# International consensus statement on the radiological evaluation of dysraphic malformations of the spine and spinal cord

Ankit Balani FRCR[1], Jai Sidpra BSc (Hons)[1,2], Sniya Sudhakar FRCR[1], Asthik Biswas DNB[1], Özgür Öztekin MD[3], Valeria Capra MD[4], Martin Catala PhD[5], Andrew J. Copp DPhil[2], Neetu Kumar FRCS[6], Navroop Johal FRCS[6], M. Zubair Tahir FRCS[7], Dominic Thompson FRCS[7], Dachling Pang FRCS[7,8], David M. Mirsky MD[9], Mai-Lan Ho MD[10], Thierry A.G.M. Huisman FACR[11], Andrea Rossi MD[12,13], Kshitij Mankad FRCR[1,2]

[1] Department of Neuroradiology, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

[2] Developmental Biology and Cancer Section, University College London Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, London, UK

[3] Department of Neuroradiology, Izmir Bakircay University, Izmir, Turkey

[4] Medical Genetics Unit, IRCCS Instituto Giannina Gaslini, Genoa, Italy

[5] Laboratoire de Biologie du développement, UMR 7622 de Sorbonne Université et du CNRS, ERL 1156 de l'INSERM et Institut de Biologie Paris Seine (IBPS), Paris, France

[6] Department of Urology, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

[7] Department of Neurosurgery, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

[8] Department of Paediatric Neurosurgery, University of California, Davis, CA, USA.

[9] Department of Radiology, Children's Hospital Colorado, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, CO, USA

[10] Department of Radiology, Nationwide Children's Hospital, Ohio State University, Ohio, USA

[11] Edward B. Singleton Department of Radiology, Texas Children's Hospital and Baylor College of Medicine, Texas, USA

[12] Neuroradiology Unit, IRCCS Istituto Giannina Gaslini, Genoa, Italy

[13] Department of Health Sciences (DISSAL), University of Genoa, Genoa, Italy

**Corresponding author contact information**

Dr Kshitij Mankad

E-Mail: drmankad@gmail.com

Mobile: +44 (0)7861 639 010

Department of Neuroradiology, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust, Great Ormond Street, London, WC1N 3JH, UK

**ORCIDs:**

Ankit Balani – 0000-0003-1703-551X

Jai Sidpra – 0000-0003-1985-5503

Sniya Sudhakar – 0000-0002-7632-9705

Asthik Biswas – 0000-0003-2010-9524

Özgür Öztekin – 0000-0002-0092-5260

Valeria Capra – 0000-0002-3097-0388

Martin Catala – 0000-0003-1554-9007

Andrew Copp – 0000-0002-2544-9117

M. Zubair Tahir – 0000-0001-9797-3770

Dominic Thompson – 0000-0002-1114-9869

Dachling Pang – 0000-0002-6603-6546

David M. Mirsky – 0000-0003-2162-515X

Mai-Lan Ho – 0000-0002-9455-1350

Thierry Huisman – 0000-0003-2302-6724

Andrea Rossi – 0000-0001-8575-700X

Kshitij Mankad – 0000-0001-5979-9337

## Compliance with ethical standards

**Funding**

No funding was sought for this work.

**Conflicts of interest**

J.S. is supported by Cancer Research UK and University College London. D.M.M. acts as the Vice President of The American Society of Pediatric Neuroradiology. A.R. acts as the President of the Italian Association of Neuroradiology and as Secretary General of the European Society of Neuroradiology. K.M. acts as the Chair of the British Paediatric Neuroimaging Group and receives private consulting fees from the Cromwell Hospital and HCA Healthcare for his role as a Consultant Paediatric Neuroradiologist. He has also received speaker honoraria from the European Society of Paediatric Neuroradiology and a travel grant from Guerbet to attend the American Society of Pediatric Neuroradiology 4th Annual Scientific Meeting. On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author asserts that no financial relationships exist with any organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work and that no other relationships or activities exist that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

**Ethical approval**

Not required.

