

ACR Appropriateness Criteria[®]

Imaging After Liver Transplant

Expert Panel on Gastrointestinal Imaging: *Shaun A. Wahab, MD^a, Abhinav Viji, MD, MPH^b, Alice Fung, MD^c, Mustafa R. Bashir, MD^d, Brooks D. Cash, MD^e, Elizabeth M. Hecht, MD^f, A. Tuba Karagulle Kendi, MD^g, Brendan M. McGuire, MD^h, Gregory K. Russo, MDⁱ, Elainea N. Smith, MD^j, Kiran H. Thakrar, MD^k, Lisa B. VanWagner, MD, MSc^l, Atif Zaheer, MD^m, Kathryn J. Fowler, MDⁿ*

Abstract

Liver transplantation is currently the treatment of choice for patients with acute or advanced chronic liver failure. Complications that can lead to liver allograft failure or patient mortality include vascular abnormalities, biliary complications, infection, rejection, and recurrent or posttransplant malignancy. Imaging plays a vital role in detecting these complications. This document summarizes the relevant literature for the selection of imaging after liver transplant for the following clinical scenarios: immediate postoperative period, postoperative complications of suspected vascular etiology, postoperative complications of suspected biliary etiology, and postoperative surveillance.

^aVanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee.

^bNew York University Langone Medical Center, New York, New York.

^cPanel Chair, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon.

^dDuke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina.

^eUniversity of Texas Health Science Center at Houston and McGovern Medical School, Houston, Texas; American Gastroenterological Association.

^fWeill Cornell Medicine, New York, New York; LI-RADS Committee.

^gMayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota; Commission on Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging.

^hUniversity of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama, Primary care physician.

ⁱDanbury Radiological Associates/Nuvance Health, Danbury, Connecticut.

^jUniversity of Alabama at Birmingham Medical Center, Birmingham, Alabama.

^kEndeavor Health, Evanston, Illinois.

^lUT Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, Texas; American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases.

^mJohns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Maryland.

ⁿSpecialty Chair, University of California San Diego, San Diego, California.

Corresponding author: Shaun A. Wahab, MD, Department of Radiology, 1161 21st Avenue South, Nashville, TN 37232-2675; e-mail: shaunwahab@gmail.com.

The American College of Radiology seeks and encourages collaboration with other organizations on the development of the ACR Appropriateness

Criteria through society representation on expert panels. Participation by representatives from collaborating societies on the expert panel does not necessarily imply individual or society endorsement of the final document. Reprint requests to: publications@acr.org.

The ACR Appropriateness Criteria documents are updated regularly. Please go to the ACR website at <https://www.acr.org/Clinical-Resources/Clinical-Tools-and-Reference/Appropriateness-Criteria> to confirm that you are accessing the most current content.

Mustafa R. Bashir, MD, reports a relationship with Rectify Pharmaceuticals Inc, Miromatrix Medical Inc, and ICON Clinical Research LLC that includes consulting or advisory; a relationship with Madrigal Pharmaceuticals Inc, Corcept Therapeutics, NGM Biopharmaceuticals Inc, Siemens Healthineers AG, and Bayer HealthCare AG that includes funding grants. Lisa B. VanWagner MD, MSc, reports a relationship with W. L. Gore & Associates Srl that includes funding grants; a relationship with Gerson Lehrman Group Inc, Atheneum Partners, Slingshot Insights, and Madrigal Pharmaceuticals Inc that includes consulting or advisory; and provides medicolegal services. Kathryn J. Fowler, MD, reports financial support was provided by Bayer Corporation; reports a relationship with Bayer AG and CME Science that includes consulting or advisory, speaking and lecture fees, and travel reimbursement; a relationship with Ascelia Pharma AB that includes consulting or advisory; and is an RSNA editorial board member. The other authors state that they have no conflict of interest related to the material discussed in this article. Brendan M. McGuire, MD, Gregory K. Russo, MD, and Kathryn J. Fowler, MD are partners, and all other authors are non-partner/non-partnership track/employees.

Disclaimer: The 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 examinations generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.

The American College of Radiology Appropriateness Criteria are evidence-based guidelines for specific clinical conditions that are reviewed annually by a multidisciplinary expert panel. The guideline development and revision process support the systematic analysis of the medical literature from peer reviewed journals. Established methodology principles such as Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation or GRADE are adapted to evaluate the evidence. The RAND/UCLA Appropriateness Method User Manual provides the methodology to determine the appropriateness of imaging and treatment procedures for specific clinical scenarios. In those instances where peer reviewed literature is lacking or equivocal, experts may be the primary evidentiary source available to formulate a recommendation.

Key Words: Appropriateness Criteria, Appropriate Use Criteria, AUC, biliary complications, liver transplant, transplant complications, vascular complications

J Am Coll Radiol 2026;23:859-873. © 2026 American College of Radiology. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights are reserved, including those for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Imaging After Liver Transplant. [Variants 1 to 4](#) and [Tables 1](#) and [2](#)

Variant 1. Adult. Liver transplant. Immediate postoperative imaging. Initial imaging.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
US duplex Doppler abdomen	Usually Appropriate	○
CT abdomen with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase	Usually Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
US abdomen	May Be Appropriate	○
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast with MRCP	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	○
CT abdomen without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕⊕
Radiography abdomen	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI abdomen without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI abdomen without IV contrast with MRCP	Usually Not Appropriate	○
CT abdomen without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕
CTA abdomen with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⊕⊕⊕

Variant 2. Adult. Liver transplant. Postoperative complications, suspected vascular etiology. Initial imaging.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
US duplex Doppler abdomen	Usually Appropriate	○
CT abdomen with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿
CTA abdomen with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿
CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿⦿
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
CT abdomen without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿⦿
US abdomen	Usually Not Appropriate	○
Radiography abdomen	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿⦿
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast with MRCP	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI abdomen without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI abdomen without IV contrast with MRCP	Usually Not Appropriate	○
CT abdomen without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿

Variant 3. Adult. Liver transplant. Postoperative complications, suspected biliary etiology. Initial imaging.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
US abdomen	Usually Appropriate	○
US duplex Doppler abdomen	Usually Appropriate	○
MRI abdomen without and with hepatobiliary contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast with MRCP	Usually Appropriate	○
MRI abdomen without IV contrast with MRCP	Usually Appropriate	○
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
CT abdomen with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿
CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase	May Be Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿⦿
Radiography abdomen	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿⦿
MRI abdomen without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
CT abdomen without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿
CT abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿⦿

Variant 4. Adult. Post liver transplant. Surveillance.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
MRI abdomen without and with hepatobiliary contrast	Usually Appropriate	0
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0
MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast with MRCP	Usually Appropriate	0
CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase	Usually Appropriate	⚠️⚠️⚠️⚠️
US abdomen	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	0
US duplex Doppler abdomen	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	0
MRI abdomen without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	0
MRI abdomen without IV contrast with MRCP	May Be Appropriate	0
CT abdomen with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	⚠️⚠️⚠️
CT abdomen without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	⚠️⚠️⚠️⚠️
Radiography abdomen	Usually Not Appropriate	⚠️⚠️
CT abdomen without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⚠️⚠️⚠️
FDG-PET/CT skull base to mid-thigh	Usually Not Appropriate	⚠️⚠️⚠️⚠️

Table 1. Appropriateness category names and definitions

Appropriateness Category Name	Appropriateness Rating	Appropriateness Category Definition
Usually Appropriate	7, 8, or 9	The imaging procedure or treatment is indicated in the specified clinical scenarios at a favorable risk-benefit ratio for patients.
May Be Appropriate	4, 5, or 6	The imaging procedure or treatment may be indicated in the specified clinical scenarios as an alternative to imaging procedures or treatments with a more favorable risk-benefit ratio, or the risk-benefit ratio for patients is equivocal.
May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	5	The individual ratings are too dispersed from the panel median. The different label provides transparency regarding the panel's recommendation. "May be appropriate" is the rating category and a rating of 5 is assigned.
Usually Not Appropriate	1, 2, or 3	The imaging procedure or treatment is unlikely to be indicated in the specified clinical scenarios, or the risk-benefit ratio for patients is likely to be unfavorable.

