

ACR Appropriateness Criteria[®]

Thoracic Venous Occlusions-Suspected Superior Vena Cava Syndrome

Expert Panel on Vascular Imaging: Anant D. Bhawe, MD^a, Nathan Franssen, MD^b, Minhaj S. Khaja, MD, MBA^c, Nima Kokabi, MD^d, William F. Browne, MD^e, Murthy R. Chamarthy, MD^f, Benjamin N. Contrella, MD^g, Baljendra S. Kapoor, MD, MBA^h, Nicole A. Keefe, MDⁱ, Mahammed Z. Khan Suheb, MD^j, Karen M. Kim, MD^k, Julie Lahiri, MD^l, Andrea Obi, MD^m, Sherry Scovell, MDⁿ, Daniel P. Sheeran, MD^o, Seda Tierney, MD^p, Nkiruka Udejiofor, MD^q, Madison Wulfeck, MD, MBA^r, Bill S. Majdalany, MD^s

Abstract

Superior vena cava (SVC) syndrome occurs in approximately 15,000 people in the United States each year. It most commonly occurs secondary to thoracic malignancies, mostly primary lung cancer and lymphoma. The cause is occlusion of the SVC or brachiocephalic veins. The following recommendations for initial imaging evaluation of acute or chronic SVC syndrome are presented. Contrast-

^aThe University of Vermont Medical Center, Burlington, Vermont.

^bResearch Author, The University of Vermont Medical Center, Burlington, Vermont.

^cPanel Chair, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

^dPanel Vice Chair, University of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

^eWeill Cornell Medicine, New York, New York.

^fUT Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, Texas and Lake Granbury Medical Center, Granbury, Texas; Commission on Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging.

^gAllegheny Health Network, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

^hUniversity of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

ⁱUniversity of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

^jSt Luke's Aurora Medical Center, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; American College of Physicians.

^kUT Health Austin/Dell Medical School, Austin, Texas; The Society of Thoracic Surgeons.

^lVascular Surgeon, The University of Vermont Medical Center, Burlington, Vermont.

^mUniversity of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Society for Vascular Surgery.

ⁿHarvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts; Society of Cardiovascular Computed Tomography.

^oUniversity of Virginia, School of Medicine, Charlottesville, Virginia.

^pStanford University Medical Center, Stanford, California; American Society of Echocardiography.

^qHumana, Louisville, Kentucky; American Academy of Family Physicians.

^rRadiology Partners Florida, Tampa, Florida; American Society of Nuclear Cardiology.

^sSpecialty Chair, The University of Vermont Medical Center, Burlington, Vermont.

Corresponding author: Anant D. Bhawe, MD, University of Vermont Medical Center, 111 Colchester Ave, Burlington, VT 05401; e-mail: anant.bhawe@uvmhealth.org.

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.

Nima Kokabi, MD, reports a relationship with Sirtex Medical Inc that includes consulting or advisory, funding grants, speaking and lecture fees, and travel reimbursement; a relationship with Boston Scientific Corporation that includes consulting or advisory and travel reimbursement; a relationship with Terumo Medical Corporation that includes consulting or advisory; and a relationship with Okami Medical that includes consulting or advisory, speaking and lecture fees, and travel reimbursement. Andrea Obi, MD, reports preclinical laboratory research in venous disease (not directly related to this topic area) funded by NIH, Medtronic, and Surmodics. The ACR is the sole funding source for the ACR AC. The other authors state that they have no conflict of interest related to the material discussed in this article. Anant Bhawe, MD, is a partner. All other authors are non-partner/non-partnership track/employees.

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.

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.

enhanced chest CT scans, particularly CT angiography/venography, with or without simultaneous inclusion of the neck are recommended studies. MRI with contrast and MR venography/MRA chest with or without contrast are also recommended studies. The recommended CT and MR studies work well to diagnose and evaluate the cause and extent of superior vena cava or brachiocephalic vein occlusion.

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, brachiocephalic vein occlusion, acute presentation, head and neck swelling, chronic presentation, SVC syndrome

J Am Coll Radiol 2026;23:159-169. © 2025 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® Thoracic Venous Occlusions-Suspected Superior Vena Cava Syndrome. [Variants 1 to 2](#) and [Tables 1](#) and [2](#).