**Consent to participate**

Informed consent for the use of anonymized survey results was obtained prior to the commencement of Delphi rounds.

**Consent for publication**

Informed consent for the use of anonymized survey results was obtained prior to the commencement of Delphi rounds.

**Availability of data and material**

Consensus statements and results from individual Delphi rounds are available in the online supplementary materials for this manuscript.

**Authors' contribution**

A.R. and K.M. conceived of the study. A.B., J.S., S.S., and K.M. performed the literature review. All authors made substantial contributions to the discussion. A.B., S.S., A.B., O.O., V.C., M.C., A.C., N.K., N.J., M.Z.T., D.T., D.P., D.M.M., M.L.H., T.H., A.R., and K.M. participated in the Delphi consensus process. J.S. independently mediated the Delphi consensus process. A.B. and J.S. drafted the manuscript. All authors critically reviewed and revised the manuscript. A.B. J.S., and K.M. have seen, verified, and are responsible for the underlying data presented in this manuscript.

## Abstract

Dysraphic malformations of the spine and spinal cord (DMSSC) represent a spectrum of common congenital anomalies typically (though not exclusively) affecting the lower spinal segments. These may be responsible for varying degrees of neurological, orthopedic and urological morbidity. With advances in neuroimaging, it is now possible to better diagnose and evaluate these disorders both prenatally and postnatally. Neuroimaging, performed at the right time and with technique optimization, is integral in guiding clinical management. However, the terminology used to describe these lesions has become increasingly confusing and there is a lack of consensus regarding the essential radiological features and their clinical weighting. This variability in radiological practice risks unstructured decision making and increases the likelihood of suboptimal, less informed clinical management. In this manuscript, the first of a series of consensus statements, we outline a standardized international consensus statement for the radiological evaluation of children with suspected DMSSC derived from a critical review of the literature, and the collective clinical experience of a multinational group of experts. We provide recommendations for plain radiography, ultrasound, computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging in evaluation of DMSSC with emphasis on technique of imaging and imaging protocols.

**Keywords:** computed tomography, children, consensus statement, infants, magnetic resonance imaging, malformations of spine and spinal cord, spinal dysraphism, ultrasound, fetal, pediatric

# Introduction

Dysraphic malformations of the spine and spinal cord (DMSSC) represent a spectrum of congenital malformations presumed to have their origins in defects of early embryogenesis. The clinical consequences of these disorders affect the development of children worldwide and result in significant personal and socioeconomic cost.[1, 2] Despite being relatively common (estimated incidence 1-3/1000 live births), their etiology is largely unknown.[3, 4] The terms 'spinal dysraphism' or 'tethered cord' are often used as umbrella terms for these disparate malformations, however the term 'dysraphism' implies a known etiology (anomaly of midline fusion) and 'tethered cord' implies a known mechanism of clinical deterioration. Since both of these assertions are incorrect, we use the term DMSSC to encompass these disorders.[1]

Neuroimaging plays a vital role in the diagnosis, classification, and management of DMSSC. With competent image acquisition and interpretation, diagnostic accuracy can be potentially excellent providing correct anatomic delineation and aid in appropriate management. - Despite this, there is currently no consensus as to how children with suspected DMSSC should be radiologically evaluated. In the absence of this guidance, clear differences arise between centers in terms of diagnostic approach, classification schema, clinical management and, by virtue, prognosis in terms of neurologic and urologic outcomes.[1] This worrying clinical heterogeneity risks unstructured decision making, missed diagnoses, and potentially suboptimal management of the child.

These challenges highlight the need for an expert-driven multidisciplinary effort to better understand the radiological and clinical classification of these disorders. To this aim, we established an international multidisciplinary DMSSC group with the aims of disseminating knowledge to the broad medical community, improving the diagnosis and management of DMSSC, and accelerating research in the field.