Table 2. Relative radiation level designations

RRL	Adult Effective Dose Estimate Range (mSv)	Pediatric Effective Dose Estimate Range (mSv)
0	0	0
⚠️	<0.1	<0.03
⚠️⚠️	0.1-1	0.03-0.3
⚠️⚠️⚠️	1-10	0.3-3
⚠️⚠️⚠️⚠️	10-30	3-10
⚠️⚠️⚠️⚠️⚠️	30-100	10-30

Note: Relative radiation level (RRL) assignments for some of the examinations cannot be made, because the actual patient doses in these procedures vary as a function of a number of factors (eg, region of the body exposed to ionizing radiation, the imaging guidance that is used). The RRLs for these examinations are designated as "varies."

SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction/Background

Liver transplantation is currently the treatment of choice for patients with acute or advanced chronic liver failure. Indications include but are not limited to noncholestatic cirrhosis, cholestatic liver disease, biliary atresia, acute hepatic necrosis, metabolic conditions, and malignancy [1]. Since the introduction of liver transplantation in 1963 [2], there have been considerable advances in donor organ preservation, surgical techniques, and immunosuppressive agents. Currently, the 1-year, 3-year, and 5-year graft survival rates after liver transplant are 93.2%, 87.3%, and 84.1%, respectively [3]. Additionally, there were more than 10,660 liver transplants performed in 2023 [3]. Early detection and treatment of postoperative complications has significantly contributed to improved graft and patient survival.

Complications that can lead to liver allograft failure or patient mortality include vascular abnormalities, biliary complications, infection, rejection, and recurrent or post-transplant malignancy. Imaging plays a vital role in detecting these complications. Although imaging in most centers starts on postoperative day 0 or day 1, the imaging protocol and follow-up thereafter can be variable from institution to institution.

Special Imaging Considerations

Multiphase CT is CT with 2 to 4 phases done during contrast administration.

For the purposes of distinguishing between CT and CT angiography (CTA), ACR Appropriateness Criteria topics use the definition in the ACR–NASCI–SIR–SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance and Interpretation of Body Computed Tomography Angiography (CTA) [4]:

CTA uses a thin-section CT acquisition that is timed to coincide with peak arterial and/or venous enhancement, depending on the vascular structures to be analyzed. The resultant volumetric data set is interpreted using primary transverse reconstructions as well as multiplanar reformations and 3-D renderings.

All elements are essential: 1) timing, 2) reconstructions/reformats, and 3) 3-D renderings. Standard CTs with contrast also include timing issues and reconstructions/reformats. Only in CTA, however, is 3-D rendering a **required** element. This corresponds to the definitions that the CMS has applied to the Current Procedural Terminology codes.

Contrast-enhanced US (CEUS) may also be of benefit in the evaluation of liver transplant patients in the immediate postoperative period. A meta-analysis of 13 studies consisting

of 2,281 CEUS studies demonstrated pooled sensitivity and specificity of 90% and 100%, respectively, for the identification of vascular complications after liver transplantation with CEUS [5]. Additionally, CEUS using microbubble contrast can reduce the false-positive rate by detecting flow not captured on standard Doppler imaging [6].

Initial Imaging Definition

Initial imaging is defined as imaging at the beginning of the care episode for the medical condition defined by the variant. More than one procedure can be considered usually appropriate in the initial imaging evaluation when:

- There are procedures that are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care)

OR

- There are complementary procedures (ie, more than one procedure is ordered as a set or simultaneously wherein each procedure provides unique clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care).

DISCUSSION OF PROCEDURES BY VARIANT

Variant 1: Adult. Liver transplant. Immediate postoperative imaging. Initial imaging

Liver allografts are vulnerable in the immediate postoperative period, and the main objective of early noninvasive imaging is to identify or exclude biliary, vascular, and parenchymal complications. Additionally, there is an overlapping spectrum of clinical and laboratory findings for patients with and without complications [7]. Because multiple vascular anastomoses are required during transplantation, vascular complications are of particular concern in the immediate postoperative period. Protocols vary from institution to institution but consist of daily liver function tests and imaging on postoperative day 0 or day 1.

CT Abdomen With IV Contrast. A retrospective study of 75 patients by Lee et al [8] demonstrated sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy of CT for diagnosis of overall complications in the early period of 93.6%, 90.2%, and 92%, respectively. The most common complication was active bleeding, and the second most common complication was portal vein thrombosis/stenosis. Of note, there were 3 false-negatives in the early period, including one case of bile leakage, one case of bile duct stenosis, and one case of hepatic artery stenosis, which were not detected with the use of CT. CTs were performed in single (portal venous), dual (arterial and portal venous), or triple (arterial, portal venous, and

equilibrium) phases. Multiphase CT is superior to single phase CTs due to the ability to evaluate arterial, venous, and other structures during a single examination [7,8].

CT Abdomen With IV Contrast Multiphase. A retrospective study of 170 patients by Boraschi et al [7] demonstrated a sensitivity and specificity of CT in the detection of vascular and biliary adverse events of 100% and 97% and 83% and 100%, respectively. Additionally, the sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), and diagnostic accuracy of CT in the identification of all early abdominal complications after liver transplantation were 96%, 97%, 87%, 99%, and 97%, respectively. CTs were performed with unenhanced, arterial, and portal venous phases.

A retrospective study of 75 patients by Lee et al [8] demonstrated sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy of CT for diagnosis of overall complications in the early period of 93.6%, 90.2%, and 92%, respectively. The most common complication was active bleeding, and the second most common complication was portal vein thrombosis/stenosis. Of note, there were 3 false-negatives in the early period, including 1 case of bile leakage, 1 case of bile duct stenosis, and 1 case of hepatic artery stenosis, which were not detected with the use of CT. CTs were performed in single (portal venous), dual (arterial and portal venous), or triple (arterial, portal venous, and equilibrium) phases. Multiphase CT is superior to single phase CTs due to the ability to evaluate arterial, venous, and other structures during a single examination [7,8]. The addition of an unenhanced phase to a CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase may provide some limited additional value by helping to differentiate hyperdense surgical material or clips from active bleeding.

