

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

Clinical Condition: Suspected Small Bowel Obstruction

Variant 1: Suspected complete or high-grade partial SBO.

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CT abdomen and pelvis without oral contrast with IV contrast	8		High
X-ray abdomen supine and upright	7		Low
CT abdomen and pelvis with oral water soluble contrast with IV contrast	5	Positive contrast in the bowel can obscure the etiology of the obstruction and enhancement of the mucosal bowel lumen.	High
CT abdomen and pelvis with oral dilute barium contrast with IV contrast	5	Positive contrast in the bowel can obscure the etiology of the obstruction and enhancement of the mucosal bowel lumen.	High
CT enterography with IV and water or water density contrast	4		High
CT enteroclysis	4		Low
X-ray small bowel follow-through	4		Low
X-ray small bowel enteroclysis	4		Med
MRI abdomen	4		None
US abdomen	2		None
<u>Rating Scale:</u> 1=Least appropriate, 9=Most appropriate			*Relative Radiation Level

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

Clinical Condition:**Suspected Small Bowel Obstruction****Variant 2:****Suspected intermittent or low-grade SBO.**

Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL*
CT abdomen and pelvis with oral water soluble contrast with IV contrast	7	All are equally acceptable choices dependent on institutional preference and available resources.	High
CT abdomen and pelvis with oral dilute barium contrast with IV contrast	7	All are equally acceptable choices dependent on institutional preference and available resources.	High
CT enterography with IV and water or water density contrast	7	All are equally acceptable choices dependent on institutional preference and available resources.	High
CT enteroclysis	7	All are equally acceptable choices dependent on institutional preference and available resources.	Low
X-ray small bowel follow-through	7	All are equally acceptable choices dependent on institutional preference and available resources.	Low
X-ray small bowel enteroclysis	7	All are equally acceptable choices dependent on institutional preference and available resources.	Med
X-ray abdomen supine and upright	5		Low
CT abdomen and pelvis without oral contrast with IV contrast	4		High
MRI abdomen	4		None
US abdomen	2		None
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.

SUSPECTED SMALL BOWEL OBSTRUCTION

Expert Panel on Gastrointestinal Imaging: Pablo R. Ros, MD, MPH¹; James E. Huprich, MD²; Robert L. Bree, MD, MHSA³; W. Dennis Foley, MD⁴; Spencer B. Gay, MD⁵; Seth N. Glick, MD⁶; Jay P. Heiken, MD⁷; Marc S. Levine, MD⁸; Max Paul Rosen, MD, MPH⁹; William P. Shuman, MD¹⁰; Frederick L. Greene, MD.¹¹

Summary of Literature Review

There is no single generally accepted approach to evaluate patients with suspected small bowel obstruction (SBO). This, in part, reflects not only the differing perspectives of investigators who have written on the topic (surgeons and radiologists) but also the increasing application of sophisticated imaging studies. The diagnostic approach also depends upon the clinical presentation, ie, acute high-grade vs low-grade or intermittent [1].

Plain film radiography has been the traditional starting point for imaging evaluation of suspected SBO. It must be conceded, however, that studies testing the utility of plain film have yielded quite disparate results [2-5]. While some investigators report 80%-90% success in diagnosing SBO using radiographs [5], an overall accuracy equal to that of computed tomography (CT) [6], others have achieved rates only in the 30%-70% range [3,4,6]. In some even less encouraging studies, abdomen films have proved to be of little to no help in assessing the site or cause of SBO [6,7], or even to be misleading in 20%-40% of patients [3].

In light of these inconsistent results, it is reasonable to expect that abdomen radiographs will not be definitive in many patients with suspected SBO. In such a setting, gastrointestinal contrast studies (small bowel follow-through (SBFT), enteroclysis, barium enema) or cross-sectional imaging studies (CT, ultrasound (US), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)) are options.

The single contrast barium enema with attempted reflux into the distal ileum can exclude colonic obstruction and may occasionally aid in distinguishing SBO from an adynamic ileus [9,10]. It is unreliable, however, for localizing and characterizing the site of SBO [9,11], as

well as for identifying patients who will need surgery [11].

