

## MRI

## James Demetrious, DC, DABCO

Diplomate, American Board of Chiropractic Orthopedists

www.PostGradDC.com



























The PostGradDC MRI Spine Assessment Tool
 • To become more proficient at reading spinal MRI:

 • Take advanced coursework to be able to read spinal MRI.
 • Spend time and shadow local radiologists.
 • If unsure about how to order an MRI, consult the ACR Appropriateness Criteria, a radiologist, a chiropractic orthopedist, and possibly the patient's medical provider.
 • Read the radiologist's report.
 • Overread images for evidence-based neuroradiologic elements of chiropractic subluxation.



























































































































<image><image><image>






















<b>Magnetic Resonance Imaging Assessment of Craniovertebral Ligaments and Membranes</b> <b>After Whiplash Trauma</b> Krakenes, Jostein MD, PhD*; Kaale, Bertel R. MT <i>Spine</i> . Volume 31(24), 15 November 2006, pp 2820-2826
$\cdot$ By use of high-resolution MRI, it is possible to assess ligaments and membranes in the craniovertebral junction with reasonable reliability.
<ul> <li>Significantly more high-grade lesions in a whiplash injured than in a noninjured population.</li> </ul>
$\cdot$ There is association between high-grade changes in the alar ligaments and clinical impairment.
<ul> <li>There is association between specific lesions and specific trauma mechanisms.</li> </ul>
POSTCRADDC James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com
31

















































Tools – Horos DICOM	Viewer	
	<complex-block></complex-block>	Image: Contract of the contract of
	James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	



























Amo	erican College of Radiology	Revised 2020	
Variant 1: Acute onset myelopat	Myelopathy hy. Initial imaging.		
Procedure	Appropriateness Category	<b>Relative Radiation Level</b>	
MRI spine area of interest without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0	
MRI spine area of interest without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0	
CT myelography spine area of interest	May Be Appropriate	Varies	
CT spine area of interest with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	Varies	
CT spine area of interest without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	Varies	
Arteriography spine area of interest	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies	
Radiography spine area of interest	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies	
MRA spine area of interest with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	0	
MRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	0	
MRA spine area of interest without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	0	
MRI spine area of interest with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	0	
CT spine area of interest without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies	
CTA spine area of interest with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies	
x James Deme	trious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com		119

ProcedureAppropriateness CategoryRelative Radiation LevelMRI spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually AppropriateOMRI spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually AppropriateOCT myelography spine area of interestMay Be AppropriateVariesCT spine area of interest with IV contrastMay Be AppropriateVariesCT spine area of interest with UV contrastMay Be AppropriateVariesCT spine area of interest without IV contrastMay Be AppropriateVariesArteriography spine area of interestUsually Not AppropriateVariesRadiography spine area of interestUsually Not AppropriateVariesMRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOCT spine area of interest with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOCT spine area of interest with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOCT spine area of interest with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOCT spine area of interest with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOCT spine area of interest wi	Procedure         Appropriateness Category         Relative Radiation Lev           MRI spine area of interest without and with IV contrast         Usually Appropriate         O           MRI spine area of interest without IV contrast         Usually Appropriate         O           CT myelography spine area of interest         May Be Appropriate         Varies           CT spine area of interest with IV contrast         May Be Appropriate         Varies           CT spine area of interest without IV contrast         May Be Appropriate         Varies           CT spine area of interest without IV contrast         May Be Appropriate         Varies           Arteriography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           Radiography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           Radiography spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies
MR spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually AppropriateOMRI spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually AppropriateOCT myelography spine area of interestMay Be AppropriateVariesCT spine area of interest with IV contrastMay Be AppropriateVariesCT spine area of interest with UV contrastMay Be AppropriateVariesCT spine area of interest with UV contrastMay Be AppropriateVariesArteriography spine area of interestUsually Not AppropriateVariesRadiography spine area of interestUsually Not AppropriateVariesMRA spine area of interest with UV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without IV 	MRI spine area of interest without and with IV contrast         Usually Appropriate         O           MRI spine area of interest without IV contrast         Usually Appropriate         O           CT myelography spine area of interest         May Be Appropriate         Varies           CT spine area of interest with IV contrast         May Be Appropriate         Varies           CT spine area of interest without IV contrast         May Be Appropriate         Varies           Arteriography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           Arteriography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           Radiography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           MRA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies
MRI spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually AppropriateOCT myelography spine area of interestMay Be AppropriateVariesCT spine area of interest with IV contrastMay Be AppropriateVariesCT spine area of interest without IV contrastMay Be AppropriateVariesCT spine area of interest without IV contrastMay Be AppropriateVariesArteriography spine area of interestUsually Not AppropriateVariesRadiography spine area of interestUsually Not AppropriateVariesMRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without IVUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRI spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOCT spine area of interest without IV 	MRI spine area of interest without IV contrast         Usually Appropriate         O           CT myelography spine area of interest         May Be Appropriate         Varies           CT spine area of interest with IV contrast         May Be Appropriate         Varies           CT spine area of interest without IV contrast         May Be Appropriate         Varies           Arteriography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           Radiography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           MRA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies
CT myelography spine area of interestMay Be AppropriateVariesCT spine area of interest with IV contrastMay Be AppropriateVariesCT spine area of interest without IV contrastMay Be AppropriateVariesArteriography spine area of interestUsually Not AppropriateVariesRadiography spine area of interestUsually Not AppropriateVariesMRA spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRI spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRI spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOCT spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOCT spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOCT spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOCT spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateVariesCTA spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateVaries	CT myelography spine area of interest         May Be Appropriate         Varies           CT spine area of interest with IV contrast         May Be Appropriate         Varies           CT spine area of interest without IV contrast         May Be Appropriate         Varies           Arteriography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           Radiography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           MRA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O
CT spine area of interest with IV contrastMay Be AppropriateVariesCT spine area of interest without IV contrastMay Be AppropriateVariesArteriography spine area of interestUsually Not AppropriateVariesRadiography spine area of interestUsually Not AppropriateVariesMRA spine area of interest with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRI spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOCT spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOCT spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOCT A spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateVaries	CT spine area of interest with IV contrast     May Be Appropriate     Varies       CT spine area of interest without IV contrast     May Be Appropriate     Varies       Arteriography spine area of interest     Usually Not Appropriate     Varies       Radiography spine area of interest     Usually Not Appropriate     Varies       MRA spine area of interest with IV contrast     Usually Not Appropriate     O
CT spine area of interest without IV contrastMay Be AppropriateVariesArteriography spine area of interestUsually Not AppropriateVariesRadiography spine area of interestUsually Not AppropriateVariesMRA spine area of interest with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRA spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOMRI spine area of interest without IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateOCT spine area of interest without and with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateVariesCTA spine area of interest with IV contrastUsually Not AppropriateVaries	CT spine area of interest without IV contrast     May Be Appropriate     Varies       Arteriography spine area of interest     Usually Not Appropriate     Varies       Radiography spine area of interest     Usually Not Appropriate     Varies       MRA spine area of interest with IV contrast     Usually Not Appropriate     O
Arteriography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           Radiography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           MRA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           MRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           MRA spine area of interest without IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           MRI spine area of interest without IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           MRI spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           CT spine area of interest without and with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           CTA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies	Arteriography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           Radiography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           MRA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O
Radiography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           MRA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           MRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           MRA spine area of interest without IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           MRI spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           CT spine area of interest without and with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           CT spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           CTA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies	Radiography spine area of interest         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           MRA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O
MRA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           MRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           MRA spine area of interest without IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           MRI spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           CT spine area of interest without and with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           CT spine area of interest without and with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           CTA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies	MRA spine area of interest with IV contrast Usually Not Appropriate O
MRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           MRA spine area of interest without IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           MRI spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           CT spine area of interest without and with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           CT spine area of interest without and with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           CTA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies	
MRA spine area of interest without IV         Usually Not Appropriate         O           MRI spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           CT spine area of interest without and with IV         Usually Not Appropriate         O           CT spine area of interest without and with IV         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           CTA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies	MRA spine area of interest without and with IV contrast OO
MRI spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         O           CT spine area of interest without and with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           CTA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies	MRA spine area of interest without IV Usually Not Appropriate O
CT spine area of interest without and with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies           CTA spine area of interest with IV contrast         Usually Not Appropriate         Varies	MRI spine area of interest with IV contrast Usually Not Appropriate O
CTA spine area of interest with IV contrast Usually Not Appropriate Varies	CT spine area of interest without and with IV Usually Not Appropriate Varies
	CTA spine area of interest with IV contrast Usually Not Appropriate Varies