CT Abdomen Without and With IV Contrast. A retrospective study of 170 patients by Boraschi et al [7] demonstrated a sensitivity and specificity of CT in the detection of vascular and biliary adverse events of 100% and 97% and 83% and 100%, respectively. Additionally, the sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and diagnostic accuracy of CT in the identification of all early abdominal complications after liver transplantation were 96%, 97%, 87%, 99%, and 97%, respectively. CTs were performed with unenhanced, arterial, and portal venous phases. Multiphase CT is superior to single phase CTs due to the ability to evaluate arterial, venous, and other structures during a single examination [7,8]. The addition of an unenhanced phase may provide some limited additional value by helping to differentiate hyperdense surgical material or clips from active bleeding, but likely less so than a multiphase CT.

CT Abdomen Without IV Contrast. CT abdomen without intravenous (IV) contrast as a stand-alone examination has limited usefulness in the immediate postoperative period and is used to evaluate peritransplant fluid collections. Low liver allograft attenuation on unenhanced CT can be associated with mortality and graft failure according to a study by Kim et al [9]; however, this was performed at 1 month after the operation.

CTA Abdomen With IV Contrast. There is no relevant literature to support the need for 3-D reconstructions that are generated with CTA protocol of the abdomen with IV contrast as the initial imaging test after orthotopic liver transplantation.

MRI Abdomen Without and With IV Contrast. Although MRI may be used to detect biliary complications after liver transplantation or as a confirmatory study after ultrasound (US), there is no relevant literature to support the use of MRI as the initial imaging test for immediate postoperative imaging after liver transplantation. MRI is often difficult to obtain in the immediate postoperative prior due to the acuity of these patients and difficulty with breath-holding, sedation, ascites, etc.

MRI Abdomen Without and With IV Contrast With MRCP. Although MRI may be used to detect biliary complications after liver transplantation or as a confirmatory study after US, there is no relevant literature to support the use of MRI as the initial imaging test for immediate postoperative imaging after liver transplantation. MRI is often difficult to obtain in the immediate postoperative prior due to the acuity of these patients and difficulty with breath-holding, sedation, etc.

MRI Abdomen Without IV Contrast. Although MRI may be used to detect biliary complications after liver transplantation or as a confirmatory study after US, there is no relevant literature to support the use of MRI as the initial imaging test for immediate postoperative imaging after liver transplantation. MRI is often difficult to obtain in the immediate postoperative prior due to the acuity of these patients and difficulty with breath-holding, sedation, etc.

MRI Abdomen Without IV Contrast With MRCP. Although MRI may be used to detect biliary complications after liver transplantation or as a confirmatory study after US, there is no relevant literature to support the use of MRI as the initial imaging test for immediate postoperative imaging after liver transplantation. MRI is often difficult to obtain in the immediate postoperative prior due to the acuity of these patients and difficulty with breath-holding, sedation, etc.

Radiography Abdomen. There is no relevant literature to support the use of abdominal radiography as the initial imaging test after orthotopic liver transplant with the exception of radiographs to look for retained surgical instruments/materials.

US Abdomen. US is useful for the detection of complications in the immediate postoperative period after liver transplantation. Grayscale/B-mode US imaging of the allograft can evaluate for abnormalities in the hepatic parenchyma and biliary tree and for peritransplant fluid collections. However, given that the detection of vascular complication is of the utmost importance in the immediate postoperative period, there is no relevant literature to support the use of grayscale/B-mode imaging alone as the initial imaging test. US duplex Doppler is considered the more optimal procedure for the detection of complications in the immediate postoperative period of liver transplantation due to its ability to evaluate hepatic vasculature, biliary tree, and hepatic parenchyma [7].

US is sensitive but not specific in the evaluation of peritransplant fluid collections because bile, lymph, blood, and pus can all present on imaging as a simple fluid collection [10]. Additionally, the extent of fluid collections is better evaluated with CT and MRI.

US Duplex Doppler Abdomen. US duplex Doppler of the abdomen is an optimal imaging procedure for the detection of complications in the immediate postoperative period after liver transplantation due to its ability to evaluate hepatic vasculature, biliary tree, and hepatic parenchyma. Additionally, these patients are often very sick, and this procedure can be performed at the bedside in the early postoperative period [7,8,11,12].

Because multiple vascular anastomoses are required during transplantation, vascular complications are of particular concern in the immediate postoperative period. Arterial complications are more common than venous ones. In normal liver arterial spectral waveforms, the arterial acceleration time is <0.08 seconds, and the resistive index (RI) [(peak systolic velocity – peak diastolic velocity) / peak systolic velocity] is between 0.5 and 0.8 [13].

A retrospective study of 110 patients by Uzochukwu et al [14] demonstrated that low early posttransplant hepatic artery resistive indices (<0.6) were 100% sensitive and 80% specific for vascular complications but not for biliary complications. A study of 522 patients demonstrates a 100% sensitivity of US compared with angiography for the detection of early hepatic artery thrombosis [15]. However, duplex US can be susceptible to false-positives due to low cardiac output, arterial spasm, and severe parenchymal edema [16]. Low RI, prolonged systolic acceleration time, and focal peak

velocities >200 cm/s are suggestive of hepatic arterial stenosis [6]. Dodd et al [17] demonstrate in a series of 125 patients that when Doppler criteria for arterial complications are combined, the diagnostic sensitivity and specificity for arterial thrombosis or stenosis are 97% and 64%, respectively. A study of 46 patients demonstrated that abnormal values for RI and acceleration time were 67% sensitive and 96% specific for arterial stenosis, and sensitivity and specificity were 81% and 60% when at least one abnormal value was found [18]. Lack of flow in the hepatic artery is suggestive of hepatic thrombosis, and US correctly identifies more than 90% of cases of hepatic artery thrombosis [19].

A retrospective study of 94 patients by Chong et al [20] demonstrated an anastomotic velocity threshold of >125 cm/s as 73% sensitive and 95% specific for portal venous stenosis, an anastomotic to preanastomotic velocity ratio of 3:1 as 73% sensitive and 100% specific for venous stenosis, and a venous pulsatility index of <0.45 as 95.7% specific for outflow venous stenosis.

On Doppler US, abnormal hepatic venous flow may manifest as increased phasicity, decreased phasicity, or absent hepatic venous flow. Abnormal portal venous flow usually manifests as increased pulsatility, slow portal venous flow, hepatofugal flow, or absent portal venous flow [21].

It is important to note that Doppler findings should be interpreted with caution in the immediate postoperative period since transient abnormalities can be observed that resolve spontaneously after a few days [20].

Although Doppler US is a noninvasive method of identifying adverse events in liver transplant recipients, a normal US examination cannot exclude the presence of biliary, vascular, and/or parenchymal complications [7].

US is a satisfactory screening tool for detecting biliary ductal dilation after orthotopic liver transplantation, with a reported sensitivity of 71% for depicting post-liver transplantation biliary obstruction according to a series [22].

Variant 2: Adult. Liver transplant. Postoperative complications. Suspected vascular etiology. Initial imaging

Because multiple vascular anastomoses are required during liver transplantation, vascular complications are of concern. They occur in up to 7% of deceased donors and 13% of living donors [19]. Arterial complications include thrombosis, stenosis, pseudoaneurysm, and splenic artery steal syndrome. Venous complications are less common and include stenosis, thrombosis, and occlusion of the portal veins, hepatic veins, and inferior vena cava [6]. Early diagnosis of vascular complications is crucial to improve the likelihood of graft and patient survival.