In this manuscript, the first of a series of consensus statements, we outline a standardized international consensus statement for the radiological evaluation of children with suspected DMSSC derived from a critical review of the literature, and the collective clinical experience of a multinational group of experts.

# Methods

### Literature review

PubMed was systematically queried for papers reporting (i) radiological protocols for the investigation of congenital DMSSC and (ii) radiological findings in congenital DMSSC. The keywords used in the search were: "spinal dysraphism", "spine malformation", "spinal cord malformation", "spina bifida", "myelomeningocele", "lipomyelocele", "lipomyelomeningocele", "terminal myelocystocele", "non-terminal myelocystocele", "abortive myelocystocele", "split cord malformation", "neurenteric cyst", "diastematomyelia", "spinal lipoma", "dorsal lipoma", "transitional lipoma", "caudal lipoma", "filar lipoma", "tethered cord", "thickened filum terminale", "caudal regression syndrome", "dermal sinus tract", "limited dorsal myeloschisis". The most recent search was performed on 1st April 2022. Following this literature search, the final reference list was generated

on the basis of (1) relevance to the scope of our recommendations and (2) relative importance and originality within the field.

**The consensus process**

This article represents an international consensus statement based on five meetings of the International DMSSC Consensus Group: a panel of 17 recognized experts invited to participate in this modified Delphi consensus process on the basis of prior scholarship in the field and the need for global representation. Participating experts are pediatric neuroradiologists (n=9), pediatric neurosurgeons (n=3), paediatric urologists (n=2), and developmental neurobiologists (n=3). Delphi rounds were mediated by an independent, non-participating author.

Meetings were held on 26th June 2020, 24th July 2020, 25th September 2020, 17th November 2020, and 8th January 2021. Of these meetings, the first two contained specific focus discussions on the radiological evaluation of congenital DMSSC. Prior to each meeting, consensus statements were prepared by a core team (A.B., J.S., S.S., and K.M.) based on evidence from the literature and expert opinion. During meetings, the panel discussed consensus statements and agreed on new or modified recommendations for the radiological evaluation of congenital DMSSC. Consensus statements were subsequently revised in view of these discussions and the process iterated until consensus was achieved. Consensus was defined as ≥80% agreement (≥14/17 experts). Unless otherwise stated, all recommendations are reported at this level of consensus. The final manuscript was revised and endorsed by all panel members prior to submission.

In the first Delphi round, all authors voted on 24 recommendation statements. Agreement was reached for 9 statements, and the remaining 15 revised as per the reasons each author provided for disagreement. In the second round, all authors voted on 16 revised recommendation statements and consensus was achieved in all remaining areas.

# Consensus recommendations

This consensus statement should be applied to the radiological evaluation of all fetuses, children  and adults with suspected DMSSC.

**Plain film radiography**

Plain film radiography with anteroposterior and lateral views is often the first-line screening investigation to assess abnormalities of the vertebral column in children. Findings seen on plain radiographs may include – but are not limited to – spina bifida, widened spinal canal, lumbosacral soft tissue swelling, segmentation anomalies, and the bony spur of diastematomyelia. Plain film radiographs may also aid the evaluation of associated kyphotic and / or scoliotic deformities in patients with certain malformations, such as segmental spinal dysgenesis.[5] However, plain radiography exposes the child to ionizing radiation and images have poor soft tissue resolution, resulting in low diagnostic sensitivity. In addition, overlying gas and stool shadows can limit

the evaluation of spine. Therefore, in the current era, we recommend that plain radiography should only be used as (i) a preliminary screening investigation when other imaging modalities are not available, (ii) an adjunct (with the aid of a marker) to aid vertebral counting if there is uncertainty in determining the lumbosacral junction on ultrasonography, or (iii) where there is a need to evaluate/monitor associated spinal deformity.[6, 7]