Amı ACF <u>Variant 1:</u> Acute low back pain Initial imaging.	erican College of Radiology R Appropriateness Criteria® Low Back Pain 1 with or without radiculopathy. No re	Revised 2 d flags. No prior manageme
Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
Radiography lumbar spine	Usually Not Appropriate	***
MRI lumbar spine with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	0
MRI lumbar spine without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	0
MRI lumbar spine without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	0
Bone scan whole body with SPECT or SPECT/CT complete spine	Usually Not Appropriate	***
CT lumbar spine with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	ତତତ
CT lumbar spine without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	ଡ଼ଡ଼ଡ଼
Discography and post-discography CT lumbar spine	Usually Not Appropriate	***
CT lumbar spine without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	****
CT myelography lumbar spine	Usually Not Appropriate	ଡ଼ଡ଼ଡ଼ଡ଼
	Usually Not Appropriate	****

management. Initial I	maging.	
Procedure	Appropriateness Category	<b>Relative Radiation Level</b>
Radiography lumbar spine	Usually Not Appropriate	<b>\$\$</b>
MRI lumbar spine with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	0
MRI lumbar spine without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	0
MRI lumbar spine without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	0
Bone scan whole body with SPECT or SPECT/CT complete spine	Usually Not Appropriate	<b>୫୫</b> ୫
CT lumbar spine with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	<b>@@@</b>
CT lumbar spine without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	ଢଢଢ
Discography and post-discography CT lumbar spine	Usually Not Appropriate	ଡଡଡ
CT lumbar spine without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	****
CT myelography lumbar spine	Usually Not Appropriate	****
FDG-PET/CT whole body	Usually Not Appropriate	****

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	<b>Relative Radiation Level</b>
MRI lumbar spine without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0
Radiography lumbar spine	May Be Appropriate	***
MRI lumbar spine without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	0
Bone scan whole body with SPECT or SPECT/CT complete spine	May Be Appropriate	***
CT lumbar spine without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	ଚଚଚ
CT myelography lumbar spine	May Be Appropriate	ଡ଼ଡ଼ଡ଼ଡ଼
MRI lumbar spine with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	0
CT lumbar spine with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	***
Discography and post-discography CT lumbar spine	Usually Not Appropriate	***
CT lumbar spine without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	***
FDG-PET/CT whole body	Usually Not Appropriate	***

Red Flag	Potential Underlying Condition as Cause of LBP
<ul> <li>History of cancer</li> <li>Unexplained weight loss</li> <li>Immunosuppression</li> <li>Urinary infection</li> <li>Intravenous drug use</li> <li>Prolonged use of corticosteroids</li> <li>Back pain not improved with conservative management</li> </ul>	Cancer or infection
<ul> <li>History of significant trauma</li> <li>Minor fall or heavy lift in a potentially osteoporotic or elderly individual</li> <li>Prolonged use of steroids</li> </ul>	Spinal fracture
<ul> <li>Acute onset of urinary retention or overflow incontinence</li> <li>Loss of anal sphincter tone or fecal incontinence</li> <li>Saddle anesthesia</li> <li>Bilateral or progressive weakness in the lower limbs</li> </ul>	Cauda equina syndrome or other severe neurologic condition

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
MRI lumbar spine without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0
MRI lumbar spine without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0
CT lumbar spine without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	***
CT myelography lumbar spine	May Be Appropriate	ଡ଼ଡ଼ଡ଼ଡ଼
Radiography lumbar spine	Usually Not Appropriate	***
MRI lumbar spine with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	0
Bone scan whole body with SPECT or SPECT/CT complete spine	Usually Not Appropriate	€€€
CT lumbar spine with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	***
Discography and post-discography CT lumbar spine	Usually Not Appropriate	₢₢₢
CT lumbar spine without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	****
FDG-PET/CT whole body	Usually Not Appropriate	***

Low back pain with history of prior lumbar surgery and with or without radiculopathy. New Variant 5: or progressing symptoms or clinical findings. Initial imaging. **Relative Radiation Level** Procedure **Appropriateness Category** Radiography lumbar spine Usually Appropriate \*\*\* MRI lumbar spine without and with IV Usually Appropriate 0 contrast MRI lumbar spine without IV contrast Usually Appropriate 0 CT lumbar spine without IV contrast May Be Appropriate ••• CT myelography lumbar spine May Be Appropriate \*\*\*\* MRI lumbar spine with IV contrast Usually Not Appropriate 0 Bone scan whole body with SPECT or Usually Not Appropriate \*\*\* SPECT/CT complete spine CT lumbar spine with IV contrast Usually Not Appropriate •••

Discography and post-discography CT lumbar

CT lumbar spine without and with IV contrast

FDG-PET/CT whole body



spine

James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com

Usually Not Appropriate

Usually Not Appropriate

Usually Not Appropriate

\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	<b>Relative Radiation Level</b>
Radiography lumbar spine	Usually Appropriate	ଡ଼ଡ଼ଡ଼
MRI lumbar spine without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0
CT lumbar spine without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	***
MRI lumbar spine without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	0
CT myelography lumbar spine	May Be Appropriate	ଡ଼ଡ଼ଡ଼ଡ଼
MRI lumbar spine with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	0
Bone scan whole body with SPECT or SPECT/CT complete spine	Usually Not Appropriate	₸₽₽₽
CT lumbar spine with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	₸₽₽₽
Discography and post-discography CT lumbar spine	Usually Not Appropriate	***
CT lumbar spine without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	♥♥♥♥
FDG-PET/CT whole body	Usually Not Appropriate	****

Γ

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
MRI lumbar spine without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0
MRI lumbar spine without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0
Radiography lumbar spine	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	***
CT lumbar spine with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	₸₽₽₽
CT lumbar spine without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	***
CT myelography lumbar spine	May Be Appropriate	€€€€
MRI lumbar spine with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	0
Bone scan whole body with SPECT or SPECT/CT complete spine	Usually Not Appropriate	<b>~~</b>
Discography and post-discography CT lumbar spine	Usually Not Appropriate	***
CT lumbar spine without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	€€€€
FDG-PET/CT whole body	Usually Not Appropriate	***






















































































<b>Table</b> Grade	Modified Grading System for Lumbar Disc I     Signal From Nucleus and Inner Fibers of Anulus	Degeneration* Distinction Between Inner and Outer Fibers of Anulus at Posterior Aspect of Disc	Height of Disc	
1 2	Uniformly hyperintense, equal to CSF Hyperintense (>presacral fat and <csf) <math="">\pm</csf)>	Distinct Distinct	Normal Normal	
3 4 5 6 7 8	hypointense intranuclear cleft Hypointense though ~presacral fat Mildly hyperintense (slightly >outer fibers of anulus) Hypointense (= outer fibers of anulus) Hypointense Hypointense Hypointense	Distinct Indistinct Indistinct Indistinct Indistinct Indistinct	Normal Normal <30% reduction in disc height 30%—60% reduction in disc height >60% reduction in disc height	
*Grades the anulu Grades, f occasion double e	<ol> <li>2, and 3 are based on the signal intensity of the nucleus a sa the posterior margin of the disc are indistinct. For Grade 6, 7, and 8, there is progressive loss of disc space height. The ally, although obvious disc collapse is present, hyperintense entry, e.g., 4/7, with the former reporting the disc signal and the second second second second second second second second second and the former reporting the disc signal and the second</li></ol>	nd inner fibers of anulus. For Grade 4, the margins 5, fihe disc is uniformly hypointense, although th se could be broadly classified as mild, moderate, to ignal from the nucleus and inner fibers of the anuli he latter the degree of collapse.	between the inner and other fibers of are is no loss of disc space height. For severe loss of disc space height. Very us is preserved. This is referred to by a	
	<b>Modified Grading Syster</b> <i>From:</i> Griffith: Spine, Volum	<b>m for Lumbar Disc Deg</b> e 32(24).November 15, 20	eneration 007.E708-E712	





