CT Abdomen With IV Contrast. CT of the abdomen may be useful for the evaluation of suspected vascular complications in liver transplant patients. Contrast-enhanced CT is useful in selected cases, such as when US is equivocal, there is persistent clinical suspicion, or more detailed anatomic assessment of vascular complications is required to plan endovascular intervention [19]. CT also has a key role in ruling out false-positive and false-negative cases prompted by US [16].

A retrospective study of 170 patients by Boraschi et al [7] demonstrated a sensitivity and specificity of CT in the detection of vascular adverse events of 100% and 97%, respectively.

Another study of 75 patients by Lee et al [8] demonstrated sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy of CT for diagnosing vascular complications in the early period (<3 months) of 97.1%, 92.6%, and 94.3%, respectively. Furthermore, they demonstrated sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy of vascular complications in the late period (>3 months) of 83.3%, 100%, and 98.9%, respectively. The most common vascular complication found during their study in the early period was active bleeding, and the second most common was portal vein thrombosis/stenosis.

Hepatic artery thrombosis is one of the most feared and most common complications, affecting 2% to 12% of transplants [6,7]. CT was found to be 89% sensitive and 100% specific in the detection of hepatic artery thrombosis [18].

CT is superior to MR angiography in terms of speed and imaging quality. Studies have shown good correlation between CT and conventional angiography in the detection of vascular lesions, with sensitivities up to 100% and specificities up to 89% [7].

Multiphase CT is superior to single phase CTs due to the ability to evaluate arterial, venous, and other structures during a single examination [7,8]. The addition of an unenhanced phase may provide limited additional value by helping to differentiate hyperdense surgical material or clips from active bleeding, but likely less so than a multiphase CT.

CT Abdomen With IV Contrast Multiphase. CT of the abdomen may be useful for the evaluation of suspected vascular complications in liver transplant patients. Contrast-enhanced CT is useful in selected cases, such as when US is equivocal, there is persistent clinical suspicion, or more detailed anatomic assessment of vascular complications is required to plan endovascular intervention [19]. CT also has a key role in ruling out false-positive and false-negative cases prompted by US [16].

A retrospective study of 170 patients by Boraschi et al [7] demonstrated a sensitivity and specificity of CT in the

detection of vascular adverse events of 100% and 97%, respectively.

Another study of 75 patients by Lee et al [8] demonstrated sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy of CT for diagnosing vascular complications in the early period (<3 months) of 97.1%, 92.6%, and 94.3%, respectively. Furthermore, they demonstrated sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy of vascular complications in the late period (>3 months) of 83.3%, 100%, and 98.9%, respectively. The most common vascular complication found during their study in the early period was active bleeding, and the second most common was portal vein thrombosis/stenosis.

Multiphase CT is superior to single phase CTs due to the ability to evaluate arterial, venous, and other structures during a single examination [7,8]. The addition of an unenhanced phase may provide limited additional value by helping to differentiate hyperdense surgical material or clips from active bleeding, but likely less so than a multiphase CT.

CT Abdomen Without and With IV Contrast. CT of the abdomen may be useful for the evaluation of suspected vascular complications in liver transplant patients. Contrast-enhanced CT is useful in selected cases, such as when US is equivocal, there is persistent clinical suspicion, or more detailed anatomic assessment of vascular complications is required to plan endovascular intervention [19]. CT also has a key role in ruling out false-positive and false-negative cases prompted by US [16].

A retrospective study of 170 patients by Boraschi et al [7] demonstrated a sensitivity and specificity of CT in the detection of vascular adverse events of 100% and 97%, respectively.

Another study of 75 patients by Lee et al [8] demonstrated sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy of CT for diagnosing vascular complications in the early period (<3 months) of 97.1%, 92.6%, and 94.3%, respectively. Furthermore, they demonstrated sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy of vascular complications in the late period (>3 months) of 83.3%, 100%, and 98.9%, respectively. The most common vascular complication found during their study in the early period was active bleeding, and the second most common was portal vein thrombosis/stenosis.

Multiphase CT is superior to single phase CTs due to the ability to evaluate arterial, venous, and other structures during a single examination [7,8]. The addition of an unenhanced phase may provide limited additional value by helping to differentiate hyperdense surgical material or clips from active bleeding, but likely less so than a multiphase CT.

CT Abdomen Without IV Contrast. There is no relevant literature to support the use of CT abdomen without IV contrast as the initial imaging test after orthotopic liver transplant for suspected vascular complications.

CTA Abdomen With IV Contrast. CTA of the abdomen may be useful for the evaluation of suspected arterial vascular complications in liver transplant patients. Contrast-enhanced CT is useful in selected cases, such as when US is equivocal, there is persistent clinical suspicion, or more detailed anatomic assessment of vascular complications is required to plan endovascular intervention [19]. CT also has a key role in ruling out false-positive and false-negative cases prompted by US [16].

A retrospective study of 170 patients by Boraschi et al [7] demonstrated a sensitivity and specificity of CT in the detection of vascular adverse events of 100% and 97%, respectively.

Another study of 75 patients by Lee et al [8] demonstrated sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy of CT for diagnosing vascular complications in the early period (<3 months) of 97.1%, 92.6%, and 94.3%, respectively. Furthermore, they demonstrated sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy of vascular complications in the late period (>3 months) of 83.3%, 100%, and 98.9%, respectively. The most common vascular complication found during their study in the early period was active bleeding, and the second most common was portal vein thrombosis/stenosis.

A retrospective study of 481 patients demonstrated that a systematic CTA at the end of the first postoperative week reduced retransplantation rates due to late hepatic artery thrombosis by detecting patients at risk who required specific treatment [23].

MRI Abdomen Without and With IV Contrast. MRI is mainly a confirmatory study after US, and there is no relevant literature to support its use as the initial imaging test after orthotopic liver transplant for suspected vascular complications. MRI has a limited role for the acute assessment of vascular complications after liver transplantation [19]. When used with US, MRI can help quantify the degree and length of the stenosis [6].

A study of 76 patients by Kim et al [24] using MRI of the abdomen with and without IV contrast for the diagnosis of hepatic artery stenosis demonstrated sensitivity, PPV, NPV, and accuracy of 100%, 74%, 29%, 100%, and 77%, respectively. In diagnosing portal venous stenosis, the same study demonstrated a sensitivity, PPV, NPV, and accuracy of 100%, 84%, 35%, and 85%, respectively. Thus, MRI was sensitive but not specific in the detecting of vascular stenosis.

MRI Abdomen Without and With IV Contrast With MRCP. There is no relevant literature to support the use of MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast with MR

cholangiopancreatography (MRCP) as the initial imaging test after orthotopic liver transplant for suspected vascular complications.

MRI Abdomen Without IV Contrast. There is no relevant literature to support the use of MRI abdomen without IV contrast as the initial imaging test after orthotopic liver transplant for suspected vascular complications.

MRI Abdomen Without IV Contrast With MRCP. There is no relevant literature to support the use of MRI abdomen without IV contrast with MRCP as the initial imaging test after orthotopic liver transplant for suspected vascular complications.

Radiography Abdomen. There is no relevant literature to support the use of abdominal radiography as the initial imaging test after orthotopic liver transplant for suspected vascular complications.

