Complete Summary

GUIDELINE TITLE

Suspected upper extremity deep vein thrombosis (DVT).

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Polak JF, Yucel EK, Bettmann MA, Casciani T, Gomes AS, Grollman JH, Holtzman SR, Sacks D, Schoepf J, Stanford W, Jaff M, Moneta GL, Expert Panel on Cardiovascular Imaging. Suspected upper extremity deep vein thrombosis (DVT). [online publication]. Reston (VA): American College of Radiology (ACR); 2005. 5 p. [33 references]

GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

It updates a previously published version: Polak JF, Levin DC, Bettmann MA, Gomes AS, Grollman J, Henkin RE, Hessel SJ, Higgins CB, Kelley MJ, Needleman L, Stanford W, Wexler L, Abbott W, Port S. Unilateral upper extremity swelling and pain. American College of Radiology. ACR Appropriateness Criteria. Radiology 2000 Jun;215(Suppl):107-12. [30 references]

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)

Upper extremity deep vein thrombosis (DVT)

GUIDELINE CATEGORY

Diagnosis
Evaluation

CLINICAL SPECIALTY

Family Practice
Internal Medicine
Radiology

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 suspected upper extremity deep vein thrombosis (DVT)

TARGET POPULATION

Patients with suspected upper extremity deep vein thrombosis (DVT)

INTERVENTIONS AND PRACTICES CONSIDERED

1. X-ray
    - Chest
    - Cervical spine
    - Shoulder
2. Ultrasound (US), Duplex Doppler
3. Invasive (INV)
    - Venography
    - Lymphangiography
    - Venography
4. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), including magnetic resonance venography (MRV)
5. Computed tomography (CT), with contrast
6. Nuclear medicine (NUC), radionuclide venogram

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 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 for reaching 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 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

A formal cost analysis was not performed and published cost analyses were not reviewed.

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: Suspected Upper Extremity Deep Vein Thrombosis (DVT)

Variant 1: Previous catheter placement.

Radiologic Exam Procedure	Appropriateness Rating	Comments
X-ray chest	8	Usually ordered as the first test to

Radiologic Exam Procedure	Appropriateness Rating	Comments
		supply information about the catheter and the chest. Also serves as a baseline.
US, Duplex Doppler, upper extremity	8	Best first approach for direct evaluation of arm veins.
INV, venography, upper extremity	8	If non-invasive studies are inconclusive or patient is a candidate for interventional therapy.
MRI, upper extremity and chest, (including MRV)	7	Useful for central venous obstruction.
CT, upper extremity and chest, with contrast	5	Useful as problem solving tool in certain situations and for central venous obstruction.
NUC, radionuclide venogram, upper extremity	2	
INV, lymphangiography, upper extremity	1	
Appropriateness Criteria Scale 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 = Least appropriate 9 = Most appropriate		

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

Variant 2: No previous catheter placement.

Radiologic Exam Procedure	Appropriateness Rating	Comments
X-ray chest	8	Usually ordered as the first test to supply information about the chest and to serve as baseline.
US, Duplex Doppler, upper extremity	8	Best first test for visualization of arm veins.
MRI, upper extremity and chest (including MRV)	7	Useful for central venous obstruction.

Radiologic Exam Procedure	Appropriateness Rating	Comments
INV, venography, upper extremity and chest	7	If non-invasive studies are inconclusive or patient is a candidate for interventional therapy.
CT, upper extremity and chest, with contrast	5	Useful as problem solving tool in certain situations and for central venous obstruction.
NUC, radionuclide venogram, upper extremity	4	May be valuable, but has been supplanted with Duplex and cross-sectional imaging.
X-ray, cervical spine	3	
X-ray, shoulder	1	
INV, lymphangiography, upper extremity	1	
Appropriateness Criteria Scale 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 = Least appropriate 9 = Most appropriate		

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

Background

Upper extremity venous thrombosis often presents as unilateral arm swelling. The differential diagnosis includes lymphatic obstruction, a mass lesion compressing the central veins and causing a functional venous obstruction, a localized mass lesion in the arm, or an infection causing edema. Bilateral upper extremity swelling may be due to right-sided heart failure and is typically associated with generalized swelling, whereas central vein obstruction can cause upper extremity and facial swelling.

The following recommendations are made with the understanding that venous disease, specifically venous thrombosis, is the primary diagnosis to be excluded or confirmed in a patient presenting with unilateral upper limb swelling.