## **Rauschning Grading System for disc** protrusions is based on the assessment of the normal specimens and actual disc

Grade 0: straight contour of the posterior annulus

Grade 1: small annulus fibrosus protrusion. Grade 2: medium-size annulus protrusion obliterating 2/3 of the anterior epidural and subarachnoid spaces. Grade 3: large disc protrusion dislocating the spinal cord

Grade 4: large disc protrusions compressing the spinal

185

Cervical Roots as Origin of Pain in the Neck or Scapular Regions Tanaka et al. *Spine*. Volume 31(17), 1 August 2006, pp E568-E573 • A prospective study was conducted to determine whether the pain in the neck or scapular regions in patients with cervical radiculopathy originates from the compressed root and whether the site of the pain is useful for diagnosing the level. It was confirmed through this study that scapular region pain is generally the initial symptom in radiculopathy and can persist alone before the C5 or C6 arm or finger symptoms develop. • Pain in the scapular region can originate directly in the compressed root, and the site of the pain is valuable for determining the localization of the involved root. POSTGRADDC James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com

Dynamic Steno	sis	
POSTGRADDC EVIDENCE BASED, CLINICALLY NTUTIVE CE	James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	













































	CLINICAL CASE SERIES	
	Cauda Equina Syndrome	
	Poor Recovery Prognosis Despite Early Treatment	
	Planty-Bonjour, Alexia MD <sup>a,b</sup> ; Kerdiles, Gaelle MD <sup>a</sup> ; François, Patrick MD, PhD <sup>a</sup> ; Destrieux, Christophe MD, PhD <sup>a,b</sup> ; Velut, Stephane MD, PhD <sup>a,b</sup> ; Zemmoura, Ilyess MD, PhD <sup>a,b</sup> ; Cook, Ann-Rose MD <sup>a</sup> ; Terrier, Louis-Marie MD <sup>a,b</sup> ; Amelot, Aymeric MD, PhD <sup>a,b</sup>	
	Author Information	
	SPINE: January 15, 2022 - Volume 47 - Issue 2 - p 105-113	
Results		
<ul> <li>The patients were</li> </ul>	young with a median age of 46.8 years (range 18–86 yrs). At presentation:	
60% were affect	cted by a motor deficit,	
• 42.8% a sensiti	ive deficit,	
• 70% urinary dy	ysfunctions, and	
<ul> <li>44% bowel dys</li> </ul>	sfunctions.	
The mean follow-	up was 15.5 months.	
<ul> <li>Time to surgery w recovery in CES.</li> </ul>	ithin an <mark>early timing &lt; 24 or 48 hours or later did not represent a prognosis facto</mark>	<mark>or of</mark>
<ul> <li>Incomplete versus</li> </ul>	s complete CES did not show better recovery.	
	James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	206




























"To always care for patients in a manner that best serves their health, interests, and well-being. To continue to learn, teach and share our knowledge and ability to help others."

~ James Demetrious, DC, DABCO

		James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	217 2)))
--	--	--	----------























Intere <b>R</b> eson	EXAMINER RELIABILITY OF T2-WEIGHTED MAGNETIC	
Gary A. Lor	ngmuir, MAppSc, DC, <sup>a,b</sup> and Raymond N. Conley, DC <sup>c</sup>	
ABSTRAC	T	
Abstrac		
<b>Ob</b> ider	jective: The aims of this study were to characterize the bright facet response within the lumbar spine, to ntify a constellation of findings associated with the response, and to quantify the interexaminer agreement on the	
pre Me	vious objectives. <b>thods:</b> A retrospective study of lumbar magnetic resonance images obtained on 105 (N = 105) adult subjects (62	
men	n and 43 women; age range, 18-84 years; mean age, $46.51 \pm 16.01$ years) were reviewed by 2 musculoskeletal iologists for the presence of high signal within the facet articulations (bright facet response) on fast spin echo T2-	
wei	ighted images. sufts: Of the 630 humbar facet articulations imaged (1.3/1.4 through 1.5/S1), 340 (54%) and 346 (55%) respectively.	
per	examiner, did show a bright facet arteriations imaged (LSLC+ through LSSS), 540 (44%) and 540 (55%) respectively,	
ave	raged 40.5% at L5/S1, 56.5% at L3/L4, and 66.5% at the L4/L5 level. There was an association with degenerative	
face	et and disk changes. nclusion: The bright facet response was a common phenomenon on T2-weighted magnetic resonance imaging of the	
lum	abar spine in these cases. There was sufficient agreement with respect to the presence and extent of the bright facet ponse to conclude that the examiners' determinations were not made by random chance. There exist sufficient	
rep	eatability and reliability that a single descriptive term can be applied to unify the bright facet response, the bright facet	
Key	y Indexing Terms: Hydrarthrosis; Radiography; Diagnostic Imaging; Chiropractic	
`		
ADDC	James Demetrious. DC. DABCO - PostGradDC.com	













































	PAIN MEDICINE Volume 9 - Number 4 - 2008					
	SPINE SECTION					
	Original Research Article					
	Fat-Saturated MR Imaging in the Detection of Inflammatory Facet Arthropathy (Facet Synovitis) in the Lumbar Spine					
	Leo F. Czervionke, MD, and Douglas S. Fenton, MD Mayo Clinic Jacksonville, Department of Radiology, Jacksonville, Florida, USA					
<i>Conclusion</i> . Fac Detection of a the facet joints	et synovitis is a common condition and appears to correlate with the patient's pain. ctive inflammatory facet osteoarthropathy (facet synovitis) within and surrounding is possible with MR imaging using a fat-saturation technique.					
PAIN MEDICINE. Volume 9 · Number 4 · 2008						
	James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com					







Fat-Saturated	MR Imaging in the Detection 403				
Grade	Criteria	-			
0 1 2 3 4	No signal abnormality Signal abnormality confined to joint capsule Periarticular signal abnormality involving less than 50% of the perimeter of the joint* Periarticular signal abnormality involving more than 50% of the perimeter of the joint* Grade 3 with extension of signal abnormality into the intervertebral foramen, ligamentum flavum, pedicle, transverse process, or vertebral body	-			
* Signal abnormality may extend into the articular pillar or lamina, but does not contribute to the definition of the grade. MR = magnetic resonance.					
	PAIN MEDICINE. Volume 9 · Number 4 · 2008				
POSTGRADDC EVIDENCE BASED, CLINICALLY INTUITIVE CE	James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	252			













































Box 5 Importance of clinical context	
Axial, nonradicular pain $\rightarrow$ seek out a posterior element cause	
Additional suggestive findings:	
Morning back stiffness	
Decreased range of motion	
Mechanical pain with extension, flexion, or rotation maneuvers	
Pain to palpation over facet joints and spinous processes	
Patient age	
Young $\rightarrow$ more likely discogenic	
Older $\rightarrow$ more likely posterior elements	
Radiol Clin N Am 50 (2012) 705–730.	
James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	272 2)))






































Reactions of Synovial Membrane
<ul> <li>The synovial membrane, which secrete synovial fluid for both nutrition and lubrication of the articular cartilage, is capable of reacting to abnormal conditions in one or more of three ways:</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>By producing an excessive amount of fluid (effusion),</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>By becoming thicker (hypertrophy),</li> </ul>
• By forming intra-articular adhesions between itself and the articular cartilage.
<ul> <li>A joint effusion may be serous, inflammatory or hemorrhagic.</li> </ul>
Salter: Continuous Passive Motion
James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com

Reactions of Synovial Membrane								
<ul> <li>A joint effusion may be serous, inflammatory or hemorrhagic.</li> </ul>								
<ul> <li>All but the transient effusions cause a second reaction in the synovial membrane, namely varying degrees of synovial hypertrophy.</li> </ul>								
<ul> <li>Synovial adhesions can also form, especially as the result of a <u>prolonged limitation of</u> joint motion from any cause, including prolonged immobilization of the abnormal.</li> </ul>								
<ul> <li>This explains the well-known clinical observation that prolonged immobilization of a diseased or injured joint is more likely to lead to persistent joint stiffness.</li> </ul>								
Salter: Continuous Passive Motion								
POSTCRADDC James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	290							





































































## **Muscle Spindles**

Muscle spindles are elongated receptors which monitor the state of muscle length, supplying afferent signals to the central nervous system (CNS), thereby conferring proprioceptive control.



