade B recommendation). MRI without IV contrast can be used to establish the diagnosis and also exclude other potential causes of pain (Murphey et al [ACR] 2015). The addition of IV contrast to MRI may on occasion be useful in patients with previous noncontrast MRI if findings are non-diagnostic for avascular necrosis versus subchondral fracture (PLE expert panel consensus opinion). MRI without and with IV contrast may also rarely be indicated to follow-up previously non-diagnostic MRI exams or previous MRI exams with transient osteoporosis (PLE expert panel consensus opinion). When MRI is unavailable or the patient is unable to undergo MRI, nuclear medicine or CT can be used (Bussi eres et al 2007). Multidetector CT, while less sensitive than MRI and bone scintigraphy, may be useful for surgical planning to assess the severity and locations of femoral head collapse, and to assess for secondary osteoarthritis (Murphey et al [ACR] 2015). SPECT imaging can improve the accuracy of radionuclide imaging for diagnosing avascular necrosis (Murphey et al [ACR] 2015).

### Clinical notes:

- Clinical features of osteonecrosis typically include progressive groin pain that may refer to the knee, normal range of motion in early stages, and limitation of extension, internal rotation and abduction, limping and atrophy in advanced stages (Bussi eres et al 2007).
- Factors which place patients at high risk for avascular necrosis include: hip fractures or dislocation, chronic steroid use, organ transplant surgery, chronic alcohol abuse,



hemoglobinopathy, decompression illness, and chronic antiretroviral medication use (Shah et al 2015).

- Radiographs should be the initial imaging study for most suspected abnormalities of the hip and pelvis (*ACR-SPR-SSR Practice Parameter 2021*).
- Avascular necrosis needs to be differentiated from transient osteoporosis and subchondral insufficiency fracture on MRI, and MRI with IV contrast may be useful in this regard with enhancement of immediate subchondral bone being absent in patients with osteonecrosis (Murphey et al [*ACR*] 2015).

Imaging notes:

- If avascular necrosis is detected on a unilateral hip exam, then the contralateral hip should also be imaged to screen for asymptomatic avascular necrosis (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).
- In patients who are at high risk for avascular necrosis, consider T1 coronal images and fluid sensitive sequences (STIR or T2 fat saturation) through the pelvis, including both hips, to evaluate for asymptomatic avascular necrosis in the contralateral hip (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).
- The use of bone scan with SPECT imaging should include pinhole collimation, scatter correction and iterative reconstruction (Murphey et al [*ACR*] 2015).

Evidence update (2014-present):

**Low Level of Evidence**

Hu et al (2015), in a study of 30 femoral head specimens collected from 23 patients, reported that there was a high correlation between MRI, CT, and coronal sectional gross specimens on the location, shape and size of avascular lesions. CT was superior to MRI, however, in identifying subchondral fracture.

---

## Hip pain with clinical and/or radiological suspicion for septic arthritis, osteomyelitis, and/or periarticular abscess:

- **Green** – MRI hip without IV contrast or MRI hip without and with IV contrast
- **Yellow** – MRI hip with IV contrast  
[further evaluate on-diagnostic findings on recent\* MRI without IV contrast]
- **Yellow** – CT hip with and/or without IV contrast  
[patient unable to undergo MRI]
- **Yellow** – Multiphase bone scan (with or without SPECT or SPECT/CT) or White Blood Cell (WBC) scan (with or without SPECT or SPECT/CT)  
[patient unable to undergo MRI]
- **Red** – CT arthrography; MR arthrography; PET; planar bone scan

\*Recent is typically defined as < 1 month (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

Level of Evidence: MRI, CT, bone scan: very low; MR arthrography, CT arthrography, PET: PLE expert panel consensus opinion

### Notes concerning applicability and/or patient preferences:

Nuclear medicine studies fused with CT (or MRI) are not yet widely available, and therefore may have applicability or generalizability issues in the community outpatient setting (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