Upper Extremity Deep Vein Thrombosis

Upper extremity deep vein thrombosis (DVT) can be associated with indwelling catheters, be idiopathic or post-traumatic, or be secondary to "effort thrombosis."

Upper extremity DVT is commonly associated with the presence of indwelling central venous catheters. The presence of the catheter, a foreign body, increases the likelihood of venous thrombosis by altering flow, causing damage to the

endothelial lining of the vein, and serving as a site for platelet adherence. The increased utilization of chronically indwelling catheters for hemodialysis, chemotherapy, or parenteral nutrition, often in a population that already has additional risk factors for venous thrombosis, has increased the incidence of upper extremity DVT from the low incidence rates reported in the late 1940s. As is the case with lower extremity DVT, the likelihood of arm thrombophlebitis increases with the presence of risk factors, such as age, previous thrombophlebitis, and postoperative state. The likelihood of upper extremity thrombosis also increases in the presence of congestive heart failure.

The location of the venous thrombosis is strongly linked to the clinical presentation. For example, head, neck, and bilateral swelling are likely due to a central process in the mediastinum or to involvement of both subclavian and brachiocephalic systems. Superficial thrombophlebitis is associated with local pain, induration, and, often, a palpable cord. It is rarely, if ever, associated with diffuse arm swelling. Unilateral swelling indicates an obstructive process at the level of the brachiocephalic, subclavian, and, occasionally, axillary veins. DVT limited to the brachial veins and even the axillary veins need not be associated with swelling. Isolated jugular vein thrombosis is asymptomatic and rarely causes neck swelling.

Upper Extremity Swelling, Lymphatic Obstruction

The mechanism responsible for arm swelling may be obstruction of previously functioning lymphatics or the absence of sufficient lymphatic channels to ensure effective drainage. Lymphatic obstruction can be seen with overwhelming infection such as cellulitis or can be secondary to invasion of the lymphatics by tumor. Absence of the lymphatics can be congenital or secondary to surgery, such as following a radical mastectomy.

Differentiating Causes of Arm Swelling

The general approach to evaluation of a swollen upper extremity is that the diagnosis of venous thrombosis must be excluded. The reason is simple -- the swelling, as a clinical sign, can respond to treatment with anticoagulation and might even be amenable to more aggressive interventions such as thrombolysis. Once the diagnosis of DVT is excluded, the possibility of lymphatic obstruction may need to be confirmed by objective means. Different imaging techniques that can be used to achieve the diagnosis include noninvasive tests such as plethysmography, radionuclide tracers for confirming venous obstruction or to image thrombus directly, ultrasound (US), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), computed tomography (CT), and finally phlebography. In patients with indwelling central venous catheters, phlebography, Doppler ultrasound and magnetic resonance angiography (MRA) have been used to document the presence of non-obstructive (asymptomatic) thrombi. Phlebography remains the best diagnostic modality for establishing the presence of venous stenosis and obstruction in the asymptomatic patient, while sonography can be used to visualize fibrin sheaths that form around chronically indwelling catheters.

Chest Radiography

Because of the broad differential diagnoses of upper extremity swelling, a plain chest X-ray is often ordered as a first step. This might help confirm the presence of a mass lesion responsible for central venous obstruction or help confirm the presence and location of a venous catheter or even the presence of pacing or defibrillator electrodes. Rare entities that might be associated with extrinsic compression syndromes, such as a cervical rib, would also be detected.

Plethysmography

Venous plethysmography measures blood volume changes in the arm. Blood volume is typically reduced, unless the patient has a very proximal obstruction. Venous emptying is typically reduced. The use of this noninvasive test has, in essence, been supplanted by venous ultrasound.

Radionuclide Imaging, Flow Studies

Radionuclide studies have often served as the minimally invasive test capable of confirming upper extremity venous obstruction. This modality has been used chiefly for diagnosing superior vena cava (SVC) syndrome. The diagnostic criteria include failure to visualize one or more of the main venous segments (axillary/subclavian/brachiocephalic) and visualization of collateral venous channels. This diagnostic test can be used to confirm the presence of venous obstruction but not to differentiate intrinsic venous thrombosis from extrinsic compression of the vein.

Radionuclide Imaging, Labeled Red Cells (Volume Imaging)

This approach images the blood pool within the veins. Venous thrombus displaces labeled red cells in the blood and shows up as an area of decreased radioactivity on the image. Extrinsic compression of the vein can also cause an area of decreased radioactivity since local blood volume is decreased in the compressed segment. This technique has been used to image the leg veins but has not to date been studied for evaluation of upper extremity and central veins.