US Abdomen. US is useful for the detection of complications in the immediate postoperative period after liver transplantation. Grayscale/B-mode US imaging of the allograft can evaluate for abnormalities in the hepatic parenchyma, biliary tree, and peritransplant fluid collections. However, given that the detection of vascular complication is of the utmost importance in the immediate postoperative period, there is no relevant literature to support the use of grayscale/B-mode imaging alone as the initial imaging test. US duplex Doppler is considered the more optimal procedure for the detection of complications in the immediate postoperative period of liver transplantation due to its ability to evaluate hepatic vasculature, biliary tree, and hepatic parenchyma [7].

US Duplex Doppler Abdomen. US duplex Doppler of the abdomen is an optimal imaging procedure for the detection of complications in the immediate postoperative period after liver transplantation due to its ability to evaluate hepatic vasculature, biliary tree, and hepatic parenchyma. Additionally, these patients are often very sick, and this procedure can be easily performed at the bedside [7,8,11,12].

Because multiple vascular anastomoses are required during transplantation, vascular complications are of particular concern in the immediate postoperative period. Arterial complications are more common than venous. In normal liver arterial spectral waveforms, the arterial acceleration time is <0.08 seconds, and the RI [(peak systolic velocity – peak diastolic velocity) / peak systolic velocity] is between 0.5 and 0.8 [13].

A retrospective study of 110 patients by Uzochukwu et al [14] demonstrates that low early posttransplant hepatic artery resistive indices (<0.6) were 100% sensitive and 80%

specific for vascular complications but not for biliary complications. A study of 522 patients demonstrates 100% sensitivity of US compared with angiography for the detection of early hepatic artery thrombosis [15]. However, duplex US can be susceptible to false-positives due to low cardiac output, arterial spasm, and severe parenchymal edema [16]. Low RI, prolonged systolic acceleration time, and focal peak velocities >200 cm/s are suggestive of hepatic arterial stenosis [6]. Dodd et al [17] demonstrate in a series of 125 patients that when Doppler criteria for arterial complications are combined, the diagnostic sensitivity and specificity for arterial thrombosis or stenosis are 97% and 64%, respectively. A study of 46 patients demonstrates that abnormal values for RI and acceleration time were 67% sensitive and 96% specific for arterial stenosis, and sensitivity and specificity were 81% and 60% when at least one abnormal value was found [18]. Lack of flow in the hepatic artery is suggestive of hepatic thrombosis, and US correctly identifies more than 90% of cases of hepatic artery thrombosis [19].

A retrospective study of 94 patients by Chong et al [20] demonstrated an anastomotic velocity threshold of >125 cm/s as 73% sensitive and 95% specific for portal venous stenosis, an anastomotic to preanastomotic velocity ratio of 3:1 as 73% sensitive and 100% specific for venous stenosis, and a venous pulsatility index of <0.45 as 95.7% specific for outflow venous stenosis.

On Doppler US, abnormal hepatic venous flow may manifest as increased phasicity, decreased phasicity, or absent hepatic venous flow. Abnormal portal venous flow usually manifests as increased pulsatility, slow portal venous flow, hepatofugal flow, or absent portal venous flow [21].

It is important to note that Doppler findings should be interpreted with caution in the immediate postoperative period because transient abnormalities can be observed that result spontaneously after a few days [20].

Although Doppler US is a noninvasive method of identifying adverse events in liver transplant recipients, a normal US examination cannot exclude the presence of biliary, vascular, and/or parenchymal complications [7].

US is a satisfactory screening tool for detecting biliary ductal dilation after orthotopic liver transplantation, with a reported sensitivity of 71% for depicting post-liver transplantation biliary obstruction according to a series [22].

CEUS may also be of benefit in the evaluation of liver transplant patients in the immediate postoperative period. A meta-analysis of 13 studies consisting of 2,281 CEUS studies demonstrates a pooled sensitivity and specificity of 90% and 100%, respectively, for the identification of vascular complications after liver transplantation with CEUS [5]. Additionally, CEUS using microbubble contrast

can reduce the false-positive rate by detecting flow not captured on standard Doppler imaging [6].

Variant 3: Adult. Liver transplant.

Postoperative complications. Suspected biliary etiology. Initial imaging

Approximately 25% of liver transplants develop biliary complications, commonly within the first 3 months. Complications include leak, biliary obstruction, stone/cast formation, biliary stricture, and recurrent biliary disease [12].

Biliary strictures occur in 15% to 18% of liver transplant recipients, are the most common cause of biliary obstruction, and can be classified as anastomotic or non-anastomotic [12,25].

Anastomotic strictures occur due to technical surgical issues and fibro-proliferative response to ischemia at the site of the biliary anastomosis, with resultant short segment bile duct narrowing, upstream continuously dilated intrahepatic and extrahepatic bile ducts, and downstream normal caliber duct. As such, these strictures tend to be isolated [11,12]. Nonanastomotic strictures are secondary to ischemia related injury, immunological injury, and bile salt-induced injury. Multiple segments of bile duct undergo necrosis, with subsequent multiple long fibrotic strictures with intervening segments of bile duct dilation. Although both the intra- and extrahepatic bile ducts can be involved, most cases involve the hilar bile duct. Necrosis of the biliary epithelium can result in poor visualization of the hilar bile duct luminal contour.

CT Abdomen With IV Contrast. CT has a role as a second-line modality after US if vascular complications are suspected or for assessment of a collection but not for assessment of biliary complications [16].

CT Abdomen With IV Contrast Multiphase. CT has a role as a second-line modality after US if vascular complications are suspected or for assessment of a collection but not for assessment of biliary complications [16].

CT Abdomen Without and With IV Contrast. CT has a role as a second-line modality after US if vascular complications are suspected or for assessment of a collection but not for assessment of biliary complications [16]. A noncontrast examination might demonstrate biliary dilation and/or a perihepatic collection, but a contrast-enhanced phase would be necessary for assessment of the vascular anatomy and patency.

CT Abdomen Without IV Contrast. CT has a role as a second-line modality after US if vascular complications are suspected or for assessment of a collection but not for assessment of biliary complications [16]. A noncontrast

examination might demonstrate biliary dilation and/or a perihepatic collection, but a contrast-enhanced phase would be necessary for assessment of the vascular anatomy and patency.

MRI Abdomen Without and With Hepatobiliary Contrast. If there is clinical suspicion for biliary obstruction, or if an US shows a perihepatic fluid collection or biliary abnormality, an MRI can provide useful anatomic detail [25].

Administration of IV contrast is essential for assessing vascular patency. In addition, administration of hepatobiliary contrast agents may be helpful when evaluation of the biliary system is required. Gadoxetate disodium has a 50% hepatic uptake and excretion into the biliary system, which allows for acquiring hepatobiliary images (approximately 20 minutes following administration of contrast). Contrast-filled bile ducts, during the hepatobiliary phase, appear hyperintense on T1-weighted images, allowing for the detection of active biliary leaks by demonstrating contrast extravasation into a perihepatic fluid collection/biloma [26]. For the detection of bile leak, the delayed phase may require an extended delay of 60 to 180 minutes, especially in those patients with dilated bile ducts or moderate hepatic dysfunction [27,28]. Gadoxetate disodium-enhanced MRI in combination with MRCP improves the sensitivity and specificity for detection of biliary leaks after liver transplantation, with reported sensitivity and specificity of 76% and 100%.