### Guideline and PLE expert panel consensus opinion summary:

MRI is the advanced imaging modality of choice for suspected bone and extremity soft-tissue infections, and has a 100% negative predictive value for excluding osteomyelitis (Bussi eres et al 2007: grade D recommendation; Beaman et al [ACR] 2017). The addition of IV contrast is useful in patients with septic arthritis and/or osteomyelitis to evaluate for periarticular abscess on MRI or CT (PLE expert panel consensus opinion). When a patient is unable to undergo MRI, CT can be useful for diagnosis of chronic osteomyelitis (Beaman et al [ACR] 2017). Nuclear medicine is very sensitive, but not specific, for suspected septic arthritis and osteomyelitis (Bussi eres et al 2007: grade D recommendation). Its role is generally limited to cases where MRI is contraindicated, infection is multifocal, or infection is associated with orthopedic hardware, trauma, or surgery (Beaman et al [ACR] 2017). Specifically, the use of white blood cell (WBC) scanning may be appropriate for chronic hip pain when infection/osteomyelitis is a consideration (Mintz et al [ACR] 2017; Beaman et al 2017). It may also be helpful to differentiate between avascular necrosis and femoral head osteomyelitis (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

### Clinical notes:

- Clinical features of septic arthritis of the hip typically include significant pain on movement and weight bearing, fever, and malaise (Bussi eres et al 2007).
- Conventional radiographs should be the initial study for the evaluation of hip pain, and may be useful for the detection and evaluation of arthritis (ACR-SPR-SSR Practice Parameter 2021; Mintz et al [ACR] 2016; Bussi eres et al 2007).
- WBC, ESR and CRP should be considered in patients with a high clinical suspicion for septic arthritis (PLE expert panel consensus opinion). In patients with hip pain and elevated inflammatory markers, consider ultrasound (if appropriate expertise available) to evaluate for

- an effusion and for joint aspiration (PLE multidisciplinary committee opinion).
- The procedure of choice for suspected infection is joint aspiration, which can be performed under fluoroscopy or ultrasound (Mintz et al [ACR] 2017; Bussi eres et al 2007; PLE expert panel consensus opinion).
  - In patients with proven septic arthritis, MRI shows effusions, synovial enhancement and synovial thickening in all patients, abscesses in 38%, bone marrow edema in 77%, erosions in 62% and myositis/cellulitis in 77%. MR is also useful to follow patients during treatment to assess resolution of effusions and abscesses (Bierry et al 2012).

Evidence update (2014-present):

**Low Level of Evidence**

Keeney et al (2014), in a retrospective study of 213 patients (218 consecutive hip MRI studies), evaluated a number of parameters including the clinical indications that most commonly influence treatment decisions and the likelihood that hip MRI influences treatment decisions separate from conventional radiographs. The authors concluded that although MRI can be valuable for diagnosing or staging specific conditions, it is not cost-effective as a screening tool for hip pain that is not supported by history, clinical examination, and conventional radiographic findings in patients between 40 and 80 years of age. MR of the hip affected treatment decisions in 40% of patients undergoing assessment for infection.

---

## Hip pain with an indeterminate or aggressive bone lesion noted on radiographs:

- **Green** – MRI hip without IV contrast or MRI hip without and with IV contrast
- **Yellow** – MRI hip with IV contrast  
[further evaluate non-diagnostic findings on recent\* MRI without IV contrast]
- **Yellow** – CT hip without IV contrast or CT hip without and with IV contrast  
[patient unable to undergo MRI; or pre-surgical planning is necessary]
- **Yellow** – PET or PET/CT  
[further evaluate possible metastatic lesion(s)]
- **Yellow** – Whole-body bone scan (with or without SPECT or SPECT/CT)  
[further evaluate possible metastatic lesion(s)]
- **Red** – CT hip with IV contrast; MR arthrography; CT arthrography; Multiphase bone scan

\*Recent is typically defined as < 1 month (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

Level of Evidence: MRI, CT: very low; PET/CT moderate level of evidence; MR arthrography, CT arthrography: PLE expert panel consensus opinion

### Notes concerning applicability and/or patient preferences:

Nuclear medicine studies fused with CT (or MRI) are not yet widely available, and therefore may have applicability or generalizability issues in the community outpatient setting (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