**Ultrasound (US)**

US is the first line modality for the antenatal diagnosis of DMSSC. Despite this, it has a limited role in the postnatal evaluation of suspected DMSSC.[8] The partially ossified, predominantly cartilaginous, posterior vertebral elements in this age group provides a good acoustic window for detailed visualization of the spinal cord and caudal structures. Studies have confirmed good concordance between ultrasounds and MRI. Beyond 3-4 months of age, this acoustic window of opportunity is lost due to ossification of the neural arches of the vertebral column. After this time, MRI becomes the first line modality for older children.[2, 8] Though individual operator expertise is its main limitation, when performed by an experienced operator, US may be used exclusively for the evaluation of DMSSC in low-risk infants less than 3-4 months of age.[9] The advantages of US are its cost-effectiveness, wide accessibility, bedside acquisition, and rapid image acquisition time which negates the need for sedation. This said, US has lower resolution that MRI and so we recommend that MRI imaging is performed in all children in whom DMSSC is suspected on US. Cranial US performed in the same setting can also expedite the diagnosis of associated intracranial anomalies such as hydrocephalus and Chiari deformity.[10] US may be of further relevance to exclude other / associated non-neurological findings such as urogenital abnormalities.

*US Technique*

We recommend feeding the infant prior to the examination as a soothing technique. US should then be performed primarily in the prone position, with the child's head slightly elevated above the feet to permit better filling of the lower CSF spaces.[11, 12] The child's neck must be slightly flexed when evaluating the craniocervical junction and a rolled towel or blanket, placed under the child's abdomen or pelvis, may also help to accentuate the lumbar lordosis and widen the posterior interspinous spaces. Real-time scanning in the lateral decubitus position results in free movement and clustering of the cauda equina nerve roots towards the dependent side, thereby permitting the assessment of cord movement.[13] Positioning the child in a semi-erect fashion, with the head held by the sonographer, may enhance the detection of meningocele.[9] US should not be used to image open DMSSC over the lesion itself as this provides limited additional information and increases susceptibility to infection.[14] In open DMSSC, US should be used to image more rostral parts of the vertebral column for the assessment of associated anomalies such as hydrosyringomyelia and hydrocephalus.

High frequency linear-array (7-12 MHz) and curved-array (8-10 MHz) transducers should be used to evaluate the spine and spinal cord in the longitudinal and transverse planes with the study limited to the area of interest, usually lumbosacral and lower thoracic region with evaluation and characterisation of the filum terminale, cauda equina nerve roots and distal thecal sac, ossified parts of the bony vertebrae (including its posterior elements),

and any skin lesions or masses. Ultrasound aids in assessment of overlying soft tissues for the presence of hemangioma, lipoma, skin covered masses (meningocele) and tracts extending from the skin surface towards the spinal canal. A thick layer of coupling gel or a standoff pad may help in better assessment of superficial soft tissues. Color or power doppler sonography may also be used as an adjunct to better characterize soft-tissue masses found on the skin or within the spinal canal.[6, 7] The study may be extended to include the entire spinal canal from the craniovertebral junction to the coccyx. If available, a small footprint sector probe may be used for detailed evaluation of the craniocervical junction. Panoramic or extended fields of view can visualize the neonatal spine from T12 to the coccyx in a single image, potentially permitting full visualization of any abnormalities. Three-dimensional (3D) US is not essential but may be of use in complex cases for visualization in the additional coronal plane.[15]

The position of the conus medullaris should be assessed by identifying the lumbosacral junction and thus the location of L5 vertebra at the lordotic angle between the lumbar and sacral vertebrae and should be confirmed by counting the vertebral level down from rib 12 or counting cephalad from S5 (rounded or triangular shape of first coccygeal segment when ossified).[6, 7, 9, 12, 15] In neonates, wherein the acute angle may not be seen clearly, flexion and extension movements of the pelvis may help to identify the point of motion of the sacrum. Alternatively, comparison with a marked lateral plain radiograph may be used.