Opinion is divided on the usefulness of SBFT with orally administered barium. Some investigators have found this study useful for management of suspected SBO in 68%-100% of cases [10-12]. Because SBFT suffers from nonuniform small bowel filling, inability to test distensibility, and limitations posed by intermittent fluoroscopy, some authorities argue that enteroclysis is the appropriate examination in problematic SBO cases [9,13,14].

Methods of examination that challenge the distensibility of the small bowel, such as standard or CT enteroclysis, offer improved sensitivity and specificity over standard barium small bowel and CT exams in evaluating suspected intermittent or low-grade small bowel obstruction [1,3,9,15,16]. Evidence is compelling that enteroclysis is highly reliable in pinpointing sites of low- and high-grade obstruction [13,17,18], as well as in distinguishing adhesions from obstructing neoplasms [13]. CT enteroclysis (CT-E) should be considered as an alternative, especially in patients with a history of malignancy [1]. Enteroclysis has low patient acceptance and is dependent on the skill of the radiologist performing the examination.

CT enterography does not require intubation of the small bowel and therefore has greater patient acceptance and is less dependent on the technical skill of the radiologist. CT enterography with a water density contrast agent offers an alternative to CT enteroclysis, particularly where there is reluctance to use pharmacologic manipulation of small bowel activity. This is particularly true in patients with partial or intermittent small bowel obstruction. Its clinical usefulness in this clinical scenario has not yet been convincingly established, however.

Evaluation of suspected small obstruction with oral water-soluble contrast agents is controversial. Some authors point out that this technique is disadvantageous because of the potential for intravascular volume depletion and electrolyte imbalance, plus the poorer imaging characteristics as compared with barium [9,20]. Others have found both low osmolar and high osmolar water-soluble agents to be useful in diagnosis, amelioration, and management of small bowel obstruction [21-24]. Their stance is bolstered by reports of admittedly rare complications with barium studies, such as conversion from partial to complete obstruction [25]. A randomized controlled study concluded that water-soluble contrast administration was not useful in the management of these patients [26].

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

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.

Convincing studies have confirmed the usefulness of the standard CT examination in suspected high-grade SBO. Diagnostic accuracy of more than 90% has been reported [4,5,27], with success in distinguishing SBO from ileus [28] and in identifying the cause of obstruction [3,27]. Patients with suspected high grade obstruction do not require additional oral contrast medium since the fluid in the bowel provides adequate contrast. Low-grade obstruction is a relative “blind spot” for standard CT. One study demonstrated correct diagnosis in fewer than half of such cases [15]. Newer multidetector (MDCT) scanners with MPR capabilities have been noticeably more effective in evaluating SBO and other abdominal pathology, particularly when coronal reconstructions are added. CT is an excellent means of detecting complications of bowel obstruction such as ischemia and strangulation [29-33].

Largely because of the success of enteroclysis and CT in diagnosing and characterizing SBO, US has been used rarely in the United States; therefore data are scanty. In skilled hands, sonography has been reported to have a nearly 90% success rate in diagnosing SBO [7,34-36]. In the pediatric age group, sonography has proven useful in evaluating intussusception [18], midgut volvulus [37], and other causes of SBO [38]. CT proved superior to US in one study [39].

Increasing evidence supports MRI’s capability to detect and characterize SBO [40-43]. Because of its higher cost and convincing lack of incremental diagnostic gain as compared with CT, MRI should not be used routinely for evaluating suspected SBO. Pregnant patients are a particularly good population to offer MRI for SBO.

Conclusions

Standard CT has emerged as the preeminent imaging modality for the evaluation of SBO and should be considered in the initial evaluation of patients with suspected high-grade SBO. The barium enema and small bowel examination play a less significant role and should not be used as a primary modality in the diagnosis of acute small bowel obstruction.

If intermittent or low-grade small bowel obstruction is a chief diagnostic concern, standard or CT-E is appropriate [1,3,15,16]. CT-E offers several advantages over standard CT and enteroclysis techniques, but its role in evaluation of small bowel obstruction is unclear at this time.