Radionuclide Imaging, Thrombus-Directed Agents

Thrombus-specific agents bind to the site of actively forming thrombus. Many agents have been used, from labeled fibrinogen (no longer available) to labeled antifibrin antibody. These agents are specific for thrombus. In the lower extremity, imaging is normally done hours to days after the injection of the compound in order to decrease the background level of radioactivity. As an example, labeled antifibrin antibody is best imaged 24 hours after injection, although early images can be taken at 6 hours if an antibody fragment is used. There are no series in the literature describing the use of this technique for upper extremity swelling.

Venography (Phlebography)

This is the "gold standard" examination for evaluating the upper extremity veins. The examination carries the risks associated with the injection of an iodinated contrast agent. The nonionic and low osmolality agents offer the advantage of

better patient tolerance and less discomfort. The risks of minor adverse events are reduced compared to standard contrast agents. Based on findings from lower extremity phlebography, the incidence of phlebitis following the injection of nonionic/low osmolality agents is lower than for the injection of ionic, high osmolality agents. Direct evidence of venous thrombus is based on the visualization of a filling defect in the vein or of a "cut-off." The presence of collateral channels is supportive of a positive diagnosis. There are no large autopsy validations of phlebography but instead a series of correlative cases. Contrast phlebography has been implicitly accepted as a "gold standard" based on its' diagnostic performance for lower extremity DVT.

Venous Ultrasound

This is a relatively inexpensive and atraumatic examination. It can be used to exclude the presence of a significant DVT or of a proximal venous obstruction. Diagnostic criteria include loss of compressibility, altered blood flow patterns, or visualization of echogenic material in the vein. Compressibility of the vein is evaluated by applying pressure to the soft tissues overlying the vein. Loss of compressibility is consistent with acute DVT but can also occur in the presence of chronic venous thrombosis. This maneuver is typically used for the more superficial veins (jugular, lateral subclavian, axillary, basilic, cephalic, and brachial). A full examination also includes the evaluation of the Doppler velocity profiles obtained from moving blood in the major veins. Alterations in Doppler velocity profiles due to cardiac pulsatility are reliable indicators of central venous obstruction. In addition, respiratory maneuvers such as rapid inspiration or "sniffing" should cause the walls of the subclavian veins to co-apt. Impairment of this collapse (which is related to rapid venous emptying) also indicates a central obstructive process. However, a central thrombus will cause the same alterations in blood flow as a mass encasing or compressing the central (superior vena cava, brachiocephalic) veins. Color flow imaging can be used to image the blood flow patterns within the vein and is useful in evaluating venous segments where compression maneuvers cannot be applied (e.g., central subclavian vein). Gray scale imaging can be used to judge the echogenic structure of a thrombus. Echogenic thrombi can be positively identified, while hypoechoic thrombi may be missed. Adjunctive use of color flow images can help in confirming the presence or absence of hypoechoic thrombus. Correlative studies between ultrasound and phlebography, show diagnostic accuracies above 80%.

Magnetic Resonance Imaging

There are three imaging approaches available utilizing MRI sequences. With direct imaging, a thrombus shows up as a focal mass in the vein lumen. This approach is very useful for identifying chronic thrombi since the associated thickened vein wall is readily seen on T1- and T2-weighted images. A central thrombus may be suspected when the vein is distended and contains signals of different intensity than those of the non-involved vein. Artifacts due to signal rephasing may be difficult to distinguish from partly obstructive thrombus. With time-of-flight magnetic resonance venography, a flow-sensitive sequence is used to image blood flow in the vein lumen. A thrombus shows up as areas of decreased signal intensity. Magnetic resonance techniques permit imaging of the more central veins. Contrast enhanced MRI with gadolinium compounds has become the favored approach for imaging the upper extremity veins. Imaging is done during

the venous phase following a bolus injection of the gadolinium compound. The typical zone of coverage includes the axillary veins to the superior vena cava on one image. Despite wide clinical acceptance, there are few correlative studies validating the use of MRI of the upper extremity veins against the "gold standard", contrast phlebography.