### Guideline and PLE expert panel consensus opinion summary:

Radiographs are usually appropriate for the initial imaging of a suspected primary bone tumor (Bestic et al [ACR] 2020). Following radiographs, special investigations for tumors and metastatic lesions include MRI, CT, or nuclear medicine (Bussi eres et al 2007: grade D recommendation). MRI without IV contrast or MRI without and with IV contrast are indicated for a suspected primary bone tumor but negative radiographs (Bestic et al [ACR] 2020). A noncontrast MRI can also be useful for imaging of a suspected primary bone tumor when radiographs show indeterminate or aggressive appearing lesions suggestive for malignancy (Bestic et al [ACR] 2020). MRI is not routinely used in the evaluation of lesions that are definitely benign on radiographs; however, if such lesions are symptomatic, MRI may also be helpful to identify unusual complications, such as stress fracture, secondary aneurysmal bone cyst formation, or malignant transformation (Bestic et al [ACR] 2020). CT can be a viable alternative for patients who are unable to undergo MRI (Bestic et al [ACR] 2020; PLE expert panel consensus opinion). FDG-PET is a valuable adjunct to conventional imaging in the diagnosis, staging, restaging, and surveillance of primary bone tumors (Bestic et al [ACR] 2020). The use of FDG-PET/CT has been shown to be accurate in the differentiation of benign from malignant cartilaginous lesions, and is accurate in the differentiation of benign from malignant pathologic fractures (Bestic et al [ACR] 2020). Recent advances in technology, such as SPECT/CT, may provide a useful tool in the evaluation of primary bone tumors (Bestic et al [ACR] 2020).

### Clinical notes:

- The term “bone tumor” may be applied to a broad range of entities, including tumor-like lesions related to developmental, metabolic, hematopoietic, lymphatic, or reactive abnormalities that affect bone (Bestic et al [ACR] 2020).

- Radiographs should be the initial imaging study for most suspected abnormalities of the hip and pelvis (*ACR-SPR-SSR Practice Parameter 2021*).
- In patients with lesions that are clearly benign on conventional radiographs (bone cyst, nonossifying fibroma, fibrous dysplasia, bone island, fibrocortical defect, etc.), consider follow-up radiograph in 6 months to ensure stability (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).
- Refer patients with lesions which are indeterminate or aggressive on radiography for subspecialist consultation (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).
- On a per lesion basis, the sensitivity of PET, CT, MRI and bone scintigraphy for bone metastases is 86.9%, 77.1%, 90.4% and 75.1%. The specificities are 97%, 83.2%, 96% and 93.6% respectively (Yang et al 2011).
- The sensitivity and specificity of PET/CT for osseous and soft tissue sarcoma is 0.96 and 0.95 respectively (Muheremu et al 2017).

Imaging notes:

- If the patient is undergoing MRI evaluation, T1 and fluid-sensitive sequences (STIR, T2 fat saturation or PD fat saturation sequences) should be obtained through the entire bony pelvis for acetabular bone lesions and the entire femur for proximal femoral lesions in at least one plane (PLE expert panel consensus opinion).

Evidence update (2007-present):

**High Level of Evidence**

Muheremu et al (2017), in a systematic review and meta-analysis, evaluated 16 articles with 883 patients and 2,214 lesions. Nine studies with 738 patients and 2,069 lesions reported the diagnostic accuracy of PET/CT for osseous and soft tissue sarcomas. On a lesion-based analysis, the overall sensitivity and specificity were 0.96 and 0.95. They concluded that PET/CT is a reliable method with high accuracy for the diagnosis of bone and soft tissue sarcomas, although the present findings require verification by larger-sample studies. The authors reported similar results with respect to the accuracy of PET/CT to assess the effect of neoadjuvant therapy on osseous and soft tissue sarcomas.

Yang et al (2011), in a meta-analysis, compared 18F FDG PET, CT, MRI and bone scintigraphy for the diagnosis of bone metastases. 67 articles consisting of 145 studies fulfilled the inclusion criteria. On a per-lesion basis, the pooled sensitivities for PET, CT, MRI and bone scintigraphy were 86.9%, 77.1%, 90.4% and 75.1%. The specificities were 97%, 83.2%, 96% and 93.6% respectively. The authors concluded that PET and MRI were comparable and both were significantly more accurate than CT and bone scintigraphy for the diagnosis of bone metastases.

**Low Level of Evidence**

O’Sullivan et al (2015), in a review paper, state that MRI is the imaging modality of choice for assessing metastatic spread in the marrow cavity, extension of tumor from the marrow cavity, and involvement of surrounding structures. The sensitivity and specificity of MRI for bone metastases is 95% and 90% respectively, CT 74% and 56%, planar bone scintigraphy 78% and 48%, and SPECT 87% and 91% respectively. 18F NaF-PET is substantially more sensitive and specific than scintigraphy and SPECT for the detection of skeletal metastases, and has a higher sensitivity than 18F FDG-PET. The sensitivity and specificity of 18F NaF-PET/CT for the detection of bone metastases is 100% and 97%.