*Antenatal US*

Imaging plays a crucial role in the prenatal diagnosis and classification of DMSSC, as emphasized by recent advances in intrauterine repair.[16] US is invariably the first-line technique for the morphological study of the fetus.[17] Second trimester US, in particular, has a high sensitivity for the detection of DMSSC and is employed in routine screening programs across the world, making it possible to suspect and detect neural tube defects early in gestation.[18] Maternal serum alfa-fetoprotein screening can also help to identify high-risk children and define the need for more detailed fetal imaging (US or MRI) and / or invasive tests, namely amniocentesis.[19] As such, the radiological investigation of suspected DMSSC should always be interpreted in tandem with maternal serum alfa fetoprotein levels.[20]

To screen for suspected DMSSC, the fetal head and entire length of the fetal spine should be studied in the coronal, parasagittal, and transverse planes.[21] US is particularly sensitive in the evaluation of the skin, soft tissues, vertebral body ossification centers, brain for features of Chiari 2 deformity, in addition to any mass lesions, sacral anomalies, and sac(s) – if present. Antenatal US is more sensitive for the diagnosis of open DMSSC than for closed DMSSC.[18]

In cases of myelomeningocele the anatomical level of the lesion is important both for prognostication and, these days, as an eligibility criterion for possible fetal surgery. Studies have confirmed the comparable accuracy of fetal US and MRI in ascertaining level of myelomeningocele defect. [22] Additionally antenatal ultrasound also has the advantage of detecting associated anomalies including cardiac, renal and bowel anomalies which are important in determining eligibility for fetal surgery. Antennal US also aids in diagnosis of lower limb

abnormalities (like equinovarus feet, vertical talus) and assessment of lower limb movements of the fetus, adding a functional perspective to this imaging modality.

**Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)**

MRI is the modality of choice for the evaluation of suspected DMSSC due to its excellent spatial and contrast resolution with multiplanar and multicontrast capabilities in the absence of ionizing radiation.

*Sedation*

One of the main challenges in pediatric MRI acquisition is the varying abilities of children to tolerate the environment of the scanner and the requirements of imaging – namely the need to remain stationary. In neonates and young infants, imaging during spontaneous sleep following feed with the baby wrapped up in a blanket (feed-and-swaddle or feed-and-wrap) is a viable option and obviates the need for sedation in this age group.[23] Attempts to keep the baby awake, hungry, and due for feed before the scheduled examination helps to increase the likelihood of a spontaneous sleep following feeding. Similarly, the availability of dedicated quiet rooms for patient preparation and subsequent awakening greatly improves the chances of success for imaging small infants without sedation. Children aged 4 years and above may be sufficiently cooperative, especially with the support of a child life specialist including mock-MR training, although this may vary due to acute illness and the developmental stage of the child.[2, 24] Younger or severely ill children will typically require sedation, typically administered according to local guidelines. Cardiorespiratory monitoring with MRI compatible equipment is required in all sedated children. Further techniques to minimize sedation during MRI including fast sequences, motion correction, noise reduction and reducing scan time are beyond the scope of this manuscript and are discussed in detail in previously published literature. [25]

*Scanner magnetic field strength*

Both 1.5 Tesla (1.5T) and 3.0 Tesla (3.0T) scanners are suitable for imaging suspected DMSSC. As such, the choice of magnetic field strength depends on local availability and radiologist preference. 1.5T scanners remain the most widely available.[26] Advantages of 3.0T MRI include higher spatial and contrast resolution; the potential for reduced scan times without compromising imagine quality; and reduced motion artifacts with higher temporal resolution.[27] 3.0T scanners are, however, more costly, and artifacts caused by field inhomogeneity, susceptibility, vascular pulsation, and chemical shift are exaggerated. Spinal imaging remains particularly challenging at 3.0T despite technical advances such as thin section imaging, parallel imaging, and increasing the receiver bandwidth.[27]