James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com





## Muscle Spindles Image: Spindles





























**HVLA-SM** Pre-During Manipulation Manipulation SPINE JOURNAL Basic Science Intervertebral kinematics of the cervical spine before, during, and after high-velocity low-amplitude manipulation William J. Anderst, PhD<sup>3,49</sup>, Tom Gale, MS<sup>3</sup>, Clarissa LeVasseur, MS<sup>3</sup>, Sandesh Raj, BS<sup>3</sup>, Kris Gongaware, DC<sup>3</sup>, Michael Schneider, DC, DPT<sup>3</sup> Department of Onloyedic Surgery, University of Fittuburgh, 320 South Water St, Pittuburgh, PA 15202, USA <sup>b</sup>Department of Physical Theory, Linevisity of Fittuburgh, 280 South Water St, Pittuburgh, PA 15202, USA Received 29 My 2018; revised 30 July 2018; seepted 31 July 2018. 3.0 mm 0.1 mm..... Fig. 3. A posterior view of the cervical spine premanipulation (left) and during manipulation (right). Gapping of the left facet joints is demonstrated by the color-coded facet joint surfaces. James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com





















APPR	APPROPRIATE USE CRITERIA			
ACR Pain	Appro —Child	opria I	teness Criteria <sup>®</sup> Back	
Expert P Richard Abhaya Richard Aylin To Susan Po Susan To Susan To Susan To	anel on Pedia A. Falcone Jr, V. Kulkarni, N L. Robertson, I kes, MD°, An elasis, MD' pain with 1 or pein with 1 or	tric Imag MD, MI MD <sup>s</sup> , Joh MD <sup>k</sup> , M drew T.	ging: Timothy N. Booth, MD <sup>4</sup> , Ramesh S. Iyer, MD <sup>4</sup> , PH <sup>7</sup> , Laura L. Hayes, MD <sup>7</sup> , Jeremy Y. Jones, MD <sup>7</sup> , Nadja Kadom, in S. Aynero, MD <sup>6</sup> , Sonia Parara, MD <sup>7</sup> , Cherler Keimman, MD <sup>7</sup> , aura E. Ryan, MD <sup>7</sup> , Gauraty Saigal, MD <sup>40</sup> , Bruno P. Soures, MD <sup>6</sup> , Trout, MD <sup>6</sup> , Nicholas A. Zumberge, MD <sup>6</sup> , Brian D. Coley, MD <sup>7</sup> , the following clinical red flags: constant pain, night pain, radicular on Anathine radiocraphs.	MD <sup>, r</sup> , pain, pain lasting
Padiologic Proc	adure	Dating	Comments	DDI
MRI complete spine wi contrast	ithout IV	8	See references [4,19,20].	0
MRI complete spine w with IV contrast	ithout and	6	This procedure is useful if there is concern for inflammation, infection, or neoplasm. See variant 6. See references [8,15,28,33].	0
CT spine area of intere IV contrast	st without	5	This procedure is useful to evaluate bony lesion. See references [8,15,28,33].	Varies
Tc-99m bone scan wh with SPECT complet	ole body te spine	5	This procedure is useful for detection and characterization of pars injury. See references [8,15,28,33].	****
CT spine area of intere contrast	st with IV	2		Varies
MRI complete spine wi contrast	ith IV	1		0
CT spine area of intere and with IV contrast	st without	1		Varies
X-ray myelography and myelography CT com	d post plete spine	1		****
Note: Rating scale: 1, 2, 3 radiation level; SPECT	<ul> <li>usually not a</li> <li>single-photor</li> </ul>	appropriat n emissio	e; 4, 5, 6 = may be appropriate; 7, 8, 9 = usually appropriate; IV = intrave n computed tomography.	nous; $RRL = relative$





















Look inside V	Imaging Painfu by Leo F. Czervionke MD	I <b>l Spine Disorders, 1e</b> Hardcover – June 2, 2011 (Author), Douglas S. Fenton MD (Author) stomer review			
Leo F. Czervinske Douglas S. Fenton Imaging Painful	<ul> <li>See all 2 formats and edi</li> <li>Kindle</li> <li>\$136.79</li> </ul>	Ions Hardcover 5169.00 <i>Prime</i>			
Spine Disorders	Read with Our Free App	20 Used from \$98.50 22 New from \$96.76 and Dourdias S. Fenton, MD present Imaging Painful Spine Disporters, the			
	diagnostic companion to Image-Guided Spine Intervention, with 1,400 high-quality radiographic images to help you diagnose common and rare spine pain conditions. The full-color, easy-to-navigate format takes you from Spinal Anatomy, which includes normal CT and MR images of the cervical, thoracic, and lumbar spine, to Clinical Disorders, where each chapter is introduced by an actual patient case. No other reference features as many case studies illustrating the imaging presentation of back				
See all 2 images	pain, provides a detaile errors quite like this one • Access represen • Read more	d differential diagnosis, and points out clinical pitfalls and common diagnosis . Access the full text and complete image bank at www.expertconsult.com. tative cross-sectional images of the cervical thoracic and lumbar spine as well			
Czervionke LF,	Fenton DS. II	maging Painful Spine Disorders.			
	James Demetrious, D	C, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	357		
































<b>Rib Fracture</b>						
	ACR Login  ACR CR Appropriate Contential I VOLUME 16, ISSUE 5, SUPPLEMENT, 5227-5224, MAY 01, 2019  ACR Appropriateness Criteria <sup>®</sup> Rib Fractures  Expert Panel on Thoracic Imaging: +Travis S, Henry, MD A P + Edwin F, Donnelly, MD, PhD +  Arteree Strajuddin, MD + Carol C, Wu, MD - All Rifery P, Kanney, MD + Show all authors  DDI: here: lefted on W10 10166 large 2019 20 20 10 +  Active Strajuddin, MD + Carol C, Wu, MD - All Rifery P, Kanney, MD + Show all authors  DDI: here: lefted on W10 10166 large 2019 20 20 10 +  Active Strajuddin, MD + Carol C, Wu, MD - All Rifery P, Kanney, MD + Show all authors  DDI: here: lefted on W10 10166 large 2019 20 20 10 +  Active Strajuddin, MD + Carol C, Wu, MD - All Rifery P, Kanney, MD + Show all authors  DDI: here: lefted on W10 10166 large 2019 20 20 10 +  Active Strajuddin, MD + Carol C, Wu, MD - All Rifery P, Kanney, MD + Show all authors  DDI: here: lefted on W10 10166 large 2019 20 20 10 +  Active Strajuddin, MD + Carol C, Wu, MD - All Rifery P, Kanney, MD + Show all Rifery P, Kanney					
<ul> <li>Rib fractures are the</li> <li>Isolated rib fractures is generally conservation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Rib fractures are the most common thoracic injury after minor blunt trauma.</li> <li>Isolated rib fractures have a relatively low morbidity and mortality and treatment is generally conservative.</li> </ul>					
<ul> <li>In patients with suspected pathologic fractures, chest CT or Tc-99m bone scans are usually appropriate and complementary modalities to chest radiography based on the clinical scenario.</li> </ul>						
	James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com					