Keeney et al (2014), in a retrospective study, evaluated a number of parameters, including the clinical indications that most commonly influence treatment decisions and the likelihood that hip MRI

influences treatment decisions separate from conventional radiographs. The authors concluded that although MRI can be valuable for diagnosing or staging specific conditions, it is not cost-effective as a screening tool for hip pain that is not supported by history, clinical examination, and conventional radiographic findings in patients between 40 and 80 years of age. MR of the hip affected treatment decisions in 58% of patients undergoing assessment for neoplasm.

**Guideline exclusions:**


- Inflammatory arthritis, other than septic arthritis
- Crystal deposition disease
- Metabolic bone disease
- Primary synovial abnormalities such as pigmented villonodular synovitis (PVNS) or osteochondromatosis
- Primary soft tissue neoplasm
- Athletic pubalgia/sports hernia
- CT navigation or modeling for hip arthroplasty
- Painful hip arthroplasty
- High energy trauma
- Pediatric patients
- Pregnant patients
- Advanced MRI imaging sequences, including diffusion sequences, T2 mapping, T1rho, dGEMRIC, sodium imaging

**AUC Revision History:**

<b><u>Revision Date:</u></b>	<b><u>New AUC Clinical Scenario(s):</u></b>	<b><u>Approved By:</u></b>
11/07/2017	Initial Document Development	CDI Quality Institute’s Multidisciplinary Committee
12/04/2018	n/a	CDI Quality Institute’s Multidisciplinary Committee
11/19/2019	n/a	CDI Quality Institute’s Multidisciplinary Committee
12/01/2020	n/a	CDI Quality Institute’s Multidisciplinary Committee
02/22/2022	n/a	RAYUS Quality Institute’s Multidisciplinary Committee

Information on our evidence development process, including our conflicts of interest policy is available on our website at <https://rayusradiology.com/ple>

---



**RAYUS**  
QUALITY INSTITUTE

**PROVIDER LED ENTITY**

## **Hip Pain AUC**

### **Bibliography**

02/22/2022

ACR-SPR-SSR practice parameter for the performance and interpretation of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the hip and pelvis for musculoskeletal disorders. Revised 2021. Available from: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/mr-hip-pelvis.pdf>

American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. Management of hip fractures in the elderly: Evidence-based clinical practice guideline (1<sup>st</sup> Ed.). Rosemont, IL: American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons; 2014.

Annabell L, Master V, Rhodes A, Moreira B, Coetzee C, Tran P. Hip pathology: The diagnostic accuracy of magnetic resonance imaging. *J Orthop Surg Res.* 2018; 13(1):127.

Australian and New Zealand Hip Fracture Registry (ANZHFR) Steering Group. Australian and New Zealand guideline for hip fracture care: Improving outcomes in hip fracture management of adults. Sydney: Australian and New Zealand Hip Fracture Registry Steering Group; 2014.

Beaman FD, von Herrmann PF, Kransdorf MJ, Adler RS, Amini B, Appel M, Arnold E, Bernard SA, Greenspan BS, Lee KS, Tuite MJ, Walker EA, Ward RJ, Wessell DE, Weissman BN. ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Suspected Osteomyelitis, Septic Arthritis, or Soft Tissue Infection (Excluding Spine and Diabetic Foot). *J Am Coll Radiol.* 2017; 14(5S):S326-S337.

Bencardino JT, Stone TJ, Roberts CC, Appel M, Baccei SJ, Cassidy RC, Chang EY, Fox MG, Greenspan BS, Gyftopoulos S, Hochman MG, Jacobson JA, Mintz DN, Mlady GW, Newman JS, Rosenberg ZS, Shah NA, Small KM, Weissman BN. ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Stress (Fatigue/Insufficiency) Fracture, Including Sacrum Excluding Other Vertebrae. *J Am Coll Radiol.* 2017; 14(5S):S293-S306.

Bestic JM, Wessell DE, Beaman FD, Cassidy RC, Czuczman GJ, Demertzis JL, Lenchik L, Motamedi K, Pierce JL, Sharma A, Sloan AE, Than K, Walker EA, Yung EY, Kransdorf MJ. ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Primary Bone Tumors. *J Am Coll Radiol.* 2020; 17(5S):S226-S238.