*Standardized spinal MRI protocol*

In cases of myelomeningocele or syndromes associated with dysraphism (e.g., VATER, cloacal exstrophy) whole spine imaging is required. In isolate, closed dysraphic states there is limited clinical utility in imaging

beyond the lumbosacral region.[28] Optimized MRI protocolling is crucial to maximize diagnostic yield and reduce scanning time, thereby limiting the necessity or duration of sedation. We recommend a combination of simple and advanced sequences to image both the whole spine including dedicated, high-resolution imaging of the area of the suspected abnormality. Given the inherent challenges of MRI in children, essential sequences should be acquired first, with optional sequences acquired subsequently as required.

The standardized spinal MRI protocol for DMSSC evaluation is presented in Table 1. Following localizer or scout imaging, high-resolution T1- and T2- weighted turbo spin echo (TSE) images of the whole spine are acquired in the sagittal plane without fat suppression. Advances in MRI, the use of multichannel phased array coils, and the combination of multiple images into a single full field of view have enabled visualization of the entire spine, from the craniocervical junction to the coccyx, in a single image, thereby permitting panoramic appraisal and the counting of vertebral levels to identify the exact level of abnormality. In addition, one panoramic coronal sequence (T2-weighted turbo spin echo [T2-TSE]) with fat suppression (T2-TSE FS, Dixon, or short tau inversion recovery [STIR]) is acquired of the whole spine. T2 -SE FS is preferred due to its inherently high signal-to-noise ratio, good visualization of small anatomic detail, and shorter acquisition time.[29] Axial acquisition on T1-weighted imaging without fat suppression is then used to study specific regions as indicated by clinical findings or by findings on the previously acquired sagittal images (block acquisition and not at the level of intervertebral discs). The slice thickness for these sequences should be ≤3.0mm with sub-millimeter in plane resolution and intersection gaps of 0.30-0.50mm.[2, 30] A volumetric acquisition of high-resolution heavily T2-weighted images in the sagittal plane with retrospective multiplanar reconstructions should also be performed – either driven equilibrium (DRIVE), constructive interference in steady state (CISS), or fast imaging employing steady-state acquisition (FIESTA). These provide exquisite delineation of the cord / root / CSF interfaces and are particularly useful for evaluating subtle structural abnormalities, such as those found in DMSSC.

Routine diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) is not required in children with DMSSC but it should be performed for the identification and assessment of dysontogenetic mass lesions. The high lesion conspicuity of post-operative inclusion epidermoids/dermoids after repair of a spinal dysraphism on diffusion weighted imaging may be advantageous. Similarly, gradient echo (GRE) or echo-planar gradient imaging (EPI-GRE) are useful for the evaluation of the bony septum in children with diastematomyelia.

The intravenous injection of gadolinium-based contrast agents is not routinely indicated and should only be used to evaluate suspected infections and mass lesions inadequately characterized on non-contrast MRI. MR angiography may also be used for preoperative identification of the artery of Adamkiewicz (great anterior radiculomedullary artery).

Additional screening of the cranial vault should be considered to exclude associated cerebral and/or cerebellar abnormalities. Other optional sequences may be added to protocol depending on clinical indication, findings on initial imaging, and national guidance.

With the advances in imaging, it is now possible to decrease examination times while maintaining diagnostic performance which is of paramount importance in radiologic evaluation of DMSSC. These advances include faster sequences, powerful computers for faster image reconstruction, three-dimensional sequences, acceleration techniques such as parallel imaging, simultaneous multislice imaging, compressed sensing, and deep learning reconstructions. Parallel imaging is the most used technique, available in most modern scanners without the need for specialized software or hardware. In simultaneous multislice imaging, excitation of more than one slice is done at a time and uses the same coil technology and reconstruction methods as parallel imaging. Both these techniques allow acceleration to a factor up to two times without degrading the image quality and when used in combination, can provide an acceleration factor of four with similar signal-to-noise ratio and contrast-to-noise ratio. Further, deep learning models can reconstruct the undersampled data to simulate the fully sampled reconstructions. [31]