References

- Walsh D, Bender G, Timmons J. Comparison of computed tomography-enteroclysis and traditional computed tomography in the setting of suspected partial small-bowel obstruction. *Emerg Radiol* 1998; 5:29-37.

- Matsuo Y. Degree of bowel distention on plain radiographs -- a surgical-radiological study of new criteria in mechanical intestinal obstruction. *Jpn J Surg* 1978; 8(3):222-227.
- Shrake PD, Rex DK, Lappas JC, Maglinte DD. Radiographic evaluation of suspected small bowel obstruction. *AJR* 1991; 86(2):175-178.
- Frager D, Medwid SW, Baer JW, et al. CT of small-bowel obstruction: value in establishing the diagnosis and determining the degree and cause. *AJR* 1994; 162(1):37-41.
- Fukuya T, Hawes DR, Lu CC, et al. CT diagnosis of small-bowel obstruction: efficacy in 60 patients. *AJR* 1992; 158(4):765-772.
- 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):1451-1445.
- Ko YT, Lim JH, Lee DH, et al. Small bowel obstruction: sonographic evaluation. *Radiology* 1993; 188(3):649-653.
- Heinbery EM, Finan MA, Chambers RB, et al. Postoperative ileus on a gynecologic oncology service—do abdominal X-rays have a role? *Gynecol Oncol* 2003; 90(1): 158-162.
- Maglinte DD, Herlinger H, Turner WW, Kelvin FM. Radiologic management of small bowel obstruction: a practical approach. *Emerg Radiol* 1994; 1:138-149.
- Dunn JT, Halls JM, Berne TV. Roentgenographic contrast studies in acute small-bowel obstruction. *Arch Surg* 1984; 119(11):1305-1308.
- Ericksen AS, Krasna MJ, Mast BA, et al. Use of gastrointestinal contrast studies in obstruction of the small and large bowel. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1990; 33(1):56-64.
- Anderson C, Humphrey WT. Contrast radiography in small bowel obstruction: a prospective, randomized trial. *Mil Med* 1997; 162(11):749-752.
- Caroline DF, Herlinger H, Laufer I, et al. Small-bowel enema in the diagnosis of adhesive obstructions. *AJR* 1984; 142(6):1133-1139.
- Maglinte DD, Burney BT, Miller RE. Lesions missed on small-bowel follow-through: analysis and recommendations. *Radiology* 1982; 144(4):737-739.
- Maglinte DD, Gage SN, Harmon BH, et al. Obstruction of the small intestine: accuracy and role of CT in diagnosis. *Radiology* 1993; 188(1):61-64.
- Boudiaf M, Jaff A, Soyer P, et al. Small-bowel diseases: prospective evaluation of multi-detector row helical CT enteroclysis in 107 consecutive patients. *Radiology* 2004; 233(2):338-344.
- Roediger WE, Marshall VC, Roberts S. Value of small bowel enema in incomplete intestinal obstruction. *Aust NZ J Surg* 1982; 52(5):507-509.
- Makanjuola D. Computed tomography compared with small bowel enema in clinically equivocal intestinal obstruction. *Clin Radiol* 1998; 53(3):203-208.
- Johnson PA, Miner PB Jr, Geier D, Harrison LA. Value of radiopaque markers in identifying partial small bowel obstruction. *Gastroenterology* 1996; 110(6):1958-1963.
- Bhisitkul DM, Listernick R, Shkolnik A, et al. Clinical application of ultrasonography in the diagnosis of intussusception. *J Pediatr* 1992; 121(2):182-186.
- Stordahl A. Water-soluble contrast media in obstructed and in ischemic small intestine. A clinical and experimental study. *J Oslo City Hosp* 1989; 39(1-2):3-22.
- Joyce WP, Delaney PV, Gorey TF, Fitzpatrick JM. The value of water-soluble contrast radiology in the management of acute small bowel obstruction. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 1992; 74(6):422-425.
- Chung CC, Meng WC, Yu SC, et al. A prospective study on the use of water-soluble contrast follow-through radiology in the management of small bowel obstruction. *Aust N Z J Surg* 1996; 66(9):598-601.
- Assalia A, Schein M, Kopelman D, et al. Therapeutic effect of oral Gastrografin in adhesive, partial small-bowel obstruction: a prospective randomized trial. *Surgery* 1994; 115(4):433-437.