Bierry G, Huang AJ, Chang CY, Torriani M, Bredella MA. MRI findings of treated bacterial septic arthritis. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2012; 41(12):509-516.



Bussieres AE, Taylor JA, Peterson C. Diagnostic imaging practice guidelines for musculoskeletal complaints in adults-an evidence-based approach. Part 1: Lower extremity disorders. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther* 2007; 30(9):684-717.

Chopra A, Grainger AJ, Dube B, Evans R, Hodgson R, Conroy J, Macdonald D, Robinson P. Comparative reliability and diagnostic performance of conventional 3T magnetic resonance imaging and 1.5T magnetic resonance arthrography for the evaluation of internal derangement of the hip. *Eur Radiol*. 2018; 28(3):963-971.

Crim J, Oserowsky A, Layfield LJ, Schmidt RL. Comparison of radiography and histopathologic analysis in the evaluation of hip arthritis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2019; 213(4):895-902.

Department of Veterans Affairs / Department of Defence. VA/DoD clinical practice guideline for the non-surgical management of hip and knee osteoarthritis (Version 2.0). 2020

Enseki K, Harris-Hayes M, White DM, Cibulka MT, Woehrle J, Fagerson TL, Clohisy JC. Nonarthritic hip joint pain. Clinical practice guidelines linked to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health from the Orthopaedic Section of the American Physical Therapy Association. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2014; 44(6):A1-A32.

Frank JM, Harris JD, Erickson BJ, Slikker W, Bush-Joseph CA, Salata MJ, Nho SJ. Prevalence of femoroacetabular impingement imaging findings in asymptomatic volunteers: A systematic review. *Arthroscopy*. 2015; 31(6):1199-1204.

Grace T, Neumann J, Samaan MA, Souza RB, Majumdar S, Link TM, Zhang AL. Using the Scoring Hip Osteoarthritis with Magnetic Resonance Imaging (SHOMRI) system to assess intra-articular pathology in femoroacetabular impingement. *J Orthop Res*. 2018; 36(11):3064-3070.

Griffin DR, Dickenson EJ, O'Donnell J, Agricola R, Awan T, Beck M, Clohisy JC, Dijkstra HP, Falvey E, Gimpel M, Hinman RS, Holmich P, Kassarian A, Martin HD, Martin R, Mather RC, Philippon MJ, Reiman MP, Takla A, Thorborg K, Walker S, Weir A, Bennell KL. The Warwick Agreement on femoroacetabular impingement syndrome (FAI syndrome): An international consensus statement. *Br J Sports Med*. 2016; 50(19):1169-1176.

Haims AH, Wang A, Yoo BJ, Porrino J. Negative predictive value of CT for occult fractures of the hip and pelvis with imaging follow-up. *Emerg Radiol*. 2021; 28(2):259-264.

Haj-Mirzaian A, Eng J, Khorasani R, Raja AS, Levin AS, Smith SE, Johnson PT, Demehri S. Use of advanced imaging for radiographically occult hip fracture in elderly patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Radiology*. 2020; 296(3):521-531.

Hu LB, Huang ZG, Wei HY, Wang W, Ren A, Xu YY. Osteonecrosis of the femoral head: Using CT, MRI and gross specimen to characterize the location, shape and size of the lesion. *Br J Radiol*. 2015; 88(1046):20140508.

Katz JN, Arant KR, Loeser RF. Diagnosis and treatment of hip and knee osteoarthritis: A review. *JAMA*. 2021; 325(6):568-578.

Keeney JA, Nunley RM, Adelani M, Mall N. Magnetic resonance imaging of the hip: Poor cost utility for treatment of adult patients with hip pain. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2014; 472(3):787-792.

Mayo-Smith WW, Hara AK, Mahesh M, Sahani DV, Pavlicek W. How I do it: Managing radiation dose in CT. *Radiology*. 2014; 273(3):657-672.

Mintz DN, Roberts CC, Bencardino JT, BAccei SJ, Caird MS, Cassidy RC, Chang EY, Fox MG, Gyftopoulos S, Kransdorf MJ, Metter DF, Morrison WB, Rosenberg ZS, Shah NA, Small KM, Subhas N, Tambar S, Towers JD, Yu JS, Weissman BN. ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Chronic Hip Pain. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2017; 14(5S):S90-S102.

