

Positional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)

Effective: May 1, 2022

Next Review: February 2023

Last Review: March 2022

IMPORTANT REMINDER

Medical Policies are developed to provide guidance for members and providers regarding coverage in accordance with contract terms. Benefit determinations are based in all cases on the applicable contract language. To the extent there may be any conflict between the Medical Policy and contract language, the contract language takes precedence.

PLEASE NOTE: Contracts exclude from coverage, among other things, services or procedures that are considered investigational or cosmetic. Providers may bill members for services or procedures that are considered investigational or cosmetic. Providers are encouraged to inform members before rendering such services that the members are likely to be financially responsible for the cost of these services.

DESCRIPTION

Positional MRI (pMRI) acquires images in multiple positions in addition to conventional horizontal imaging. It allows weight-bearing and movement based images.

MEDICAL POLICY CRITERIA

Positional or upright MRI for the diagnosis and management of any condition, including but not limited to cervical, thoracic or lumbosacral back pain, is considered **investigational**.

NOTE: A summary of the supporting rationale for the policy criteria is at the end of the policy.

CROSS REFERENCES

None

BACKGROUND

It is theorized that imaging the body in positions related to the central loading of the spine, which occurs when standing upright or sitting or in the specific position related to the patient's clinical symptoms, may lead to more accurate diagnosis. This is being evaluated in patients

with suspected nerve root compression and in some cases of spondylolisthesis, and may be particularly relevant in cases where disease is not visible on a horizontal MRI.

One concern with positional MRI is the field strength of the scanners. Today's clinical MRI scanners may operate at a field strength between 0.1 Tesla (T) to 3 T and are classified as either low-field (<0.5 T), mid-field (0.5-1.0 T), or high-field (>1.0 T). Low- to mid-field MRI is typically used in open scanners. Open scanners are designed for use during interventional or intraoperative procedures, when a conventional design is contraindicated (e.g., an obese or claustrophobic patient), or for changes in patient positioning.

In general, higher field strength results in an increase in signal-to-noise ratio, spatial resolution, contrast and speed. Thus, low-field scanners produce poorer-quality images compared to high-field scanners, and the longer acquisition times with low-field scanners increases the possibility of image degradation due to patient movement. However, field strength has less of an effect on the contrast-to-noise ratio, which determines the extent to which adjacent structures can be distinguished from one another. It may be possible, because of the pMRI technology to diagnose conditions not seen on a conventional or open MRIs.

REGULATORY STATUS

Several MRI systems have been cleared for marketing by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) through the 510(k) process as open or total body systems for positional imaging. One such system is FONAR's Upright® MRI. FDA product code: LNH.

EVIDENCE SUMMARY

In evaluating positional MRI, it is important to evaluate if this approach results in improved clinical management of the patient compared to other standard imaging.

Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are needed to determine the following:

- Characteristics of patients who might benefit from positional MRI studies;
- Clinical benefit of basing treatment decisions, including surgery, on these additional findings; and
- How this technique might replace current diagnostic tests such as myelography.

SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

Earlier systematic reviews (SR)s indicate that the literature on kinetic MRI consists primarily of examining anatomic changes in neutral, flexion, extension, and axial rotation. These do not address how anatomical changes detected by positional MRI lead to improved health outcomes. Lord et al. reviewed 16 studies using kinetic MRI on the cervical spine and identified changes in neuroforaminal size, cord compression, cord length, cross-sectional area, ligamentum flavum thickness, and motion at the index and adjacent levels when comparing symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals^[1]. Lao et al. reviewed 11 studies that used kinetic MRI on lumbar and cervical spine on symptomatic individuals, but reported high study bias, since all studies were performed at the same institution.^[2] Both these reviews highlighted the need for studies comparing kinetic and traditional MRI in order to establish the clinical utility of kinetic MRI.

A SR of emerging MRI technologies for musculoskeletal imaging under loading stress was prepared by the Tufts Medical Center Evidence-based Practice Center for the Agency for

Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) in 2011.^[3] The review analyzed 57 studies using MRI under physiologic loading stress in an upright or sitting position or under axial load using a compression device. The majority of studies (37 cross-sectional studies and 13 case-control studies) reported on the anatomical measurements rather than patient-relevant endpoints. The most commonly imaged body region was the lumbar spine. Fifteen of 57 studies used at least two imaging tests and reported on diagnostic or patient-relevant outcomes but did not report meaningful information on the relative performance of the tests. The potential effect on image quality of low magnetic field strengths (<0.6 Tesla) in weight-bearing MRI scanners was not assessed. In 10 studies that included information on adverse effects, 5% to 15% of participants reported new-onset or worsening pain and neuropathy during MRI under loading stress. The SR concluded that, despite the large number of available studies, the evidence is insufficient to support the clinical utility of MRI under loading stress for musculoskeletal conditions.

RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS

There are no RCTs comparing how the use of positional MRI versus other standard imaging alters patient treatment plans or health outcomes.