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.

25. Assalia A, Schein M, Hashmonai M. Barium contrast study converts partial small-bowel obstruction into a complete one. Report of 2 cases. *S Afr J Surg* 1993; 31(3):102-103.
26. Fevang BT, Jensen D, Fevang J, et al. Upper gastrointestinal contrast study in the management of small bowel-obstruction—a prospective randomised study. *Eur J Surg* 2000; 166(1):39-43.
27. Megibow AJ, Balthazar EJ, Cho KC, et al. Bowel obstruction: evaluation with CT. *Radiology* 1991; 180(2):313-318.
28. Gazelle GS, Goldberg MA, Wittenberg J, et al. Efficacy of CT in distinguishing small-bowel obstruction from other causes of small-bowel dilatation. *AJR* 1994; 162(1):43-47.
29. Ha HK, Kim JS, Lee MS, et al. Differentiation of simple and strangulated small-bowel obstructions: usefulness of known CT criteria. *Radiology* 1997; 204(2):507-512.
30. Donckier V, Closset J, Van Gansbeke D, et al. Contribution of computed tomography to decision making in the management of adhesive small bowel obstruction. *Br J Surg* 1998; 85(8):1071-1074.
31. Frager D, Baer JW, Medwid SW, et al. Detection of intestinal ischemia in patients with acute small-bowel obstruction due to adhesions or hernia: efficacy of CT. *AJR* 1996; 166(1):67-71.
32. Balthazar EJ, Leibeskind ME, Macari M. Intestinal ischemia in patients in whom small bowel obstruction is suspected: evaluation of accuracy, limitations, and clinical implications of CT in diagnosis. *Radiology* 1997; 205(2):519-522.
33. Zalcman M, Sy M, Donckier V, et al. Helical CT signs in the diagnosis of intestinal ischemia in small-bowel obstruction *AJR* 2000; 175(6):1601-1607.
34. Wold PB, Fletcher JG, Johnson CD, Sandborn WJ. Assessment of small bowel Crohn disease: noninvasive peroral CT enterography compared with other imaging methods and endoscopy—feasibility study. *Radiology* 2003; 229(1):275-281.
35. Czechowski J. Conventional radiography and ultrasonography in the diagnosis of small bowel obstruction and strangulation. *Acta Radiol* 1996; 37(2):186-189.
36. Schmutz GR, Benko A, Fournier L, et al. Small bowel obstruction: role and contribution of sonography. *Eur Radiol* 1997; 7(7):1054-1058.
37. Pracros JP, Sann L, Genin G, et al. Ultrasound diagnosis of midgut volvulus: the "whirlpool" sign. *Pediatr Radiol* 1992; 22(1):18-20.
38. Ikeda H, Matsuyama S, Suzuki N, et al. Small bowel obstruction in children: review of 10 years experience. *Acta Paediatr Jpn* 1993; 35(6):504-507.
39. Suri S, Gupta S, Sudhakar PJ, et al. Comparative evaluation of plain films, ultrasound and CT in the diagnosis of intestinal obstruction. *Acta Radiol* 1999; 40(4):422-428.
40. Chou CK, Liu GC, Chen LT, Jaw TS. The use of MRI in bowel obstruction. *Abdom Imaging* 1993; 18(2):131-135.
41. Lee JK, Marcos HB, Semelka RC. MR imaging of the small bowel using the HASTE sequence. *AJR* 1998; 170(6):1457-1463.
42. Regan F, Beall DP, Bohlman M, et al. Fast MR imaging and the detection of small-bowel obstruction. *AJR* 1998; 170(6):1465-1469.
43. Matsuoka, H, Takahara T, Masaki T, et al. Preoperative evaluation by magnetic resonance imaging in patients with bowel obstruction. *Am J Surgery* 2002; 183(6): 614-617.

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.