



Complete Summary

GUIDELINE TITLE

Palpable abdominal mass.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Gay SB, Bree RL, Foley WD, Glick SN, Heiken JP, Huprich JE, Levine MS, Ros PR, Rosen MP, Shuman WP, Greene FL, Rockey DC, Expert Panel on Gastrointestinal Imaging. Palpable abdominal mass. [online publication]. Reston (VA): American College of Radiology (ACR); 2006. 3 p. [7 references]

GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

This guideline updates a previous version: American College of Radiology (ACR), Expert panel on Gastrointestinal Imaging. Imaging evaluation of the palpable abdominal mass. Reston (VA): American College of Radiology (ACR); 2001. 2 p. (ACR appropriateness criteria).

The appropriateness criteria are reviewed annually and updated by the panels as needed, depending on introduction of new and highly significant scientific evidence.

COMPLETE SUMMARY CONTENT

SCOPE
METHODOLOGY - including Rating Scheme and Cost Analysis
RECOMMENDATIONS
EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS
BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS
QUALIFYING STATEMENTS
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE
INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT
CATEGORIES
IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY
DISCLAIMER

SCOPE

DISEASE/CONDITION(S)

Palpable abdominal mass

GUIDELINE CATEGORY

Diagnosis
Evaluation

CLINICAL SPECIALTY

Family Practice
Gastroenterology
Internal Medicine
Radiology
Surgery

INTENDED USERS

Health Plans
Hospitals
Managed Care Organizations
Physicians
Utilization Management

GUIDELINE OBJECTIVE(S)

To evaluate the appropriateness of initial radiologic examinations for patients with a palpable abdominal mass

TARGET POPULATION

Patients with a palpable abdominal mass

INTERVENTIONS AND PRACTICES CONSIDERED

1. Computed tomography (CT), abdomen
2. Ultrasound (US), abdomen
3. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), abdomen
4. X-ray
 - Abdomen, supine
 - Abdomen, supine and upright
 - Upper gastrointestinal (GI) series
 - Upper GI with small bowel
 - Barium enema
 - Excretory urogram

MAJOR OUTCOMES CONSIDERED

Utility of radiologic examinations in differential diagnosis

METHODOLOGY

METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT EVIDENCE

Searches of Electronic Databases

DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT THE EVIDENCE

The guideline developer performed literature searches of recent peer-reviewed medical journals, and the major applicable articles were identified and collected.

NUMBER OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS

The total number of source documents identified as the result of the literature search is not known.

METHODS USED TO ASSESS THE QUALITY AND STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE

Weighting According to a Rating Scheme (Scheme Not Given)

RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE

Not stated

METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE

Systematic Review with Evidence Tables

DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE

One or two topic leaders within a panel assume the responsibility of developing an evidence table for each clinical condition, based on analysis of the current literature. These tables serve as a basis for developing a narrative specific to each clinical condition.

METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Expert Consensus (Delphi)

DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Since data available from existing scientific studies are usually insufficient for meta-analysis, broad-based consensus techniques are needed to reach agreement in the formulation of the appropriateness criteria. The American College of Radiology (ACR) Appropriateness Criteria panels use a modified Delphi technique to arrive at consensus. Serial surveys are conducted by distributing questionnaires to consolidate expert opinions within each panel. These questionnaires are distributed to the participants along with the evidence table and narrative as developed by the topic leader(s). Questionnaires are completed by the participants in their own professional setting without influence of the other members. Voting is conducted using a scoring system from 1-9, indicating the least to the most appropriate imaging examination or therapeutic procedure. The survey results are collected, tabulated in anonymous fashion, and redistributed after each round. A maximum of three rounds is conducted and opinions are unified to the highest degree possible. Eighty percent agreement is considered a

consensus. This modified Delphi technique enables individual, unbiased expression, is economical, easy to understand, and relatively simple to conduct.

If consensus cannot be reached by the Delphi technique, the panel is convened and group consensus techniques are utilized. The strengths and weaknesses of each test or procedure are discussed and consensus reached whenever possible. If "No consensus" appears in the rating column, reasons for this decision are added to the comment sections.

RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Not applicable

COST ANALYSIS

Investigators have stressed the ability of computed tomography (CT) and ultrasound to image masses no matter what their organ of origin and have touted them as first-line procedures for evaluation of palpable masses. While certain combinations of clinical findings could lend themselves to a more targeted approach (for example, hematemesis plus a palpable gastric-region mass might merit endoscopy as the first study), cross-sectional imaging in general is well suited to initial evaluation of abdominal masses. One study in 1981 showed that, compared with strategies not using CT, the use of CT can result in savings in time for diagnosis and overall cost of hospitalization.

METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION

Internal Peer Review

DESCRIPTION OF METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION

Criteria developed by the Expert Panels are reviewed by the American College of Radiology (ACR) Committee on Appropriateness Criteria.

RECOMMENDATIONS

MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

ACR Appropriateness Criteria®

Clinical Condition: Palpable Abdominal Mass

Radiologic Exam Procedure	Appropriateness Rating	Comments
CT, abdomen	8	
US, abdomen	7	
MRI, abdomen	6	

Radiologic Exam Procedure	Appropriateness Rating	Comments
X-ray, abdomen, supine	4	
X-ray, abdomen, supine and upright	4	
X-ray, upper GI series	4	Exam can be used to evaluate selected cases.
X-ray, upper GI with small bowel	4	Exam can be used to evaluate selected cases.
X-ray, barium enema	4	Exam can be used to evaluate selected cases.
X-ray, excretory urogram (IVP)	4	Exam can be used to evaluate selected cases.
<i>Appropriateness Criteria Scale</i> 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 = Least appropriate 9 = Most appropriate		

Note: Abbreviations used in the table are listed at the end of the "Major Recommendations" field.

There has been little written about the generic use of imaging in evaluating palpable abdominal masses since the 1980s. Rather, newer research has been both scant and focused on evaluation of specific masses using CT, US, and MRI.

Investigators have found both US and CT excellent for affirming or excluding a clinically suspected abdominal mass, with sensitivity and specificity values in excess of 95%. This is particularly noteworthy since as few as 16%-38% of patients referred for suspected abdominal mass will have that diagnosis corroborated by an imaging study.

Both US and CT can visualize the organ from which a mass arises. The success of US in determining organ of origin has been 88%-91%, while CT has fared slightly better at 93%. US is limited by bowel gas in cases of dilated bowel. As one might expect, attempts to predict the pathologic diagnosis of masses based on imaging findings are less successful. US studies correctly predicted the pathologic diagnosis in 77%-81% of cases, while CT suggested the diagnosis in 88% of cases.

Investigators have stressed the ability of CT and US to image masses no matter what their organ of origin and have touted them as first-line procedures for evaluation of palpable masses. While certain combinations of clinical findings could lend themselves to a more targeted approach (for example, hematemesis plus a palpable gastric-region mass might merit endoscopy as the first study), cross-sectional imaging in general is well suited to initial evaluation of abdominal

masses. One study in 1981 showed that, compared with strategies not using CT, the use of CT can result in savings in time for diagnosis and overall cost of hospitalization.

At the time of this writing, no comparative studies evaluating MRI are available. From an intuitive standpoint, however, the nonorgan-specific nature and multiplanar imaging capabilities of MRI seem quite suitable for evaluating an abdominal mass. In the absence of data, the usefulness of MRI in evaluating palpable masses is unknown. It is likely comparable to CT and US.

Abbreviations

- CT, computed tomography
- GI, gastrointestinal
- IVP, intravenous pyelogram
- MRI, magnetic resonance imaging
- US, ultrasound

CLINICAL ALGORITHM(S)

Algorithms were not developed from criteria guidelines.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

TYPE OF EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations are based on analysis of the current literature and expert panel consensus.

BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS

POTENTIAL BENEFITS

Selection of appropriate radiologic imaging procedures for evaluation of patients with a palpable abdominal mass

POTENTIAL HARMS

Not stated

QUALIFYING STATEMENTS

QUALIFYING STATEMENTS

An American College of Radiology (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 U.S. Food and Drug Administration (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.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE

DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

An implementation strategy was not provided.

IMPLEMENTATION TOOLS

Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) Downloads

For information about [availability](#), see the "Availability of Companion Documents" and "Patient Resources" fields below.

INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT CATEGORIES

IOM CARE NEED

Getting Better

IOM DOMAIN

Effectiveness

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Gay SB, Bree RL, Foley WD, Glick SN, Heiken JP, Huprich JE, Levine MS, Ros PR, Rosen MP, Shuman WP, Greene FL, Rockey DC, Expert Panel on Gastrointestinal Imaging. Palpable abdominal mass. [online publication]. Reston (VA): American College of Radiology (ACR); 2006. 3 p. [7 references]

ADAPTATION

Not applicable: The guideline was not adapted from another source.

DATE RELEASED

1998 (revised 2006)

GUIDELINE DEVELOPER(S)

American College of Radiology - Medical Specialty Society

SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING

The American College of Radiology (ACR) provided the funding and the resources for these ACR Appropriateness Criteria®.

GUIDELINE COMMITTEE

Committee on Appropriateness Criteria, Expert Panel on Gastrointestinal Imaging

COMPOSITION OF GROUP THAT AUTHORED THE GUIDELINE

Panel Members: Spencer B. Gay, MD; Robert L. Bree, MD, MHSA; W. Dennis Foley, MD; Seth N. Glick, MD; Jay P. Heiken, MD; James E. Huprich, MD; Marc S. Levine, MD; Pablo R. Ros, MD, MPH; Max Paul Rosen, MD, MPH; William P. Shuman, MD; Frederick L. Greene, MD; Don C. Rockey, MD

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES/CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Not stated

GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

This guideline updates a previous version: American College of Radiology (ACR), Expert panel on Gastrointestinal Imaging. Imaging evaluation of the palpable abdominal mass. Reston (VA): American College of Radiology (ACR); 2001. 2 p. (ACR appropriateness criteria).

The appropriateness criteria are reviewed annually and updated by the panels as needed, depending on introduction of new and highly significant scientific evidence.

GUIDELINE AVAILABILITY

Electronic copies: Available in Portable Document Format (PDF) from the [American College of Radiology \(ACR\) Web site](#).

ACR Appropriateness Criteria® *Anytime, Anywhere*™ (PDA application). Available from the [ACR Web site](#).

Print copies: Available from the American College of Radiology, 1891 Preston White Drive, Reston, VA 20191. Telephone: (703) 648-8900.

AVAILABILITY OF COMPANION DOCUMENTS

The following is available:

- ACR Appropriateness Criteria®. Background and development. Reston (VA): American College of Radiology; 2 p. Electronic copies: Available in Portable Document Format (PDF) from the [American College of Radiology \(ACR\) Web site](#).

PATIENT RESOURCES

None available

NGC STATUS

This summary was completed by ECRI on March 19, 2001. The information was verified by the guideline developer on March 29, 2001. This summary was updated by ECRI on July 31, 2002. The updated information was verified by the guideline developer on October 1, 2002. The summary was updated on August 11, 2006.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

Instructions for downloading, use, and reproduction of the American College of Radiology (ACR) Appropriateness Criteria® may be found on the [ACR Web site](#).

DISCLAIMER

NGC DISCLAIMER

The National Guideline Clearinghouse™ (NGC) does not develop, produce, approve, or endorse the guidelines represented on this site.

All guidelines summarized by NGC and hosted on our site are produced under the auspices of medical specialty societies, relevant professional associations, public or private organizations, other government agencies, health care organizations or plans, and similar entities.

Guidelines represented on the NGC Web site are submitted by guideline developers, and are screened solely to determine that they meet the NGC Inclusion Criteria which may be found at <http://www.guideline.gov/about/inclusion.aspx>.

NGC, AHRQ, and its contractor ECRI Institute make no warranties concerning the content or clinical efficacy or effectiveness of the clinical practice guidelines and related materials represented on this site. Moreover, the views and opinions of developers or authors of guidelines represented on this site do not necessarily

state or reflect those of NGC, AHRQ, or its contractor ECRI Institute, and inclusion or hosting of guidelines in NGC may not be used for advertising or commercial endorsement purposes.

Readers with questions regarding guideline content are directed to contact the guideline developer.

© 1998-2008 National Guideline Clearinghouse

Date Modified: 9/15/2008