Rib	Fracture					
ACR Login  ACR Login  ACR Login  ACR Login  ACR Login  ACR Login  ACR Appropriateness Criteria®  ACR Appropriateness Criteri						
	Variant I. Suspected rib fractures from minor blunt trauma (injury contined to ribs). Initial imaging.					
	Radiography chest	Usually Appropriate				
	Radiography rib views	May Be Appropriate	***			
	CT chest without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	***			
	Tc-99m bone scan whole body	Usually Not Appropriate	***			
	CT chest with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	***			
	CT chest without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	ବବବ			
	US chest	Usually Not Appropriate	0			
	C James Dem	etrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com		374		

<b>Rib Fracture</b>			
	PRICORLINE USE CHITERIA I VOLUME 10, ISSUE 5, SUPPLEMENT, S227-S234, AY 01, 2019 AX 01, 2019 ACCR Appropriateness Criteria <sup>®</sup> Rib Fract txper Panel on Thoracic Imaging: •Travis S. Henry, MD A ☉ • Edwin F. Donne terre Brauddin, MD • Cara C. Wu, MD - Jeffrey P. Kanne, MD • <sup>1</sup> Chora di autho OI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacr.2019.02.019 • 💽 Check for updates	ACR Login UIPOS #9, MD, PhD • MS	
Variant 2. Suspected rib fractures afte	er cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR). Initial imagi	ng. Pelative Padiation Level	
Radiography chest	Usually Appropriate		
Radiography rib views	May Be Appropriate	ଚଚଚ	
CT chest without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	&&&	
CT chest with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	&&&	
Tc-99m bone scan whole body	Usually Not Appropriate	***	
US chest	Usually Not Appropriate	0	
CT chest without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	<del>ଷ</del> ଷ ଷ	
	James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com		375



<b>Rib Fractu</b>	re							
	> J Can Chiropr Assoc. 2020 Apr;64(1):7-15.							
Lessons learned from cases of rib fractures after manual therapy: a case series to increase patient safety								
Daphne To <sup>1</sup> , Anthony Tibbles <sup>1</sup> , Martha Funabashi <sup>1</sup> Affiliations + expand PMID: 32476664 PMC/D: PMC7250508								
Л	ncident characteristi	cs. SMT (sp	oinal mani	1 adie 2 pulative thera	z. apy); N/A (not applicab	le, due to unavaila	ble data)	
	Type	SMT Side Lavel		Symptom	Fracture	Complications	Time to symptom resolution	
Case 1	Supine; posterior contact	Bilateral	Т3-Т6	Immediate	Ribs 5 and 6; left side, axillary region	None	7 weeks	
Case 2	Prone; hypothenar transverse contact	Left	C7-T1	Immediate	Ribs 4 and 5; left side, anterolateral region	None	12 weeks	
Case 3	Side posture; lumbar roll	Left	L3-L5	Immediate	Rib 9; left side, anterior region	None	N/A	
10	10 J Can Chiropr Assoc 2020; 64(1)							
POSTGRADDC EVIDENCE BASED, CLINICALLY INTUITIVE CE	James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com							













































































In	structiv	e Case	FS 320/19 SE
<u>Case Repor</u> Metastatic Spine	r <u>ts</u> Testicular Seminon JAMES DEME	Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Theraperties 525 Volume 15 + Number & October, 1992 0161-4754/92/1506-0525 983.00/00 6 1992 MPT	ASH
ABSTRACT A case of metasta the cervico-thoracic clinical and radiogra discussed. (J Manipu 528).	tic testicular seminoma affecting spine is reported along with its phic findings. Case progression is lative Physiol Ther 1992; 15:525–	Key Indexing Terms: Metastasis, Seminoma, Cervi- cal Vertebrae, Spine, Chiropractie.	Figure 1. The sagittal image reveals areas of abnormal signal intensity in the C3 and T1 vertebral bodies.
	ITUITIVE CE	James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	1 413

















<ul> <li>A 73-year-old man presented to our chiropractic office eight-weeks following a vehicular accident.</li> </ul>				
• While driving, he suffered a head on collision with an oncoming vehicle.				
<ul> <li>He was transported via ambulance to a local hospital where evaluation and extensive imaging was performed.</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>The attending emergency medical physician diagnosed rib fractures and the patient was subsequently released from the hospital.</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>He sought care with his medical primary care physician (PCP) and received a prescription for pain medication.</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>No other recommendations were provided to the patient.</li> </ul>				
POSTCRADDC James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com				





SYMPTOMS OF HORNER'S SYNDROME
Normal eye Horner's Syndrome
A ponsilentify and puper in the between the bus events in the ordered bus events in the ordered bus of the defected bus of the defected bus of the defected bus of the defected bus of the
 Decomp of the upper cyclid Stight televation of the lower Id Stight televation to the eye Neodoches and Reddoches and Reddoches and
James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com

<ul> <li>The lungs were clear to auscultation.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Globally decreased cervical range of motion tenderness was noted at C7/∏.</li> </ul>	and localized
<ul> <li>Palpation revealed tenderness of the first rib lung.</li> </ul>	o at the apex of the right
<ul> <li>The patient reported localized discomfort at compression, Spurling's test and Valsalva mage</li> </ul>	: C7/T1 upon cervical aneuver.
<ul> <li>No radiating pain was elicited. No other abn identified during physical examination.</li> </ul>	ormalities were
POSTGRADDC EVIDENCE BARER, CLINICALLY MTUITIVE CE	com 424






















Revised 2018	
American College of Radiology ACR Appropriateness Criteria <sup>®</sup> Suspected Spine Trauma	
Table 1. NEXUS Criteria for Cervical SpineImaging [4]	
Focal neurologic deficit	
Midline spinal tenderness	
Altered level of consciousness	
Intoxication	
Distracting injury	
James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	















































	Neuro-Oncology Practice 7(51), 15-19, 2020   dd: 10.1932/nop/npaa046 Epidemiology of spinal cord and column tumors	
	Joshua T. Wewel and John E. O'Toole Atlanta Brain and Spine Care, Piedmont Healthcare, Atlanta, Georgia (J.T.W.); Department of Neurosurgery, University Medical Center, Chicago, Illinois, US (J.E.O)	
<ul> <li>A detailed history and obtain radiographs.</li> </ul>	d neurologic exam is necessary, and the provider is obligated to	
<ul> <li>In its most severe for Although relatively ra emergent evaluation</li> </ul>	m, metastatic disease can cause spinal cord compression. are, in 10 per 100 000 patients spinal cord compression necessitate .10	S
<ul> <li>The symptoms are of disturbances includir</li> </ul>	ten advanced and include weakness (60%-85%), sensory ng saddle anesthesia, and bowel/bladder disturbances.15	
<ul> <li>Untreated spinal core bowel/bladder dysful</li> </ul>	d compression can progress to paralysis, sensory loss, and nction.17	
POSTCRADDC ENDERCE BASED, CLINICALLY INTUITIVE CE	James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	452







Pancoast Tumor	
Differential Diagnosis	
General imaging differential considerations include:	
pulmonary metastases	
• <u>mesothelioma</u>	
primary chest wall tumors	
<u>Ewing sarcoma</u>	
<u>PNE</u> (primitive neuroectodermal tumor) <u>I</u>	
chest wall metastases	
<ul> <li>apical pleural thickening secondary to e.g. previous <u>pulmonary tuberculosis</u></li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>In addition a number of plain film mimics should be considered, including:</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>vascular lesions: e.g. <u>carotid pseudoaneurysm</u><sup>4</sup></li> </ul>	
anterosuperior mediastinal masses	
<ul> <li>bronchogenic adenocarcinomas are now more frequently identified <sup>8</sup>.</li> </ul>	
Gaillard, F., Bickle, I. Pancoast tumor. Reference article, Radiopaedia.org. (accessed on 26 Oct 2021) https://doi.org/10.53347/rID-1829	
POSTCRADDC INDEXCE BASED. CLAINCALLY INTUITIVE CE James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	456



















