The combination of gadoxetate disodium-enhanced MRI and MRCP improves the accuracy for detection of both anastomotic and nonanastomotic biliary strictures, with reported sensitivity and specificity of 79% and 96% to 100%, respectively [26].

MRI Abdomen Without and With IV Contrast. If there is clinical suspicion for biliary obstruction, or if an US shows a perihepatic fluid collection or biliary abnormality, an MRI can provide useful anatomic detail [25].

In a study on 232 liver transplant patients with suspected biliary complications (impaired liver function and/or sonographic biliary abnormalities), MRI with MRCP had a sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and accuracy for the detection of all types of biliary complications of 99%, 96%, 95%, 99%, and 97% respectively [29]. In 207 patients, the examination was performed without IV contrast. This suggests that MRI with MRCP but without IV contrast could still be helpful in diagnosing biliary complications. However, if a biliary stricture or leak is secondary to vascular compromise, this may not be detected on a noncontrast examination.

MRCP has been reported to be >95% sensitive, specific, and accurate for depicting anastomotic strictures [25].

As such, whenever possible, inclusion of MRCP images in the imaging protocol should be considered.

MRI Abdomen Without and With IV Contrast With MRCP. If there is clinical suspicion for biliary obstruction, or if an US shows a perihepatic fluid collection or biliary abnormality, an MRI can provide useful anatomic detail [25].

In a study on 232 liver transplant patients with suspected biliary complications (impaired liver function and/or sonographic biliary abnormalities), MRI with MRCP had a sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and accuracy for the detection of all types of biliary complications of 99%, 96%, 95%, 99%, and 97% respectively [29]. In 207 patients, the examination was performed without IV contrast.

Garg et al [30], in a prospective study of 34 patients, reported that compared with findings at direct cholangiography, MRCP presented a 96.9% sensitivity, 96.9% PPV, and 94.1% accuracy for the detection of biliary complications. The sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and accuracy for the detection of anastomotic strictures, biliary leak, and biliary stone or sludge on MRCP were reported to be 100%, 84.6%, 91.3%, 100%, and 94.1%; 72.7%, 95.7%, 88.9%, 88%, and 88.2%; and 80%, 100%, 100%, 96.7%, and 97.1%, respectively.

In another study of 27 liver transplant recipients, the authors reported a statistically significant correlation between the MRCP findings and both the endoscopic retrograde cholangiography and percutaneous transhepatic cholangiography findings, with a sensitivity of 94.4%, a specificity of 88.9%, and a PPV and NPV of 94.4% and 88.9%, respectively [31]. The combination of gadoxetate disodium-enhanced MRI and MRCP improves the accuracy for the detection of both anastomotic and nonanastomotic biliary strictures, with reported sensitivity and specificity of 79% and 96% to 100%, respectively [26].

MRI Abdomen Without IV Contrast. There is no relevant literature and a lack of data regarding MRI abdomen without IV contrast in this clinical scenario.

MRI Abdomen Without IV Contrast With MRCP. MRCP has been reported to be more than 95% sensitive, specific, and accurate for depicting anastomotic strictures [25]. As such, whenever possible, inclusion of MRCP images in the imaging protocol should be considered.

In a study on 232 liver transplant patients with suspected biliary complications (impaired liver function and/or sonographic biliary abnormalities), MRI with MRCP had a sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and accuracy for the detection of all types of biliary complications of 99%, 96%, 95%, 99%, and 97% respectively [29]. In 207 patients, the examination was performed without IV contrast. This

suggests that MRI with MRCP but without IV contrast could still be helpful in diagnosing biliary complications. However, if a biliary stricture or leak is secondary to vascular compromise, this may not be detected on a non-contrast examination.

Radiography Abdomen. There is no relevant literature supporting the use of abdominal radiography for the evaluation of posttransplant biliary complications.

US Abdomen. US is the first-line modality for assessing postoperative biliary complications after liver transplantation, with a reported sensitivity of 71% for detecting post-liver transplant biliary obstruction [11,25].

US can identify peritransplant fluid collections, calculi, and biliary dilation/obstruction [12]. It can also be helpful to distinguish between anastomotic and nonanastomotic strictures. The skipped and irregular dilatation of intrahepatic bile ducts, and nonvisualization of hilar bile duct luminal contour (due to lengthy fibrotic bile duct strictures with necrosis of the biliary epithelium resulting in poor visualization of the hilar bile duct luminal contour) and can help distinguish between anastomotic and nonanastomotic strictures [11].

US has a high PPV and NPV for diagnosing biliary obstruction (80% and 90%); however, the sensitivity is low (38%-66%). The absence of biliary dilatation does not exclude the possibility of a biliary stricture [6]. Although US is sensitive for detecting posttransplant fluid collections, it is not specific, as bile, blood, pus can all look similar.

US Duplex Doppler Abdomen. A duplex US study with B-mode images and Doppler images allows for contemporaneous evaluation of the hepatic parenchyma, biliary system, and hepatic vasculature and as such is the ideal initial imaging examination to detect posttransplant complications [10].

Because the arterial supply of intrahepatic ducts and the donor proximal common bile duct is solely derived from the reconstructed hepatic artery, vascular compromise can result in biliary stricturing. Nonanastomotic strictures should prompt a Doppler assessment of the hepatic artery to assess for a stricture [12].

A normal US cannot exclude the presence of parenchymal, biliary, or vascular complications; in these cases, cross-sectional imaging with CT or MRI may be indicated [10].

Variant 4: Adult. Post liver transplant. Surveillance

The rate of hepatic malignancy after liver transplantation is higher than in the overall population, with the increased incidence partly attributed to chronic immunosuppressive therapy. This may include recurrence of the primary

malignancy or posttransplant lymphoproliferative disorder [12,26].

Posttransplantation hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) recurrence occurs in 11% to 20% of patients, with a median survival of <1 year from the time of diagnosis, with recurrence usually seen in the first 2 years after transplantation. As of now, there are no specific recommendations for surveillance of recurrence of HCC after liver transplantation in the radiology literature. However, the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases (AASLD) advises surveillance for detection of posttransplant HCC recurrence using multiphasic contrast-enhanced abdominal CT or MRI and chest CT scan [32]. Additionally, an International Consensus conference report recommended that posttransplant monitoring may include 6 to 12 monthly contrast-enhanced CT or MRI along with alpha-fetoprotein measurements [33,34]. There is institutional variation in the timing of the examinations, with some institutions performing cross-sectional imaging with either multiphase contrast-enhanced CT or MRI of the abdomen once every 3 to 6 months for the first 1 to 5 years, with the time interval changing to every 6 to 12 months at some point after the first year [35,36]. The optimal timing and duration of posttransplant imaging is uncertain and will depend on the indication for transplant; however, risk scores may be considered to guide decisions [32].

CT Abdomen With IV Contrast. There is no relevant literature comparing the performance characteristics of the different imaging modalities for surveillance in posttransplant patients. Anecdotally, contrast-enhanced cross-sectional examinations seem to be preferred.

CT Abdomen With IV Contrast Multiphase. There is no relevant literature comparing the performance characteristics of the different imaging modalities for surveillance in posttransplant patients. Multiphase CT is considered one of the optimal choices for this scenario and may be appropriate based on institutional practice [35-37]. Additionally, the AASLD advises surveillance for detection of posttransplant HCC recurrence using multiphasic contrast-enhanced abdominal CT or MRI and chest CT scan [32].