Computed Tomography

Computed tomography can be used to determine the presence of centrally located thrombi within the jugular veins, the brachiocephalic veins, and the superior vena cava. The presence of an extrinsic process causing obstruction of the venous channels can also be determined. Rapid imaging sequences during injection of contrast material are typically used to evaluate the pulmonary arteries for suspected pulmonary embolism. Delayed imaging at 2 to 3 minutes can permit evaluation of the central veins. No large series have looked at the diagnostic accuracy of this technique diagnosing upper extremity venous thrombosis, although extensive experience is accumulating with lower extremity venous thrombosis.

Contrast Lymphography

Lipid-soluble contrast agents are injected in the subcutaneous tissues of the hand. The number and course of the lymphatic channels can then be imaged. This technique is rarely used. It may be useful in evaluating patients with previous surgery or radiation therapy at the sites of draining lymph nodes, such as the axillary nodes.

Lymphoscintigraphy

A labeled colloid preparation of small diameter particles (technetium [Tc]-99m antimony sulfur colloid; Tc-99m human serum albumin micro-colloid) can also be injected between the digits. The transit of the radiolabeled compound can then be traced through the lymphatic channels. Areas of obstruction show up as zones with no uptake contiguous to lymphatic channels. Lymph node uptake is absent, or the number of lymph nodes is decreased. This imaging technique displays the functional state of the lymphatics but does not offer much anatomic information.

Summary

Despite the availability of noninvasive imaging techniques, contrast phlebography remains the most useful, best documented diagnostic test for suspected upper extremity acute venous thrombosis. In the lower extremity, contrast venography is rarely needed since noninvasive imaging modalities have sufficient diagnostic accuracy. In the upper extremity, imaging with ultrasound has slightly lower accuracy than it has in the lower extremity. Imaging with gadolinium contrast enhanced magnetic resonance imaging is routinely used to evaluate the status of the central veins. Unfortunately, despite widespread clinical use, there are few validation studies in comparison to contrast venography. Delayed computed tomographic venography can often be used to confirm or exclude more central vein venous thrombi. As in the case of magnetic resonance venography, there are few correlative studies justifying this approach. Contrast venography may be

needed whenever other noninvasive strategies fail to adequately image the upper extremity veins.

Abbreviations

- CT, computed tomography
- INV, invasive
- MRI, magnetic resonance imaging
- MRV, magnetic resonance venography
- NUC, nuclear 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 suspected upper extremity deep vein thrombosis (DVT)

POTENTIAL HARMS

Venography carries the risks associated with the injection of an iodinated contrast agent. The nonionic and low osmolality agents offer the advantage of better patient tolerance and less discomfort. The risks of minor adverse events are reduced compared to standard contrast agents. Based on findings from lower extremity phlebography, the incidence of phlebitis following the injection of nonionic/low osmolality agents is lower than for the injection of ionic, high osmolality agents.

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)

Polak JF, Yucel EK, Bettmann MA, Casciani T, Gomes AS, Grollman JH, Holtzman SR, Sacks D, Schoepf J, Stanford W, Jaff M, Moneta GL, Expert Panel on Cardiovascular Imaging. Suspected upper extremity deep vein thrombosis (DVT). [online publication]. Reston (VA): American College of Radiology (ACR); 2005. 5 p. [33 references]

ADAPTATION

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

DATE RELEASED

1995 (revised 2005)

GUIDELINE DEVELOPER(S)

American College of Radiology - Medical Specialty Society

SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING

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 Cardiovascular Imaging

COMPOSITION OF GROUP THAT AUTHORED THE GUIDELINE

Panel Members: Joseph F. Polak, MD, MPH; E. Kent Yucel, MD; Michael A. Bettmann, MD; Thomas Casciani, MD; Antoinette S. Gomes, MD; Julius H. Grollman, MD; Stephen R. Holtzman, MD; David Sacks, MD; Joseph Schoepf, MD; William Stanford, MD; Michael Jaff, MD; Gregory L. Moneta, MD

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES/CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Not stated

GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

It updates a previously published version: Polak JF, Levin DC, Bettmann MA, Gomes AS, Grollman J, Henkin RE, Hessel SJ, Higgins CB, Kelley MJ, Needleman L, Stanford W, Wexler L, Abbott W, Port S. Unilateral upper extremity swelling and pain. American College of Radiology. ACR Appropriateness Criteria. Radiology 2000 Jun;215(Suppl):107-12. [30 references]

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™ 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 NGC summary was completed by ECRI on April 3, 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 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, 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.

© 1998-2006 National Guideline Clearinghouse

Date Modified: 9/25/2006