Multiple Myeloma	
Clinical Presentation	
• Clinical presentation of patients with multiple myeloma is varied, and includes <sup>1,2,7</sup> :	
• bone pain	
<ul> <li>initially intermittent, but becomes constant</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>worse with activity/weight-bearing, and thus is worse during the day</li> </ul>	
• anemia	
<ul> <li>typically normochromic/normocytic</li> </ul>	
• renal failure	
• proteinuria	
• hypercalcemia	
Yap, K., Bell, D. Multiple myeloma. Reference article, Radiopaedia.org. (accessed on 18 Oct 2021) https://radiopaedia.org/articles/9555	
POSTCRADDC James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	477
477	



Multiple Myeloma					
Distribution					
<ul> <li>Distributio and thus th skeleton:</li> </ul>	n of multiple myeloma mirrors that of red marrow in the older individual, nis is mostly encountered in the axial skeleton and proximal appendicular				
• vertebra	ae (most common)				
• ribs					
• skull					
• shoulde	er girdle				
<ul> <li>pelvis</li> </ul>					
<ul> <li>long bo</li> </ul>	nes				
• extraske	eletal structures (extraosseous <u>myeloma</u> ): rare				
	Yap, K., Bell, D. Multiple myeloma. Reference article, Radiopaedia.org. (accessed on 18 Oct 2021) https://radiopaedia.org/articles/9555				
EVIDENCE BASED, CLINICALLY INTUITIVE CE	James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com				
179					

























	Plasmacytoma	
	Presentation	
	<ul> <li>Most common signs/symptoms</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Clinical manifestations related to anatomic sites</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Most common symptom = pain due to bone destruction</li> </ul>	
	Description Painful phase with mean of 6 months	
	- Can be asymptomatic	
	- Epidural extension may cause compression of cord or nerve root	
	- Pathologic fracture may cause cord compression	
	<ul> <li>Other signs/symptoms</li> </ul>	
	- Low levels of serum/urine monoclonal proteins (25-75%)	
	M protein has been reported in 24-72%	
	- Uncommon presentation of demyelinating polyneuropathy	
	<ul> <li>Consider POEMS (p olyneuropathy, o rganomegaly, e ndocrinopathy,</li> </ul>	
	<b>M</b> protein, <b>s</b> kin changes) syndrome	
	Ross and Moore. Diagnostic Imaging Spine, 4 <sup>th</sup> Edition	
POSTGRADDC EVIDENCE BASED, CLINICALLY INTUITIVE CE	James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	491
191		









Variant 1. Asymptomatic BMD screening	g or individuals with established	or clinically suspected low BMD.	
Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL
DXA lumbar spine and hip(s)	9		•
QCT lumbar spine and hip	6		♦♥♥
DXA distal forearm	5		•
TBS lumbar spine	4		•
QUS calcaneus	2		0
SXA distal forearm	2		\$
pQCT distal forearm	2		•
X-ray axial skeleton	1		Varies
X-ray appendicular skeleton	1		**
Note: Rating Scale 1,2,3 = usually not approp absorptiometry; pQCT = peripheral QCT; QC absorptiometry; TBS = trabecular bone sco	riate; 4,5,6 = may be appropriate; 7, T = quantitative CT; QUS = periphera re. Journal of the American College of R Volume 14 - Number 55 - N	8,9 = usually appropriate. DXA = dual- al ultrasound; RRL = relative radiation leve adiology (av 2017	energy x-ray શ; SXA = single x-ray

	Osteoporos	5IS	
Variant 3. Follow-up. Patients demonst	trated to have risk for fracture or	low density.	
Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL
DXA lumbar spine and hip(s)	9		•
QCT lumbar spine and hip	7		***
DXA VFA	5		•
pQCT distal forearm	3		•
TBS lumbar spine	2		•
QUS calcaneus	1		0
SXA distal forearm	1		•
Note: Rating Scale: 1,2,3 = usually not appro absorptiometry; QCT = quantitative CT; Q TBS = trabecular bone score; VFA = verter	priate; 4,5,6 = may be appropriate; 7 US = quantitative ultrasound; RRL = bral fracture assessment; pQCT = pe	78,9 = usually appropriate. DXA = dual- relative radiation level; SXA = single x-r rripheral QCT.	energy x-ray ay absorptiometry;
	Journal of the American College of Ra Volume 14 = Number 55 = Ma	diology ay 2017	

	Osteoporo	sis	
Variant 4. Identify low BMD. Premeno	pausal females with risk factors.	Males 20–50 years of age with risk	factors.
Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL
DXA lumbar spine and hip(s)	9		•
DXA distal forearm	8		•
QCT lumbar spine and hip	3		***
pQCT distal forearm	3		8
QUS calcaneus	1		0
SXA distal forearm	1		•
Note: Rating Scale = 1,2,3 usually not appro absorptiometry; pQCT = peripheral QCT; 0 x-ray absorptiometry.	priate; 4,5,6 = may be appropriate; 7, QCT = quantitative CT; QUS = quantit	8,9 = usually appropriate. DXA = dual-e ative ultrasound; RRL = relative radiation	energy x-ray n level; SXA = single
	Journal of the American College of Ra Volume 14 = Number 55 = N	idiology ay 2017	

Oste	Osteoporosis				
suspected osteoporosis or a patient treated with corticos	al body bi steroids (	ased on acute or subacute symptomatology in a patie >3 months). First examination.	nt with		
Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL		
X-ray spine area of interest	9	This procedure includes 2 views.	Varies		
CT spine area of interest without IV contrast	5	This procedure may be appropriate but there was disagreement among panel members on the appropriateness rating as defined by the panel's median rating.	Varies		
MRI spine area of interest without IV contrast	2		0		
CT spine area of interest with IV contrast	1		Varies		
CT spine area of interest without and with IV contrast	1		Varies		
MRI spine area of interest without and with IV contrast	1		0		
DXA VFA	1		•		
Note: Rating Scale: 1,2,3 = usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 = may absorptiometry; RRL = relative radiation level; VFA = vertebra Journal of the Volu	be approp al fracture American Co me 14 = Num	oriate; 7,8,9 = usually appropriate. DXA = dual-energy x-ray assessment. Illege of Radiology ber 55 • May 2017	,		
STGRADDC James Demetrious	s, DC, DABC	0 - PostGradDC.com			

	Octo	oporo	sic			
	Uste	oporos	515			
	Maint O Daliate as loss territoria (7.5 and	No Chilesche auch aus das auch die	abilities and a sector filters areas	- 1		
	Variant 9. Patients on long-term treatment (3-3 years,	) of bisphosphonates with	thigh or groin pain. First exan	nination.		
	X-ray femur	Rating	Comments	RRL		
	DYA extended formus scan	3				
	CT thigh without IV contract hilptoral	1				
	CT thigh with IV contrast bilateral	1				
	CT thigh without and with IV contrast bilateral	1		000		
	MRI think without IV contrast bilateral	1		0		
	MRI thigh without and with IV contrast bilateral	1		0		
	Tc-99m bone scan whole body	1		999		
	IS thigh bilateral	1		0		
	absorptiometry; $IV = intravenous$ ; $RRL = relative radiation le$	evel; US = ultrasound.				
	Variant 10. Patients on long-term treatment (3–5 years)	) of bisphosphonates with	thigh or groin pain and negativ	e radiographs.		
	Radiologic Procedure	Rating	Comments	RRL		
	MRI thigh without IV contrast bilateral	y		0		
	CT thigh without IV contrast bilateral	8		88		
	Ic-99m bone scan whole body	/		***		
	UXA extended femur scan	1		~		
	CT thigh with IV contrast bilateral	1		<b>000</b>		
	CT thigh without and with IV contrast bilateral	1		***		
	LIS thick bilatoral	1		0		
	Note: Rating Scale: 1,2,3 = usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 = ma absorptiometry; IV = intravenous; RRL = relative radiation le	ay be appropriate; 7,8,9 = usu evel; US = ultrasound.	ally appropriate. $DXA = dual-energy$	rgy x-ray		
	Journal of the A Volum	American College of Rad ne 14 = Number 55 = Ma	<b>liology</b> 1y 2017			
POSTGRADDC EVIDENCE BASED, CLINICALLY INTUITIVE CE	James Demetrious,	DC, DABCO - PostG	radDC.com		500	)))