SECTION SUMMARY

A number of studies reported that positional MRI may show abnormalities in patients which were not seen with conventional MRI. However, no studies indicated how these results changed or affected the patient's treatment plan thereby impacting health outcomes.^[4-33]

PRACTICE GUIDELINE SUMMARY

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF RADIOLOGY

In 2018, the American College of Radiology (ACR) published an updated guideline in collaboration with the American Society of Neuroradiology (ASNR), the Society of Computed Body Tomography and Magnetic Resonance (SCBT-MR), and the Society for Skeletal Radiology (SSR).^[34] This guideline states that there is insufficient supportive evidence that the use of positional MRI (referred in the guideline as kinematic or dynamic) correlates with individual patient symptoms or improves patient outcomes after therapy.

SUMMARY

There is not enough research to show that positional or upright MRI improves health outcomes for people with any condition, including but not limited to cervical, thoracic or lumbosacral back pain. In addition, no practice guidelines recommend positional or upright MRI. Therefore, positional MRI is considered investigational.

REFERENCES

1. EL Lord, R Alobaidan, S Takahashi, et al. Kinetic magnetic resonance imaging of the cervical spine: a review of the literature. *Global Spine J.* 2014;4:121-8. PMID: 25054099
2. LF Lao, GB Zhong, QY Li, ZD Liu. Kinetic magnetic resonance imaging analysis of spinal degeneration: a systematic review. *Orthopaedic surgery.* 2014;6(4):294-9. PMID: 25430713

3. IJ Dahabreh, N Hadar, M Chung. Emerging magnetic resonance imaging technologies for musculoskeletal imaging under loading stress: scope of the literature. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2011;155(9):616-24. PMID: 22041950
4. D Weishaupt, MR Schmid, M Zanetti, et al. Positional MR imaging of the lumbar spine: does it demonstrate nerve root compromise not visible at conventional MR imaging? *Radiology*. 2000;215(1):247-53. PMID: 10751495
5. TW Vitaz, CB Shields, GH Raque, et al. Dynamic weight-bearing cervical magnetic resonance imaging: technical review and preliminary results. *South Med J*. 2004;97(5):456-61. PMID: 15180020
6. JR Jinkins, JS Dworkin, RV Damadian. Upright, weight-bearing, dynamic-kinetic MRI of the spine: initial results. *Eur Radiol*. 2005;15(9):1815-25. PMID: 15906040
7. EJ Karadimas, M Siddiqui, FW Smith, D Wardlaw. Positional MRI changes in supine versus sitting postures in patients with degenerative lumbar spine. *J Spinal Disord Tech*. 2006;19(7):495-500. PMID: 17021413
8. D Weishaupt, L Boxheimer. Magnetic resonance imaging of the weight-bearing spine. *Semin Musculoskelet Radiol*. 2003;7(4):277-86. PMID: 14735426
9. JR Jinkins, J Dworkin. Proceedings of the State-of-the-Art Symposium on Diagnostic and Interventional Radiology of the Spine, Antwerp, September 7, 2002 (Part two). Upright, weight-bearing, dynamic-kinetic MRI of the spine: pMRI/kMRI. *JBR-BTR*. 2003;86(5):286-93. PMID: 14651085
10. AA Zamani, T Moriarty, L Hsu, et al. Functional MRI of the lumbar spine in erect position in a superconducting open-configuration MR system: preliminary results. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 1998;8(6):1329-33. PMID: 9848747
11. S Wildermuth, M Zanetti, S Duewell, et al. Lumbar spine: quantitative and qualitative assessment of positional (upright flexion and extension) MR imaging and myelography. *Radiology*. 1998;207(2):391-8. PMID: 9577486
12. MR Schmid, G Stucki, S Duewell, S Wildermuth, B Romanowski, J Hodler. Changes in cross-sectional measurements of the spinal canal and intervertebral foramina as a function of body position: in vivo studies on an open-configuration MR system. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 1999;172(4):1095-102. PMID: 10587155
13. MH Kong, HJ Hymanson, KY Song, et al. Kinetic magnetic resonance imaging analysis of abnormal segmental motion of the functional spine unit. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2009;10(4):357-65. PMID: 19441995
14. A Hioki, K Miyamoto, H Sakai, K Shimizu. Lumbar axial loading device alters lumbar sagittal alignment differently from upright standing position: a computed tomography study. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2010;35(9):995-1001. PMID: 20139804
15. P Niggemann, J Kuchta, J Hoeffler, D Grosskurth, HK Beyer, KS Delank. Juxtafacet cysts of the lumbar spine: a positional MRI study. *Skeletal Radiol*. 2012;41(3):313-20. PMID: 21560008
16. P Niggemann, S Sarikaya-Seiwert, HK Beyer, R Sobottke. Features of positional magnetic resonance imaging in tethered cord syndrome. *Clin Neuroradiol*. 2011;21(1):11-5. PMID: 21246180
17. G Keorochana, CE Taghavi, KB Lee, et al. Effect of sagittal alignment on kinematic changes and degree of disc degeneration in the lumbar spine: an analysis using positional MRI. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2011;36(11):893-8. PMID: 21242877
18. P Niggemann, A Forg, D Grosskurth, HK Beyer. Postural effect on the size of the cisterna chyli. *Lymphat Res Biol*. 2010;8(4):193-7. PMID: 21190491