Variant 1. Adult. Suspected acute superior vena cava or brachiocephalic vein occlusion. Initial Imaging.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
MRA and MRV chest without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0
MRV chest without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	0
CT chest with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿
CT chest without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿
CT neck and chest with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿⦿
CT neck and chest without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿⦿
CTA and CTV chest with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿⦿
CTV chest with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿⦿
Radiography chest	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	⦿
MRA chest with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	0
MRA chest without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	0
MRA chest without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	0
MRI chest with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	0
MRI chest without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	0
MRI chest without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	0
MRV chest without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	0
CTA chest with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	⦿⦿⦿
CTA chest without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	⦿⦿⦿
US duplex Doppler upper extremity and chest	Usually Not Appropriate	0
Catheter venography upper extremity and SVC	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿
CT chest without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿
CT neck and chest without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿⦿

Variant 2. Adult. Suspected chronic superior vena cava or brachiocephalic vein occlusion. Initial Imaging.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
MRA and MRV chest without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
MRV chest without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
CT chest with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿
CT chest without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿
CT neck and chest with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿⦿
CT neck and chest without and with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿⦿
CTA and CTV chest with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿⦿
CTV chest with IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿⦿
US duplex Doppler upper extremity and chest	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	○
Radiography chest	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	⦿
Catheter venography upper extremity and SVC	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	⦿⦿⦿
MRA chest with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
MRA chest without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
MRI chest with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	○
MRI chest without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
MRI chest without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	○
MRV chest without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	○
CTA chest with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	⦿⦿⦿
CTA chest without and with IV contrast	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	⦿⦿⦿
MRA chest without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
CT chest without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿
CT neck and chest without IV contrast	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

Venous drainage of the head, neck, and upper extremities returns to the heart via the superior vena cava (SVC). Obstruction of the SVC can occur from a variety of causes, including intrinsic obstructive and extrinsic compressive pathologies. A review of the causes, diagnosis, and management of SVC syndrome is presented here in addition to an evaluation of relevant imaging studies.

SVC syndrome occurs in approximately 15,000 people in the United States each year. It most commonly occurs secondary to thoracic malignancies, mostly primary lung cancer and lymphoma. With the increased use of intravascular devices, the prevalence of SVC thrombosis or stenosis related to these devices is increasing

[1]. Other benign causes include fibrosing mediastinitis, tuberculosis, histoplasmosis, thyroid goiter, and aortic aneurysms [1,2]. Symptoms typically present over weeks to months, although they can also present acutely over minutes to hours. The incidence of acute SVC syndrome is not well documented, although it is considered relatively rare compared with chronic or subacute forms [2,3].

SVC syndrome is typically not acutely life-threatening, and management revolves around relieving symptoms and treating the underlying etiology. Treatments can include elevating the patient's head, anticoagulation, diuretics, chemotherapy, thrombolysis, thrombectomy, endovascular recanalization with stent placement, and/or radiation therapy [2-4].

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 where each procedure provides unique clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care).

DISCUSSION OF PROCEDURES BY VARIANT

Variant 1: Adult. Suspected acute superior vena cava or brachiocephalic vein occlusion. Initial imaging

SVC syndrome arises from compromised venous return from the head, neck, and upper extremities, typically evolving gradually as collateral circulation develops over time. However, in cases of acute thrombosis or embolism, symptoms may abruptly manifest before collateral circulation is established. Common symptoms include facial and neck swelling, upper extremity discoloration, dyspnea, cough, dysphagia, dizziness, blurred vision, breathing difficulty, and hoarseness. Although symptoms often cause significant discomfort, they are typically not life-threatening. Nevertheless, in severe cases of increased venous pressures, altered mental status, hypotension, life-threatening cerebral edema, and venous infarctions may occur. Additionally, acute respiratory distress may occur from nasal and laryngeal edema, requiring urgent medical intervention [1].

SVC syndrome is a clinical diagnosis. The goal of imaging is to determine the etiology and anatomic location of the disease processes causing the patient's symptoms and to help formulate an appropriate treatment plan.

Catheter Venography Upper Extremity and SVC.