Bone Density		
Definitio	is of normal bone density, osteopenia, and osteoporosis	
T-sco	Bone density	
+1 to -1	Normal bone density	
	Bone density that is between 0 and 1 SD below the mean is considered to be normal. This may be reported as a T-score of +1 to -1. Treatment is not usually recommended for people with normal bone density, although preventive measures (eg. calcium supplements, weightbearing exercise) are recommended to prevent osteopenia and osteoporosis.	
Between	1 Osteopenia	-
and -2.5	Bone density that is between 1 and 2.5 SD below the mean is called osteopenia. A person with osteopenia does not yet have osteoporosis but is at risk of developing it if not treated.	
-2.5 or le	s Osteoporosis	-
	Osteoporosis is defined as a BMD 2.5 or more SD below the mean of normal young women. The lower the bone density, the greater the risk of fracture.	
The WHO statistical	as defined normal bone density as a value within 1 SD from average peak bone mass. SD is a easure that defines how much a patient's result varies from the "average" young adult.	
SD: standa	d deviation; BMD: bone mineral density; WHO: World Health Organization.	
POSTGRADDC	James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com	503


The T-Score
• Low bone mass (osteopenia) — Low bone mass (osteopenia) is the term
but that has not yet reached the low levels seen with osteoporosis.
<ul> <li>A person with osteopenia does not yet have osteoporosis but is at risk of developing it. People with osteopenia have a T-score between -1.1 and -2.4.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>If you have other risk factors for fracture (see <u>'Risk factors for fracture'</u> above) and have a T-score in the osteopenic range, you may be at high risk for fracture. People with low bone mass are usually advised to take steps to prevent osteoporosis. Sometimes that includes taking medications. (See <u>"Patient</u> <u>education: Osteoporosis prevention and treatment (Beyond the Basics)"</u>.)</li> </ul>
POSTCRADDC James Demetrious, DC, DABCO - PostGradDC.com
505



Calculation Tool         Please answer the questions below to calculate the ten year probability of fracture with BMD.         Country: US (Caucasin) Name/ID: Nour the risk factors         Operation Calculate         1. Age (between 40 and 90 years) or Date of Birth:         1. Age (between 40 and 90 years) or Date of Birth:         1. Acabel 3 or more units/day         2. Ser         2. Ser         2. Ser	Country:       US (Caucasian)       Name/DD:       About the risk factors         Country:       US (Caucasian)       10. Secondary osteoporosis       No       Yes         1.       Age( between 40 and 90 years) or Date of Birth       10. Secondary osteoporosis       No       Yes         Age:       Date of Birth:       12. Fennoal neck BMD (g/cm <sup>2</sup> )       Select BMD       Yes       Neight (kg)       Convert         3.       Weight (kg)       Clear       Calculate       Height Conversion
Please answer the questions below to calculate the ten year probability of fracture with BMD.   Country: US (Caucasian) Name/ID: About the risk factors    Questionnaire: 1. Age (between 40 and 90 years) or Date of Birth 2. Sex Date of Birth: 2. Sex . Male Oremale 3. Weight (kg) 3. Weight (kg) 5. Previous Fracture 8. No Ores 6. Premart Fractured Hip 8. No Ores 6. Premart Fractured Hip 8. No Ores 6. Premart Fractured Hip 8. No Ores 8. discocorticoids 8. No Ores 9. Rheumatoid arthritis 8. No Ores 9. Rheumatoid arthritis 9. No Yes 9. Rheumatoid arthritis 9. Yes 9. Yes 9. Rheumatoid arthritis 9. Yes	Please answer the questions below to calculate the ten year probability of fracture with BMD.       Image: Country: US (Caucasian)       Name/ID:       About the risk factors         Questionnaire:       10. Secondary osteoporosis       Image: No       Yes         1. Age (between 40 and 90 years) or Date of Birth       11. Alcohol 3 or more units/day       Image: No       Yes         Age:       Date of Birth:       12. Femoral neck BMD (g/cm <sup>2</sup> )       Image: No       Yes         2. Sex       Male       Pemale       Select BMD       Image: Convert         3. Weight (kg)       Clear       Calculate       Height Conversion
Country:       US (Caucasian)       Name/ID:       About the risk factors         Questionnaire:       10. Secondary osteoporosis <ul> <li>No</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Age (between 40 and 30 years) or Date of Birth</li> <li>Alcohol 3 or more units/day</li> <li>No</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Femoral neck BMD (g/cm<sup>2</sup>)</li> <li>Select BMD</li> <li>Select BMD&lt;</li></ul>	Country:       US (Caucasian)       Name/ID:       About the risk factors         Questionnaire:       10. Secondary osteoporosis       Image: No       Yes         1. Age (between 40 and 90 years) or Date of Birth       11. Alcohol 3 or more units/day       Image: No       Yes         Age:       Date of Birth:       12. Femoral neck BMD (g/cm <sup>2</sup> )       Image: No       Yes       Yes         2. Sex       Male       Pemale       Select BMD       Image: Clear       Convert         3. Weight (kg)       Clear       Calculate       Height Conversion
Questionnaire:       10. Secondary osteoporosis       ® No       Yes         1. Age (between 40 and 90 years) or Date of Birth       11. Alcohol 3 or more units/day       ® No       Yes         2. Sex       Date of Birth:       12. Femoral neck BMD (g/cm <sup>2</sup> )       Select BMD       Yes         3. Weight (kg)       Male       Permale       Clear       Catculate       Height Conversion         5. Previous Fracture       ® No       Yes       Convert       Convert         6. Parent Fractured Hip       ® No       Yes       Convert       Ops822600         9. Rheumatoid arthritis       ® No       Yes       Unividual with fracture risk and ma 2011       Ops822600	Questionnaire:       10. Secondary osteoporosis       ● No       ○ Yes         1. Age (between 40 and 90 years) or Date of Birth       11. Alcohol 3 or more units/day       ● No       ○ Yes       Pounds       kg
	4. Height (cm)       Integrat Control Storm         5. Previous Fracture <ul> <li>No</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul> 6. Parent Fractured Hip <ul> <li>No</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul> 7. Current Smoking <ul> <li>No</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Glucocorticoids</li> <li>No</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul> <ul> <li>O9582600</li> <li>Rheumatoid arthritis</li> <li>No</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul> <ul> <li>Oys</li> <li>Androval arthritis</li> <li>No</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul> <ul> <li>Oys</li> <li>Oys</li></ul>
https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/EDAX/tool.aspx2country=9	https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/FRAX/tool.aspx?country=9





Frax Tool
Lifestyle changes
<ul> <li>Some FRAX scores indicate that lifestyle changes should be sufficient to manage the risk of fractures.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>These changes might <u>include</u>:</li> </ul>
stopping smoking
reducing alcohol intake
keeping physically active
<ul> <li>getting enough <u>calcium</u> and <u>vitamin D</u></li> </ul>
eating a healthful diet
<ul> <li>limiting the use of some long-term medications, such as glucocorticoids, whenever possible</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Calcium and vitamin D supplements may be necessary.</li> </ul>
• People generally need 200–1,300 milligrams of calcium per day, depending on their age.
• About <u>600–800 international units</u> of vitamin D are necessary for most people.
Medical News Today. Reviewed by <u>Angela M. Bell, MD. FACP</u> — Written by <u>Aaron Kandola</u> on March 12, 2020
POSTCRADDC Indexed askid, curically infuritive ce