CT Abdomen Without And With IV Contrast. There is no relevant literature comparing the performance characteristics of the different imaging modalities for surveillance in posttransplant patients. Anecdotally, contrast-enhanced cross-sectional examinations seem to be preferred.

CT Abdomen Without IV Contrast. There is no relevant literature comparing the performance characteristics of the different imaging modalities for surveillance in

posttransplant patients. Anecdotally, contrast-enhanced cross-sectional examinations seem to be preferred.

FDG-PET/CT Skull Base to Mid-Thigh. Fluorine-18-2-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose (FDG)-PET can be helpful for confirmation of recurrence in the liver once a suspicious observation is seen on routine posttransplant surveillance with either CT or MRI, but there is no current data to support the use of FDG-PET/CT as an initial screening tool [35].

MRI Abdomen Without and With Hepatobiliary Contrast. There is no relevant literature comparing the performance characteristics of the different imaging modalities for surveillance in posttransplant patients or different contrast agents. Multiphase CT and MRI are considered optimal choices for this scenario and may be useful based on institutional practice [35-37]. Additionally, AASLD advises surveillance for detection of posttransplant HCC recurrence using multiphasic contrast-enhanced abdominal CT and MRI and chest CT scan [32].

MRI Abdomen Without And With IV Contrast. There is no relevant literature comparing the performance characteristics of the different imaging modalities for surveillance in posttransplant patients. Multiphase CT or MRI are considered optimal choices for this scenario and may be useful based on institutional practice [35-37]. Additionally, AASLD advises surveillance for detection of posttransplant HCC recurrence using multiphasic contrast-enhanced abdominal CT or MRI and chest CT scan [32].

MRI Abdomen Without and With IV Contrast With MRCP. There is no relevant literature comparing the performance characteristics of the different imaging modalities for surveillance in posttransplant patients. Anecdotally, contrast-enhanced cross-sectional examinations seem to be preferred.

MRI Abdomen Without IV Contrast. There is no relevant literature comparing the performance characteristics of the different imaging modalities for surveillance in posttransplant patients. Anecdotally, contrast-enhanced cross-sectional examinations seem to be preferred.

MRI Abdomen Without IV Contrast With MRCP. There is no relevant literature comparing the performance characteristics of the different imaging modalities for surveillance in posttransplant patients. Anecdotally, contrast-enhanced cross-sectional examinations seem to be preferred.

Radiography Abdomen. There is no relevant literature supporting the use of abdominal radiography for surveillance in this population.

US Abdomen. There is no relevant literature comparing the performance characteristics of the different imaging modalities for surveillance in posttransplant patients. Anecdotally, contrast-enhanced cross-sectional examinations seem to be preferred. Some experts, however, suggest that US abdomen and US duplex Doppler abdomen may be performed after transplant for surveillance in certain scenarios.

US Duplex Doppler Abdomen. There is no relevant literature comparing the performance characteristics of the different imaging modalities for surveillance in posttransplant patients. Anecdotally, contrast-enhanced cross-sectional examinations seem to be preferred. Some experts, however, suggest that US abdomen and US duplex Doppler abdomen may be performed after transplant for surveillance in certain scenarios.

SUMMARY OF HIGHLIGHTS

This is a summary of the key recommendations from the variant tables. Refer to the complete narrative document for more information.

- **Variant 1:** US duplex Doppler abdomen or CT abdomen with IV contrast or CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase is usually appropriate as the initial imaging for immediate postoperative imaging after liver transplant. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care). The panel did not agree on recommending MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast with MRCP in this clinical scenario. There is insufficient medical literature to conclude whether these patients would benefit from this imaging procedure, but it may be appropriate.
- **Variant 2:** US duplex Doppler abdomen or CT abdomen with IV contrast or CTA abdomen with IV contrast or CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase is usually appropriate as the initial imaging for liver transplant postoperative complication of suspected vascular etiology. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care).
- **Variant 3:** US abdomen or US duplex Doppler abdomen or MRI abdomen without and with hepatobiliary contrast or MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast with MRCP or MRI abdomen without IV contrast with MRCP is usually appropriate as the initial imaging for liver transplant

postoperative complication of suspected biliary etiology. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care).

■ **Variant 4:** MRI abdomen without and with hepatobiliary contrast or MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast or MRI abdomen without and with IV contrast with MRCP or CT abdomen with IV contrast multiphase is usually appropriate as the initial imaging for surveillance after liver transplantation. These procedures are equivalent alternative (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care). The panel did not agree on recommending US abdomen or US duplex Doppler abdomen in this clinical scenario. There is insufficient medical literature to conclude whether these patients would benefit from these imaging procedures but it may be appropriate.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

The evidence table, literature search, and appendix for this topic are available at <https://acsearch.acr.org/list>. The appendix includes the strength of evidence assessment and the final rating round tabulations for each recommendation.

For additional information on the Appropriateness Criteria methodology and other supporting documents, please visit <https://www.acr.org/Clinical-Resources/Clinical-Tools-and-Reference/Appropriateness-Criteria>.

GENDER EQUALITY AND INCLUSIVITY CLAUSE

The ACR acknowledges the limitations in applying inclusive language when citing research studies that predates the use of the current understanding of language inclusive of diversity in sex, intersex, gender, and gender-diverse people. The data variables regarding sex and gender used in the cited literature will not be changed. However, this guideline will use the terminology and definitions as proposed by the National Institutes of Health [38].

RELATIVE RADIATION LEVEL INFORMATION

Potential adverse health effects associated with radiation exposure are an important factor to consider when selecting the appropriate imaging procedure. Because there is a wide range of radiation exposures associated with different diagnostic procedures, a relative radiation level (RRL) indication has been included for each imaging examination. The RRLs are based on effective dose, which is a radiation dose quantity that is used to estimate population total

radiation risk associated with an imaging procedure. Patients in the pediatric age group are at inherently higher risk from exposure, because of both organ sensitivity and longer life expectancy (relevant to the long latency that appears to accompany radiation exposure). For these reasons, the RRL dose estimate ranges for pediatric examinations are lower as compared with those specified for adults (see Table 2). Additional information regarding radiation dose assessment for imaging examinations can be found in the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Radiation Dose Assessment Introduction document [39].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The ACR is the sole funding source for the ACR AC.