Catheter venography upper extremity and SVC accurately delineates location and degree of obstruction and is helpful for planning interventions. However, it is not as useful for determining the cause of obstruction or assisting in staging evaluation in the case of obstruction caused by malignancy, and there is no relevant literature to support the use of catheter venography as an initial imaging evaluation, due to the invasive nature of the examination and associated risks, although it may be considered when rapid diagnosis and treatment is needed. CO₂ venography may be indicated in

patients seeking an alternative imaging option. Zhao et al [5] demonstrated a high specificity (97%) but a low sensitivity (56%) for multidetector CT (MDCT) as compared with digital subtraction angiography (DSA). In their study, only 156 of 280 lesions found on DSA were correctly identified by MDCT. Therefore, catheter venography may be needed in addition to cross-sectional imaging for better characterization, particularly in catheter-related central venous stenosis in patients undergoing hemodialysis.

CT Chest With IV Contrast. CT chest with intravenous (IV) contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC syndrome with acute presentation. It allows delineation of degree and cause of SVC/brachiocephalic vein (BCV) obstruction/stenosis. CT chest with dynamic time-resolved component may be useful in the preoperative assessment of SVC syndrome to determine invasion into adjacent structures [6]. CT with IV contrast imaging, in general, has a high sensitivity (96%) and specificity (92%) for diagnosing SVC syndrome [7,8].

CT Chest Without and With IV Contrast. CT chest without and with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC syndrome with acute presentation. It allows delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis. CT chest without and with IV contrast will provide similar details as a CT chest with IV contrast. The addition of the CT chest without IV contrast is not required for evaluation of the vasculature, although it can still add additional diagnostic value, particularly in cases in which there are central catheters or stents already in place.

CT Chest Without IV Contrast. There is no relevant literature to support the use of CT chest without IV contrast for the diagnosis of SVC syndrome. It is not indicated for acute presentation of SVC syndrome, as the vasculature is not adequately evaluated without IV contrast. It may be able to diagnose a chest/mediastinal mass or presence of a central venous catheter.

CT Neck and Chest With IV Contrast. CT neck and chest with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC syndrome with acute presentation. It allows delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis. Although it may be able to provide additional information in cases in which jugular venous thrombus or obstruction is suspected, as the CT neck scan has a larger field of view, which includes the whole neck and the chest.

CT Neck and Chest Without and With IV Contrast. CT neck and chest without and with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC

syndrome with acute presentation. It allows delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis. CT neck and chest without and with IV contrast will provide similar details as a CT neck and chest with IV contrast. It may be able to provide additional information in cases in which jugular venous thrombosis or obstruction is suspected, as the CT neck scan has a larger field of view, which includes the whole neck and the chest. The addition of the CT neck and chest without IV contrast is not required for evaluation of the vasculature, although it can still add additional diagnostic value, particularly in cases in which there are central catheters or stents already in place.

CT Neck and Chest Without IV Contrast. There is no relevant literature to support the use of CT neck and chest without IV contrast for the diagnosis of SVC syndrome, as the vasculature is not adequately evaluated without IV contrast. It may be able to diagnose a chest/mediastinal mass or presence of a central venous catheter.

CTA and CTV Chest With IV Contrast. CT angiography (CTA) and CT venography (CTV) chest with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC syndrome with acute presentation. It allows delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis. In most cases, it will provide additional or more accurate imaging of venous occlusion/thrombus due to the additional venographic phase (CTV). The arterial phase (CTA) may allow better characterization of chest/mediastinal tumors and possible pulmonary embolism (PE) if that is in the differential. Sundaram et al [9] suggest that CTV chest provides equivalent diagnostic information compared with CTA/CTV combination, with more streak artifact on the CTA phase.

CTA Chest With IV Contrast. CTA chest with IV contrast in the arterial phase is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC syndrome with acute presentation. However, because of the arterial timing of the contrast, it may limit delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis compared with venographic phase (CTV). Therefore, it is inferior to CTA/CTV due to a lack of the venographic phase [9].

CTA Chest Without and With IV Contrast. CTA chest without and with IV contrast in the arterial phase is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC syndrome with acute presentation. However, because of the arterial timing of the contrast, it may limit delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis compared with venographic phase (CTV). Therefore, it is inferior to CTA/CTV due to a lack of the venographic phase [9]. The without IV contrast component (precontrast phase) is essentially a CT chest without IV contrast and can add

additional diagnostic value, particularly in cases in which there are central catheters or stents already in place.