Murphey MD, Roberts CC, Bencardino JT, Appel M, Arnold E, Chang EY, Dempsey ME, Fox MG, Fries IB, Greenspan BS, Hochman MG, Jacobson JA, Mintz DN, Newman JS, Rosenberg ZS, Rubin DA, Small KM, Weissman BN. ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Osteonecrosis of the Hip. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2016; 13(2):147-155.

Muheremu A, Ma J, Amudong A, Ma Y, Niyazi M, Ou Y, Ma Y. Positron emission tomography/computed tomography for osseous and soft tissue sarcomas: A systematic review of the literature and meta-analysis. *Mol Clin Oncol*. 2017; 7(3):461-467.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). The management of hip fracture in adults. 2011 [updated 2017]. London: National Clinical Guideline Centre.

Neiman M, Halshtok Neiman O, Aharoni D, Liberman B, Adar E, Eshed I. Magnetic resonance arthrography of the hip: Prevalence of diagnoses not suspected by the referring physician and correlation with clinical examination and pain score. *Acta Radiol*. 2016; 57(5):595-601.

Neumann J, Zhang AL, Schwaiger BJ, Samaan MA, Souza R, Foreman SC, Joseph GB, Grace T, Majumdar S, Link TM. Validation of scoring hip osteoarthritis with MRI (SHOMRI) scores using hip arthroscopy as a standard of reference. *Eur Radiol*. 2019; 29(2):578-587.

Nguyen BJ, Burt A, Baldassarre RL, Smitaman E, Morshedi M, Kao S, Chang EY, Obrzut S. The prognostic and diagnostic value of 18F-FDG-PET/CT for assessment of symptomatic osteoarthritis. *Nucl Med Commun*. 2018; 39(7):699-706.

O'Sullivan G, Carty F, Cronin CG. Imaging of bone metastasis: An update. *World J Radiol*. 2015; 7(8):202-211.

Reiman MP, Thorborg K, Goode AP, Cook CE, Weir A, Holmich P. Diagnostic accuracy of imaging modalities and injection techniques for the diagnosis of remoracetabular impingement/labral tear: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *Am J Sports Med*. 2017; 45(11):2665-2677.

Ross AB, Lee KS, Chang EY, Amini B, Bussell JK, Gorbachova T, Ha AS, Khurana B, Klitzke A, Mooar PA, Shah NA, Singer AD, Smith SE, Taljanovic MS, Kransdorf MJ. ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Acute Hip Pain – Suspected Fracture. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2019; 16(5S):S18-S25.

Saied AM, Redant C, Anthonissen J, Audenaert E, Somers J, Bataillie F, Myncke J, Pattyn C. Conventional versus direct magnetic resonance imaging in detecting labral lesions in femoroacetabular impingement – a retrospective multicenter study. *Acta Orthop Belg.* 2019; 85(1):100-106.

Saied AM, Redant C, El-Batouty M, El-Lakkany MR, El-Adl WA, Anthonissen J, Verdonk R, Audenaert EA. Accuracy of magnetic resonance studies in the detection of chondral and labral lesions in femoroacetabular impingement: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2017; 18:83.

Sakellariou G, Conaghan PG, Zhang W, Bijlsma JW, Boyesen P, D'Agostino MA, Doherty M, Fodor D, Kloppenburg M, Miese F, Naredo E, Porcheret M, Iagnocco A. EULAR recommendations for the use of imaging in the clinical management of peripheral joint osteoarthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis.* 2017; 76(9):1484-1494.

Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN). Management of hip fracture in older people. A national clinical guideline. 2009. Edinburgh: Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network.

Shah KN, Racine J, Jones LC, Aaron RK. Pathophysiology and risk factors for osteonecrosis. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med.* 2015; 8(3):201-209.

Wilson MP, Nobbie D, Murad MH, Dhillon S, McInnes MD, Katlariwala P, Low G. Diagnostic accuracy of limited MRI protocols for detecting radiographically occult hip fractures: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2020; 215(3):559-567.

Yang HL, Liu T, Wang XM, Xu Y, Deng SM. Diagnosis of bone metastases: A meta-analysis comparing FDG PET, CT, MRI and bone scintigraphy. *Eur Radiol.* 2011; 21(12):2604-2617.