REFERENCES

1. Brookmeyer CE, Bhatt S, Fishman EK, Sheth S. Multimodality imaging after liver transplant: top 10 important complications. *Radiographics* 2022;42:702-21.
2. Starzl TE, Marchioro TL, Vonkaulla KN, Hermann G, Brittain RS, Waddell WR. Homotransplantation of the liver in humans. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1963;117:659-76.
3. Kwong AJ, Kim WR, Lake JR, et al. OPTN/SRTR 2022 Annual Data Report: Liver. *Am J Transplant* 2024;24:S176-265.
4. American College of Radiology. ACR–NASCI–SIR–SPR practice parameter for the performance and interpretation of body computed tomography angiography (CTA). Available at: <https://gravitas.acr.org/PPTS/GetDocumentView?docId=164+&releaseId=2>. Accessed September 30, 2025.
5. Chen S, Wang X, Zhang B, Liu B, Pan H. Meta-analysis of the diagnostic value of contrast-enhanced ultrasound for the detection of vascular complications after liver transplantation. *Rev Esp Enferm Dig* 2019;111:388-96.
6. Craig EV, Heller MT. Complications of liver transplant. *Abdom Radiol (NY)* 2021;46:43-67.
7. Boraschi P, Donati F, Rossi M, Ghinolfi D, Filipponi F, Falaschi F. Role of MDCT in the detection of early abdominal complications after orthotopic liver transplantation. *Clin Imaging* 2016;40:1200-6.
8. Lee IS, Park SH, Choi SJ, et al. Diagnostic performance of multi-detector computerized tomography in the detection of abdominal complications early and late after liver transplantation: a 10-year experience. *Transplant Proc* 2018;50:3673-80.
9. Kim JS, Kwon JH, Kim KW, et al. Low graft attenuation at unenhanced CT: association with 1-month mortality or graft failure after liver transplantation. *Radiology* 2018;287:167-75.
10. Boraschi P, Della Pina MC, Donati F. Graft complications following orthotopic liver transplantation: role of non-invasive cross-sectional imaging techniques. *Eur J Radiol* 2016;85:1271-83.
11. Liao M, Guo H, Tong G, et al. Can ultrasonography differentiate anastomotic and non-anastomotic biliary strictures after orthotopic liver transplantation—a single-center experience. *Eur J Radiol* 2021;134:109416.
12. Maheshwari E, Tublin ME. Sonography of liver transplantation. *Abdom Radiol (NY)* 2021;46:68-83.
13. Bhargava P, Vaidya S, Dick AA, Dighe M. Imaging of orthotopic liver transplantation: self-assessment module. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2011;196:S35-8.
14. Uzochukwu LN, Bluth EI, Smetherman DH, et al. Early post-operative hepatic sonography as a predictor of vascular and biliary complications in adult orthotopic liver transplant patients. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2005;185:1558-70.

15. Horrow MM, Blumenthal BM, Reich DJ, Manzarbeitia C. Sonographic diagnosis and outcome of hepatic artery thrombosis after orthotopic liver transplantation in adults. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2007;189:346-51.
16. Girometti R, Pancot M, Como G, Zuiani C. Imaging of liver transplantation. *Eur J Radiol* 2017;93:295-307.
17. Dodd GD 3rd, Memel DS, Zajko AB, Baron RL, Santaguida LA. Hepatic artery stenosis and thrombosis in transplant recipients: Doppler diagnosis with resistive index and systolic acceleration time. *Radiology* 1994;192:657-61.
18. Sureka B, Bansal K, Rajesh S, Mukund A, Pamecha V, Arora A. Imaging panorama in postoperative complications after liver transplantation. *Gastroenterol Rep (Oxf)* 2016;4:96-106.
19. Zhong J, Smith C, Walker P, Sheridan M, Guthrie A, Albazaz R. Imaging post liver transplantation part I: vascular complications. *Clin Radiol* 2020;75:845-53.
20. Chong WK, Beland JC, Weeks SM. Sonographic evaluation of venous obstruction in liver transplants. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2007;188:W515-21.
21. McNaughton DA, Abu-Yousef MM. Doppler US of the liver made simple. *Radiographics* 2011;31:161-88.
22. Beswick DM, Miraglia R, Caruso S, et al. The role of ultrasound and magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography for the diagnosis of biliary stricture after liver transplantation. *Eur J Radiol* 2012;81:2089-92.
23. Memeo R, Ciacio O, Pittau G, et al. Systematic computer tomographic scans 7 days after liver transplantation surgery can lower rates of repeat-transplantation due to arterial complications. *Transplant Proc* 2014;46:3536-42.
24. Kim BS, Kim TK, Jung DJ, et al. Vascular complications after living related liver transplantation: evaluation with gadolinium-enhanced three-dimensional MR angiography. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2003;181:467-74.
25. Camacho JC, Coursey-Moreno C, Telleria JC, Aguirre DA, Torres WE, Mittal PK. Nonvascular post-liver transplantation complications: from US screening to cross-sectional and interventional imaging. *Radiographics* 2015;35:87-104.
26. Cannella R, Dasyam A, Miller FH, Borhani AA. Magnetic resonance imaging of liver transplant. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am* 2021;29:437-50.
27. Cieszanowski A, Stadnik A, Lezak A, et al. Detection of active bile leak with Gd-EOB-DTPA enhanced MR cholangiography: comparison of 20-25 min delayed and 60-180 min delayed images. *Eur J Radiol* 2013;82:2176-82.
28. Kul M, Erden A, Dusunceli Atman E. Diagnostic value of Gd-EOB-DTPA-enhanced MR cholangiography in non-invasive detection of postoperative bile leakage. *Br J Radiol* 2017;90:20160847.
29. Boraschi P, Donati F, Pacciardi F, Ghinolfi D, Falaschi F. Biliary complications after liver transplantation: assessment with MR cholangiopancreatography and MR imaging at 3T device. *Eur J Radiol* 2018;106:46-55.
30. Garg B, Rastogi R, Gupta S, Rastogi H, Garg H, Chowdhury V. Evaluation of biliary complications on magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography and comparison with direct cholangiography after living-donor liver transplantation. *Clin Radiol* 2017;72:518.e9-518.e15.
31. Katz LH, Benjaminov O, Belinki A, et al. Magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography for the accurate diagnosis of biliary complications after liver transplantation: comparison with endoscopic retrograde cholangiography and percutaneous transhepatic cholangiography—long-term follow-up. *Clin Transplant* 2010;24:E163-9.
32. Singal AG, Llovet JM, Yarchoan M, et al. AASLD practice guidance on prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hepatology* 2023;78:1922-65.
33. Clavien PA, Lesurtel M, Bossuyt PM, et al. Recommendations for liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma: an international consensus conference report. *Lancet Oncol* 2012;13:e11-22.
34. Samanci C, Sobhani F, Ucbilek E, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging in diagnosis and monitoring of hepatocellular carcinoma in liver transplantation: a comprehensive review. *Ann Transplant* 2016;21:68-76.
35. Bowlus CL, Lim JK, Lindor KD. AGA clinical practice update on surveillance for hepatobiliary cancers in patients with primary sclerosing cholangitis: expert review. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2019;17:2416-22.
36. Liu D, Chan AC, Fong DY, Lo CM, Khong PL. Evidence-based surveillance imaging schedule after liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence. *Transplantation* 2017;101:107-11.
37. American College of Radiology. Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System (LI-RADS). Available at: <https://www.acr.org/Clinical-Resources/Clinical-Tools-and-Reference/Reporting-and-Data-Systems/LI-RADS>. Accessed September 30, 2025.
38. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine; Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education; Committee on National Statistics; Committee on Measuring Sex, Gender Identity, and Sexual Orientation. Measuring sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation. In: Becker T, Chin M, Bates N, eds. Measuring sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2022.
39. American College of Radiology. ACR Appropriateness Criteria® radiation dose assessment introduction. Available at: <https://edge.sitecorecloud.io/americancoldf5f-acrorgf92a-productioncb02-3650/media/ACR/Files/Clinical/Appropriateness-Criteria/ACR-Appropriateness-Criteria-Radiation-Dose-Assessment-Introduction.pdf>. Accessed September 30, 2025.