CTV Chest With IV Contrast. CTV chest with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC syndrome with acute presentation. It allows delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis. Lack of a CTA phase may be less useful to characterize chest/mediastinal tumors or diagnose PE if also suspected. Findings from Sundaram et al [9] suggest that CTV chest provides equivalent diagnostic information compared with CTA/CTV combination, with more streak artifact on the CTA phase.

MRA and MRV Chest Without and With IV Contrast. MR angiography (MRA) and MR venography (MRV) chest without and with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC syndrome with acute presentation. The venographic phase may allow better delineation of venous occlusion/thrombus. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8].

MRA Chest With IV Contrast. MRA chest with arterial IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC syndrome with acute presentation. However, it may be less useful compared with an MRI/MRA/MRV combination if characterization of a mediastinal mass is indicated. The lack of an MRV may limit characterization of venous occlusion/thrombosis because the examination is optimized to evaluate the arteries. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8].

MRA Chest Without and With IV Contrast. MRA chest without and with arterial IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC syndrome with acute presentation. It may be less useful compared with an MRI/MRA/MRV combination if characterization of a mediastinal mass is indicated. The lack of an MRV may limit characterization of venous occlusion/thrombosis as the examination is optimized to evaluate the arteries. There is no advantage over MRA chest with IV contrast alone. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8].

MRA Chest Without IV Contrast. MRA chest without IV contrast is not ideal as an initial imaging study; however, it may be considered in patients seeking an alternative

option. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8]. However, it may be inferior to MRV chest for characterizing venous obstruction/thrombosis depending on protocol. It may also be less useful compared with an MRI/MRA/MRV combination if characterization of a mediastinal mass is indicated.

MRI Chest With IV Contrast. MRI chest with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC syndrome with acute presentation. It may serve as a complementary imaging option to characterize a mediastinal mass more specifically. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. It is suboptimal for characterizing venous occlusion/thrombosis without MRA or MRV study concurrently. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8].

MRI Chest Without and With IV Contrast. MRI chest without and with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC syndrome with acute presentation. It may serve as a complementary imaging option to characterize a mediastinal mass more specifically, and the noncontrast portion of the study may provide additional diagnostic value compared with MRI chest with IV contrast alone. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. It is suboptimal for characterizing venous occlusion/thrombosis without MRA or MRV study concurrently. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8].

MRI Chest Without IV Contrast. MRI chest without IV contrast may be considered in patients seeking an alternative option or as a complementary imaging option to characterize a mediastinal mass more specifically, although it may be inferior to other examinations using IV contrast. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. It is suboptimal for characterizing venous occlusion/thrombosis compared with all other MR studies. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8].

MRV Chest Without and With IV Contrast. MRV chest without and with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC syndrome with acute presentation. It may be less useful compared with an MRI/MRA/MRV combination if characterization of a mediastinal mass is indicated or if PE is additionally suspected.

However, it may be superior to MRA chest alone, with or without IV contrast, as MRV is optimized to evaluate venous structures. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8].

MRV Chest Without IV Contrast. MRV chest without IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of SVC syndrome with acute presentation. It may be less useful compared with an MRI/MRA/MRV combination if characterization of a mediastinal mass is indicated or if PE is additionally suspected. However, it may be superior to MRA chest with or without IV contrast because it is optimized to evaluate venous structures even without the additional benefit of IV contrast. Image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8]. This represents the only option, other than CO₂ venography and Doppler ultrasound (US), which does not involve the use of a contrast agent and provides superior cross-sectional information than the alternative modalities.

Radiography Chest. Radiography chest is not an optimal study for the diagnosis of SVC syndrome, although it may be able to diagnose a large chest or mediastinal mass, evidence of collaterals, or central catheter/stent [10,11]. However, it cannot determine extent of obstruction or cause of SVC syndrome. Radiography often must be followed by a more definitive imaging study.

US Duplex Doppler Upper Extremity and Chest. US duplex Doppler chest is not an optimal study for the diagnosis of SVC syndrome in the acute setting due to poor visualization of the mediastinum. However, it may be able to diagnose BCV or subclavian vein obstruction/thrombosis and may be able to visualize sequela of SVC obstruction/thrombosis, such as collaterals associated with central venous obstruction or slowed venous flow, or to diagnose upper extremity deep vein thrombosis (DVT) [10]. It cannot determine extent of obstruction or cause of SVC syndrome. If echocardiography is included in this category, it may be an initial study to diagnose pacemaker wire associated SVC syndrome [7].