19. Y Morishita, M Naito, JC Wang. Cervical spinal canal stenosis: the differences between stenosis at the lower cervical and multiple segment levels. *Int Orthop*. 2011;35(10):1517-22. PMID: 21113592
20. P Niggemann, J Kuchta, HK Beyer, D Grosskurth, T Schulze, KS Delank. Spondylolysis and spondylolisthesis: prevalence of different forms of instability and clinical implications. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2011;36(22):E1463-8. PMID: 20838368
21. Z Fei, C Fan, S Ngo, J Xu, J Wang. Dynamic evaluation of cervical disc herniation using kinetic MRI. *J Clin Neurosci*. 2011;18(2):232-6. PMID: 21159511
22. RV Damadian, D Chu. The possible role of cranio-cervical trauma and abnormal CSF hydrodynamics in the genesis of multiple sclerosis. *Physiol Chem Phys Med NMR*. 2011;41:1-17. PMID: 21970155
23. JA Nicholson, AG Sutherland, FW Smith. Single bundle anterior cruciate reconstruction does not restore normal knee kinematics at six months: an upright MRI study. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. 2011;93(10):1334-40. PMID: 21969431
24. JW Gilbert, JC Martin, GR Wheeler, et al. Lumbar stenosis rates in symptomatic patients using weight-bearing and recumbent magnetic resonance imaging. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 2011;34(8):557-61. PMID: 21907413
25. E Liodakis, M Kenaway, I Doxastaki, C Krettek, C Haasper, S Hankemeier. Upright MRI measurement of mechanical axis and frontal plane alignment as a new technique: a comparative study with weight bearing full length radiographs. *Skeletal Radiol*. 2011;40(7):885-9. PMID: 21170524
26. JA Nicholson, AG Sutherland, FW Smith, T Kawasaki. Upright MRI in kinematic assessment of the ACL-deficient knee. *Knee*. 2012;19(1):41-8. PMID: 21163659
27. H Kanno, H Ozawa, Y Koizumi, et al. Dynamic change of dural sac cross-sectional area in axial loaded magnetic resonance imaging correlates with the severity of clinical symptoms in patients with lumbar spinal canal stenosis. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2012;37(3):207-13. PMID: 21301392
28. H Kanno, T Endo, H Ozawa, et al. Axial Loading During Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Patients with Lumbar Spinal Canal Stenosis: Does It Reproduce the Positional Change of the Dural Sac Detected by Upright Myelography? *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2011. PMID: 21258271
29. J Yan, Y Wang, X Liu, J Li, Z Jin, Z Zheng. Vertical weight-bearing MRI provides an innovative method for standardizing Spurling test. *Med Hypotheses*. 2010;75(6):538-40. PMID: 20678865
30. C Stehling, RB Souza, MP Hellio Le Graverand, et al. Loading of the knee during 3.0T MRI is associated with significantly increased medial meniscus extrusion in mild and moderate osteoarthritis. *European journal of radiology*. 2012;81(8):1839-45. PMID: 21684704
31. C Diefenbach, BS Lonner, JD Auerbach, N Bharucha, LE Dean. Is radiation-free diagnostic monitoring of adolescent idiopathic scoliosis feasible using upright positional magnetic resonance imaging? *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. 2013;38(7):576-80. PMID: 23324938
32. U Tarantino, E Fanucci, R Iundusi, et al. Lumbar spine MRI in upright position for diagnosing acute and chronic low back pain: statistical analysis of morphological changes. *Journal of orthopaedics and traumatology : official journal of the Italian Society of Orthopaedics and Traumatology*. 2013;14(1):15-22. PMID: 22983676
33. H Hebelka, H Brisby, T Hansson. Comparison between pain at discography and morphological disc changes at axial loaded MRI in patients with low back pain. *European spine journal : official publication of the European Spine Society, the*

European Spinal Deformity Society, and the European Section of the Cervical Spine Research Society. 2014;23(10):2075-82. PMID: 24957259

34. ACR–ASNR–SCBT–MR–SSR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) of the Adult Spine. [cited 3/14/2022]. Available from: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Practice-Parameters/mr-adult-spine.pdf>.

CODES

NOTE: There is no specific code for positional MRI, which should be reported with an unlisted procedures code such as 76498.

Codes	Number	Description
CPT	76498	Unlisted magnetic resonance procedure (eg, diagnostic, interventional)
HCPCS	None	

Date of Origin: February 2006