*Follow-Up MRI*

At follow-up, imaging can be limited to the area of interest with screening T2-weighted images of whole spine without fat suppression.[2]

**Fetal MRI**

Fetal MRI is the preferred technique for imaging of the fetus.[32, 33] Though not indicated in all children due to availability and technical limitations, it is a powerful adjunct to prenatal US, providing additional information crucial for prenatal counseling, assessing eligibility for prenatal surgery, predicting neurological outcomes, and guiding perinatal management.[34]

DMSSC become more evident on fetal MRI in the second trimester. This fortunately coincides with the optimal age for MRI. We recommend waiting until 17-18 gestational weeks (15-16 weeks post-fertilization) before performing fetal MRI due to the potential risks posed to the developing fetus and the current technical limitations of fetal MRI in younger fetuses due to their smaller size and even greater motion. Pregnant females should only undergo MRI earlier in their pregnancy if the risk-benefit ratio to the child is favorable and if other non-ionizing imaging modalities are inadequate. In all instances, it is important to counsel parents on the likelihood of diagnosing a DMSSC in their child and of the potential effects this may have on their child's development.

Fetal MRI aims to identify pertinent anatomic features of DMSSC such as the level of the spinal defect by (i) establishing the most caudal hyperintense spinal disc space as L5–S1 and the lowest horizontal vertebral body as L5 and by (ii) counting the vertebral bodies superior to the highest level of the absence of the posterior elements at the bone / skin defect. Fetal MRI can also define and characterize the presence or absence of a spinal cord syrinx; diastematomyelia; and sac; and the continuity of cutaneous soft tissues with the neural tube sac.[35, 36] Associated anomalies of the fetal extremities and intracranial anomalies may also be detected on fetal MRI,

including the severity of the Chiari II deformity according to the degree of posterior fossa hindbrain herniation, lateral ventricular size, and third ventricular size.[36]

*Standardized fetal MRI protocol*

Prior to undergoing fetal MRI, child-bearing females must empty the urinary bladder. A phased-array body surface coil is then wrapped around the mother's pelvis and centered over the fetal region of interest. Maternal comfort is the priority; both supine and left lateral decubitus positions are acceptable and should be adopted as per maternal preference.

Prenatal imaging of the fetus is a dynamic process that starts with an initial scout or localizer followed by a series of sequences with each sequence acting as a localizer for the next. Images are acquired in all three anatomic planes with respect to the fetus. The main challenge of fetal MRI is fetal motion artifact. If persistent and severe, it may be necessary to prioritize image acquisition on planes that best visualize the anatomy in maximize the yield of the study. Due to this, constant monitoring by the radiologist is essential.

The standardized fetal MRI protocol for DMSSC evaluation is presented in Table 2. Fetal MRI should be performed at 1.5T or 3.0T depending on local availability and radiologist preference. 3.0T is superior to 1.5T for the visualization of cartilage and spine due to the use of single-shot turbo spin-echo (SSTSE) and steady-state free precession (SSFP) sequences. The fetal head and entire length of the fetal spine should be studied on all three planes (axial, sagittal, and coronal) using T2-single-shot fast spin echo (T2-SSFSE) or HASTE and balanced fast field echo (bFFE) or FIESTA at 3-4mm slice thickness with no intersection gaps and the smallest field of view (FOV) possible.[37] A minimum of two stacks of images in each plane should be obtained (which may be omitted in case of excessive fetal motion). Gradient echo sequences – i.e., echoplanar imaging (EPI) and true fast imaging with steady state precession (FISP) – have greater ferromagnetic susceptibility and provide greater resolution of bony and vascular structures, especially in fetuses aged less than 27 gestational weeks.