Variant 2: Adult. Suspected chronic superior vena cava or brachiocephalic vein occlusion. Initial imaging

Chronic SVC syndrome is a consequence of compromised venous drainage from the head, neck, and upper extremities, which typically presents over weeks, months, or years. The gradual development or worsening of a stenosis or

occlusion allows time for collateral venous drainage to occur, decreasing symptom severity and acuity. The most common symptoms include swelling and discoloration of the face, neck, and upper extremities. This may be exacerbated by bending over or lying flat. Additional symptoms can include dyspnea, cough, dysphagia, dizziness, blurry vision, difficulty breathing, hoarseness, and cerebral edema [1,3].

SVC syndrome is a clinical diagnosis. The goal of imaging is to determine the etiology and anatomic location of the disease processes causing the patient's symptoms and to help formulate an appropriate treatment plan.

Catheter Venography Upper Extremity and SVC.

Catheter venography upper extremity and SVC accurately delineates location and degree of obstruction and is helpful for planning interventions. However, it is not as useful for determining cause of obstruction and assisting in staging evaluation in the case of obstruction caused by malignancy, and there is no relevant literature to support the use of catheter venography as an initial imaging evaluation because of the invasive nature of the examination and associated risks. CO₂ venography may be indicated in patients seeking an alternative imaging option. Zhao et al [5] demonstrated a high specificity (97%) but a low sensitivity (56%) MDCT as compared with DSA. In their study, only 156 of 280 lesions found on DSA were correctly identified by MDCT. Therefore, catheter venography may be needed in addition to cross-sectional imaging for better characterization, particularly in catheter-related central venous stenosis in patients undergoing hemodialysis.

CT Chest With IV Contrast. CT chest with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. It allows delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis. CT chest with dynamic time-resolved component may be useful in the preoperative assessment of SVC syndrome to determine invasion into adjacent structures [6]. CT with IV contrast imaging, in general, has a high sensitivity (96%) and specificity (92%) for diagnosing SVC syndrome [7,8].

CT Chest Without and With IV Contrast. CT chest without and with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. It allows delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis. CT chest without and with IV contrast will provide similar details as a CT chest with IV contrast. The addition of the CT chest without IV contrast is not required for evaluation of the vasculature, although it can still add additional diagnostic value, particularly in cases in which there are central catheters or stents already in place.

CT Chest Without IV Contrast. There is no relevant literature to support the use of CT chest without IV contrast for the diagnosis of SVC syndrome. It is not indicated for chronic SVC syndrome, as the vasculature is not adequately evaluated without IV contrast. It may be able to diagnose a chest/mediastinal mass or presence of a central venous catheter.

CT Neck and Chest With IV Contrast. CT neck and chest with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. It allows delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis. However, it may be able to provide additional information in cases in which jugular venous thrombus or obstruction is suspected, as the CT neck scan has a larger field of view that includes the whole neck and the chest.

CT Neck and Chest Without and With IV Contrast.

CT neck and chest without and with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. It allows delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis. CT neck and chest without and with IV contrast will provide similar details as a CT neck and chest with IV contrast, although the addition of the CT neck and chest without IV contrast is not required for evaluation of the vasculature, although it can still add additional diagnostic value, particularly in cases in which there are central catheters or stents already in place. It may provide additional information compared with CT neck and chest with IV contrast if there are central catheters or stents in place. It may be able to provide additional information in cases in which jugular venous thrombosis or obstruction is suspected, as the CT neck scan has a larger field of view, which includes the whole neck and the chest.

CT Neck and Chest Without IV Contrast. There is no relevant literature to support the use of CT neck and chest without IV contrast for the diagnosis of SVC syndrome, as the vasculature is not adequately evaluated without IV contrast. It may be able to diagnose a chest/mediastinal mass or presence of a central venous catheter.