	Thoracolumbar Injury Severity Score		
	Description	Qualifier	Points
	Injury Mechanism		
	Compression		
		Simple	1
		Lateral angulation > 15°	1
Therealymber Injury Classification and Severity Score (TI ICS) (Vaccare		Burst	1
I noracolumbar injury classification and Severity Score (TLICS) (Vaccaro	Translational/rotational		3
2006)	Distraction		4
	Posterior Ligamentous Complex		
<ul> <li>3 components give final numeric score that directs treatment</li> </ul>	Intact		0
<ul> <li>Injury mechanism, integrity of posterior ligamentous complex, and</li> </ul>	Suspected/indeterminate for disruption		2
neurologic status (see table 2)	Injured		3
	Neurologic Status		
	Nerve root involvement		2
	Cord, conus involvement (incomplete)		3
Ross JS, Moore KR. Diagnostic Imaging Spine, 4 <sup>th</sup> Edition. Elsevier; 2021.	Cauda equina involvement		3
	Cord, conus involvement (complete)		2
	Score is a total of 3 components. Score 3 suggests nonoperative treatment, while score of 4 is indeterminate. Score 5 suggests operative treatment. For injury mechanism, the worst level is used and the injury is additive. An example is distraction injury with burst without angulation is 1 (simple compression) + 1 (burst) + 4 (distraction) = 6 points. (Vaccaro 2006.)		





















<ol> <li>Injury mechanism; worst level is distraction injury with a burst would receive 1 [simple comp Description</li> </ol>	used and injury is additive ( <i>e.g.,</i> component without lateral angula pression] + 1 [burst] + 4 [distrac Qualifier	a ntion tion] = 6) Points	
<ul> <li>a. Compression</li> <li>b. Translational/rotational</li> <li>c. Distraction</li> <li>2. PLC disrupted in tension, rota</li> <li>a. Intact</li> <li>b. Suspected/indeterminate</li> <li>c. Injured</li> <li>3. Neurologic status</li> <li>Nerve root involvement</li> <li>Cord, conus medullaris involvement</li> <li>Cauda equina involvement</li> </ul>	Simple compression Lateral angulation >15° Burst ation, or translation Incomplete Complete	1 1 3 4 0 2 3 3 2 3 3 2 3 3	Reliability of a Novel Classification System for Thoracolumbar Injuries: The Thoracolumbar Injury severity Score     Vaccaro, 2006 PLC = Posterior Ligamentous Complex
<ul> <li>c. Distraction</li> <li>2. PLC disrupted in tension, rota <ul> <li>a. Intact</li> <li>b. Suspected/indeterminate</li> <li>c. Injured</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Neurologic status <ul> <li>Nerve root involvement</li> </ul> </li> <li>Cord, conus medullaris <ul> <li>involvement</li> </ul> </li> <li>Cauda equina involvement</li> </ul> <li>The score is the total of 3 compoint of poperative or noncoperative treatment <ul> <li>and PLC disruption. A score of operative or noncoperative treatment</li> </ul> </li>	tion, or translation Incomplete Complete ≤3 suggests nonoperative tre ant, and ≥5 suggests operative	4 0 2 3 2 3 2 3 0 pgic status, reatment, 4, treatment.	Severity Score Vaccaro, 2006 PLC = Posterior Ligamentous Complex

























Key question addressed	Task Force recommendation/finding	Quality of evidence	Strength of findings	Strength of recommendation	
1. Efficacy of percutaneous vertebroplasty on outcomes of pain, physical function, and quality of life	Percutaneous vertebroplasty provides no demonstrable clinically significant benefit over placebo or sham procedure. Results did not	High to moderate	High—5 randomized trials that compared vertebroplasty with placebo ( $n = 535$ ). Follow-up period 2 years.	High to moderate	
2. Efficacy of balloon kyphoplasty on outcomes of pain, physical function, and quality of life	amer accorang to duration of pain. Balloon kyphoplasty provides a small clinical benefit over nonsurgical management, percutaneous vertebroplasty, vertebral body stenting, or KIVA. There is also insufficient evidence versus placeho for KIVA.	Low	Low—1 randomized trial versus nonsurgical management. No placebo (n = 300). Follow-up period 2 years.	Weak	JBMR
3. Harms of percutaneous vertebroplasty, including possible risk of new vertebral fractures	It is uncertain whether percutaneous vertebroplasty increases risk of incident or radiographic vertebral fractures or related serious AEs.	Moderate	Moderate—8 randomized trials (placebo control in 4 trials and usual care in 4 trials) ( $n = 804$ ). Low number of events ( $n = 203$ fractures; 57 SAEs). Follow up nericd 1–2 years	Moderate	Original Article : @ Free Access The Efficacy and Safety of Vertebral Augmentation: A Second ASBMR Task Force Report
<ol> <li>Harms of balloon kyphoplasty, including possible risk of new vertebral fractures</li> </ol>	It is uncertain whether kyphoplasty increases risk of incident or radiographic vertebral fractures or serious AE related to kyphoplasty.	Low	Low—1 randomized trial versus nonsurgical management ( $n = 223$ ) and case reports. Low number of events ( $n = 101$ fractures; 157 SAEs). Follow-up period 2 vears.	Weak	Feith Accelling & Noian Accessin, Jougas Caude, Accellent educiancie, Accilent duciante, Accellent duci
5. Efficacy and harms of spinal bracing after vertebral fracture	Spinal bracing may improve pain, spinal strength, kyphosis, pulmonary volume and quality of life at 6 months. Bracing may improve physical function, disability, or quality of life.	Low	Low—4 randomized trials comparing orthoses (n = 281). High risk of bias due to absent blinding of subjects and investigators. Low numbers of fractures and AEs. Follow-up period 3 weeks to 6 months	Weak	
<ol> <li>Efficacy and harms of exercise interventions after vertebral fracture</li> </ol>	Exercise may improve mobility and reduce pain and fear of falling. It is uncertain whether exercise improves balance, back extensor strength, reduces falls, and was safe.	Moderate	Moderate —9 randomized trials comparing exercise with usual care (n = 749). Low to high risk of bias due to absent blinding of subjects and investigators. Low numbers of events (n = 15 fractures; 5 SAEs). Follow-up period 4 weeks to 2 vears.	Moderate	















	Journal of Clinical Medicine		MDPI	
	Review Bone Loss, Osteoporosis, an with Rheumatoid Arthritis:	nd Fractures in Patient A Review	ts	
	<ul> <li>Patrice Fardellone <sup>1,*</sup>, Emad Salawati <sup>2</sup>, Laure I</li> <li>Department of Rheumatology, Picardie-Jules Verne France; LeMonnier.Laure@chu-amiens.fr (L.L.M.);</li> <li>Assistant Professor, Faculty of Medicine, King Abc esalawati@kau.edu.sa</li> <li>Correspondence: fardellone.patrice@chu-amiens.fr</li> </ul>	e Monnier <sup>1</sup> and Vincent Goëb <sup>1</sup> University, University hospital of Amiens, 800 goeb.vincent@chu-amiens.fr (V.G.) ulaziz University, 21589 Jeddah, Saudi Arabi	154 Amiens, a;	
	Received: 28 August 2020; Accepted: 15 October 2020;	Published: 20 October 2020	check for updates	
<ul> <li>In the Canac significant control measured by and baseline</li> </ul>	dian Early Arthritis Co orrelation between i y the FRAXtool <sup>®</sup> and e erosions ( <i>p</i> = 0.040)	ohort (CATCH), 1 ncreased fractu oral glucocortic [49].	there was a Ire risk groups coid use ( <i>p</i> = 0.01	2)
EVIDENCE BASED, CLANCALLY INTUITIVE CE	James Demetrious, DC, D	ABCO - PostGradDC.com		541
541				























