

Appendix 1: Effectiveness of modalities used to identify kidney stones and the resultant radiation exposure¹⁻⁶

Modality				Radiation exposure	
	Adult		Pediatric	Effective dose in an adult, 95% CI, mSv	Absorbed dose in a fetus, min-max, mGy*
	Sensitivity	Specificity	Accuracy, %		
Ultrasonography	13-100†	97-100	Stone location • 90 in kidney • 75 in kidney + ureter • 38 in ureter	-	-
Plain radiography	45-59	71-77	Sensitivity 30-60	0.5-0.9	1.4-4.2
Ultrasonography and plain radiography	94-97	90	NA	0.5-0.9	1.4-4.2
Intravenous urography	64-97	92-94	NA	1.3-3.5	1.7-10
Non-contrast-enhanced computed tomography					
Standard dose	95-100	94-100	89-100	8-16	8.0-49
Reduced dose	98	95	89-100‡	0.5-2.0	4

Note: NA = not available.
*Exposure < 50 mGy in a fetus has not been shown to be associated with an increased risk of fetal anomalies or loss of pregnancy.³
†Sensitivity 13% with kidney stones < 3 mm, 96%-100% with stones > 5mm.
‡Computed tomography performed with a reduced tube current resulted in a dose reduction of 25%-90% without a significant change in accuracy. The amount of reduction depends on patient size and habitus.

References

1. Jindal G, Ramchandani P. Acute flank pain secondary to urolithiasis: radiologic evaluation and alternate diagnoses. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2007;45:395-410.
2. Dhar M, Denstedt JD. Imaging in diagnosis, treatment, and follow-up of stone patients. *Adv Chronic Kidney Dis* 2009;16:39-47.
3. Srirangam SJ, Hickerton B, Cleynenbreugel BV. Management of urinary calculi in pregnancy: a review. *J Endourol* 2008;22:867-75.
4. Hiorns MP. Imaging of urinary tract lithiasis: Who, when and how? *Pediatr Radiol* 2008;38(Suppl 3):S497-500.
5. Heneghan JP, McGuire KA, Leder RA, et al. Helical CT for nephrolithiasis and ureterolithiasis: comparison of conventional and reduced radiation-dose techniques. *Radiology* 2003;229:575-80.
6. Cody DD, Moxley DM, Krugh KT, et al. Strategies for formulating appropriate MDCT techniques when imaging the chest, abdomen, and pelvis in pediatric patients. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2004;182:849-59.