CTA and CTV Chest With IV Contrast. CTA and CTV chest with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. It allows delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis. In most cases, it will provide additional or more accurate imaging of venous occlusion/thrombus due to the additional venographic phase (CTV). The arterial phase (CTA) may allow better characterization of chest/mediastinal tumors and possible PE if that is in the differential. Sundaram et al [9] suggest that CTV chest provides equivalent diagnostic information compared with

CTA/CTV combination, with more streak artifact on the CTA phase.

CTA Chest With IV Contrast. CTA chest with IV contrast in the arterial phase is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. However, because of the arterial timing of the contrast, it may limit delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis compared with venographic phase (CTV). Therefore, it is inferior to CTA/CTV due to the lack of the venographic phase [9].

CTA Chest Without and With IV Contrast. CTA chest without and with IV contrast in the arterial phase is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. However, because of the arterial timing of the contrast, it may limit delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis compared with venographic phase (CTV). Therefore, it is inferior to CTA/CTV due to the lack of the venographic phase [9]. The without IV contrast component (precontrast phase) is essentially a CT chest without IV contrast and can add additional diagnostic value, particularly in cases in which there are central catheters or stents already in place.

CTV Chest With IV Contrast. CTV chest with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. It allows delineation of degree and cause of SVC/BCV obstruction/stenosis. Lack of a CTA phase may be less useful to characterize chest/mediastinal tumors or diagnose PE if also suspected. Findings from Sundaram et al [9] suggest that CTV chest provides equivalent diagnostic information compared with CTA/CTV combination, with more streak artifact on the CTA phase.

MRA and MRV Chest Without and With IV Contrast.

MRA and MRV chest without and with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. The venographic phase may allow better delineation of venous occlusion/thrombus. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8].

MRA Chest With IV Contrast. MRA chest with arterial IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. It may be less useful compared with an MRI/MRA/MRV combination if characterization of a mediastinal mass is indicated. The lack of an MRV may limit characterization of venous occlusion/thrombosis because the examination is optimized to evaluate the arteries. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. Metal

artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8].

MRA Chest Without and With IV Contrast. MRA chest without and with arterial IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. It may be less useful compared with an MRI/MRA/MRV combination if characterization of a mediastinal mass is indicated. The lack of an MRV may limit characterization of venous occlusion/thrombosis because the examination is optimized to evaluate the arteries. There is no advantage over MRA chest with IV contrast alone. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8].

MRA Chest Without IV Contrast. MRA chest without IV contrast is not ideal as an initial imaging study; however, it may be considered in patients seeking an alternative option. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8]. However, it may be inferior to MRV chest for characterizing venous obstruction/thrombosis depending on the protocol. It may also be less useful compared with an MRI/MRA/MRV combination if characterization of a mediastinal mass is indicated.

MRI Chest With IV Contrast. MRI chest with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. It may serve as a complementary imaging option to characterize a mediastinal mass more specifically. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. It is suboptimal for characterizing venous occlusion/thrombosis without MRA or MRV study concurrently. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8].

MRI Chest Without and With IV Contrast. MRI chest without and with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. It may serve as a complementary imaging option to characterize a mediastinal mass more specifically, as the non-contrasted portion of the study may provide additional diagnostic value compared with MRI chest with IV contrast alone. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. It is suboptimal for characterizing venous occlusion/thrombosis without MRA or MRV study concurrently. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8].

MRI Chest Without IV Contrast. MRI chest without IV contrast is not ideal as an initial imaging study; however, it may be considered in patients seeking an alternative option or as a complementary imaging option to characterize a mediastinal mass more specifically, although it may be inferior to other examinations using IV contrast. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. It is suboptimal for characterizing venous occlusion/thrombosis compared with all other MR studies. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8].

MRV Chest Without and With IV Contrast. MRV chest without and with IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. It may be less useful compared with an MRI/MRA/MRV combination if characterization of a mediastinal mass is indicated or if PE is additionally suspected. However, it may be superior to MRA chest alone, with or without IV contrast, as MRV is optimized to evaluate venous structures. The image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8].

MRV Chest Without IV Contrast. MRV chest without IV contrast is a good initial imaging examination for most causes of chronic SVC syndrome. It may be less useful compared with an MRI/MRA/MRV combination if characterization of a mediastinal mass is indicated or if PE is additionally suspected. However, it may be superior to MRA chest with or without IV contrast, as it is optimized to evaluate venous structures even without the additional benefit of IV contrast. Image quality is highly dependent on equipment quality and protocol optimization. Metal artifacts may be a factor in image quality in patients with stents/sternal wires/metal implants [8]. This represents the only option, other than CO₂ venography and Doppler US, which does not involve the use of a contrast agent and provides superior cross-sectional information than the alternative modalities.

Radiography Chest. Radiography chest is not an optimal study for the diagnosis of SVC syndrome, although it may be able to diagnose large chest or mediastinal mass, evidence of collaterals, or central catheter/stent [10,11]. However, it cannot determine extent of obstruction or cause of SVC syndrome. Radiography often must be followed by a more definitive imaging study.

US Duplex Doppler Upper Extremity and Chest. US duplex Doppler chest is not an optimal study for the diagnosis of SVC syndrome in the chronic setting due to poor visualization of the mediastinum. However, it may be

able to diagnose BCV or subclavian vein obstruction/thrombosis and may be able to visualize sequela of SVC obstruction/thrombosis, such as collaterals associated with central venous obstruction or slowed venous flow, or to diagnose upper extremity DVT [10]. It cannot determine extent of obstruction or cause of SVC syndrome. If echocardiography is included in this category, it may be an initial study to diagnose pacemaker wire associated SVC syndrome [7].

SUMMARY OF HIGHLIGHTS

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

■ **Variants 1 and 2:** For initial evaluation of suspected acute or chronic SVC syndrome, contrast-enhanced chest CT scans, particularly CTA/CTV, with or without simultaneous inclusion of the neck are recommended studies. MRI with IV contrast and MRV/MRA chest with or without IV contrast are also recommended studies. The recommended CT and MR studies work well to diagnose and evaluate the cause and extent of SVC or BCV occlusion. MRI and CT should be used as alternative studies rather than complementary studies. On the other hand, CT or MRI scans without IV contrast, chest radiographs, US duplex Doppler, and catheter venography are usually not recommended due to their limited diagnostic value.

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 [12].

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 [13].

REFERENCES

1. Friedman T, Quencer KB, Kishore SA, Winokur RS, Madoff DC. Malignant venous obstruction: superior vena cava syndrome and beyond. *Semin Intervent Radiol* 2017;34:398-408.
2. Kalra M, Sen I, Gloviczki P. Endovenous and operative treatment of superior vena cava syndrome. *Surg Clin North Am* 2018;98:321-35.
3. Yu JB, Wilson LD, Detterbeck FC. Superior vena cava syndrome—a proposed classification system and algorithm for management. *J Thorac Oncol* 2008;3:811-4.
4. Ierardi AM, Jannone ML, Petrillo M, et al. Treatment of venous stenosis in oncologic patients. *Future Oncol* 2018;14:2933-43.
5. Zhao Y, Yang L, Wang Y, Zhang H, Cui T, Fu P. The diagnostic value of multi-detector CT angiography for catheter-related central venous stenosis in hemodialysis patients. *Phlebology* 2021;36:217-25.
6. Choong CK, Pasricha SS, Li X, et al. Dynamic four-dimensional computed tomography for preoperative assessment of lung cancer invasion into adjacent structures. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2015;47:239-43; discussion 243.
7. Akin Y, Cagli K, Okten RS, Keles T, Golbasi Z. Pacemaker-associated superior vena cava syndrome: role of contrast echocardiography. *Echocardiography* 2022;39:647-53.
8. Sonavane SK, Milner DM, Singh SP, Abdel Aal AK, Shahir KS, Chaturvedi A. Comprehensive imaging review of the superior vena cava. *Radiographics* 2015;35:1873-92.
9. Sundaram B, Kuriakose JW, Stojanovska J, Watcharotone K, Parker RA, Kazerooni EA. Thoracic central venous evaluation: comparison of first-pass direct versus delayed-phase indirect multidetector CT venography. *Clin Imaging* 2015;39:412-6.
10. Azizi AH, Shafi I, Shah N, et al. Superior vena cava syndrome. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv* 2020;13:2896-910.
11. Lacout A, Marcy PY, Thariat J, Lacombe P, El Hajjam M. Radio-anatomy of the superior vena cava syndrome and therapeutic orientations. *Diagn Interv Imaging* 2012;93:569-77.
12. 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.
13. 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.