Optional sagittal and coronal T1-weighted spoiled gradient-echo acquisition of the fetus with slice thickness 5mm and with no intersection gaps may also be performed and should have the smallest possible FOV.[35] Prenatal imaging (including T1 weighted images) do not adequately demonstrate fat within the defect of closed dysraphism. This is attributable to several factors including low spatial resolution of T1-weighted images in fetus, underdevelopment of fetal fat in early gestation age and relatively increased proportion of brown fat in the fetus and neonate which has slightly different signal characteristics than white fat on MRI. Furthermore, optional cine imaging may convey an idea of the motility of fetal extremities, offering an insight into the child's postnatal prognosis.

**Computed Tomography (CT)**

CT is of limited value for the evaluation of DMSSC due to its poor soft tissue resolution and correspondingly poor sensitivity, exposure of the child to ionizing radiation, and invasiveness in the case of CT-myelography.[2, 38] This said, we support the use of CT for several specific indications:

1. Vertebral anomalies where there is a need to define bony anatomy, e.g., as part of pre op planning prior to instrumented fixation
2. Identification of the bony septum in diastematomyelia.
3. Preoperative identification of the artery of Adamkiewicz (great anterior radiculomedullary artery) via CT angiography when MR angiography either fails to identify the vessel or is not feasible.[39]
4. Patients with absolute contraindications to MRI.

*Standardized CT protocol*

We recommend that children undergo a low-dose non-contrast CT of the spinal area of interest (slice thickness ≤2mm), acquired continuously in the axial plane with no intersection gaps. Multiplanar 3D-reconstructions in bone and soft kernel should also be performed as they have been shown to increase the sensitivity and specificity of the study.[40] As CT is reserved for the elucidation of specific features, it should, therefore, always be performed with the minimum possible field of view and not extended beyond the region of the abnormality in order to minimize radiation exposure, as per the as low as reasonable achievable (ALARA) principle.[2, 41]

CT has limited soft tissue contrast and thus evaluation of the thecal sac and its contents is limited. Intrathecal injection of iodinated contrast media in CT myelography may facilitate visualization of the thecal sac and its contents. However, the use of CT myelography is not recommended when MRI is available as it is invasive, less sensitive, and exposes the child to ionizing radiation.[2, 38]

## Imaging guideline adaptations and further considerations

The challenges of imaging children vary across institutions and countries depending on (i) clinical management and (ii) the availability of resources given the expense of additional imaging and the cost and risk of sedation if required. Therefore, the principal adaptation to this consensus statement is for clinical settings without routine access to MRI, in which we recommend that children are referred to institutions with MRI, however, we do agree that it may not be possible in certain resource poor care environments. CT should not be performed in lieu of MRI given its markedly reduced diagnostic accuracy. US is the first line modality for the antenatal diagnosis of DMSSC and has a significant but limited role in the evaluation of neonates and infants with suspected DMSSC. US is the first method of screening for infants up to 3-4 months of age before ossification of the vertebral bodies. MRI is the modality of choice for the evaluation of suspected DMSSC due to its excellent spatial and contrast resolution.

We recommend imaging patients with combined cutaneous stigmata (combination of 2 or more midline cutaneous lesions) or an atypical skin dimple with MRI, however, US may be used in some cases. Atypical dimples are larger than 5mm and located within 25 mm of the anus. Other criteria include deep dimples, dimples located cranially to the gluteal crease or outside the midline, and multiple dimples. On the other hand, a simple sacral dimple is smaller in size (<5mm in diameter) with a midline placement within 25mm of the gluteal crease from the anus and no other cutaneous abnormalities (such as asymmetry of the gluteal crease, capillary hemangioma, hypertrichosis, dermal sinus tract, lipoma, subcutaneous dermoid cyst, pseudotail, or true tail).[42, 43]38,39 In patients with combination of less than two cutaneous stigmata, atypical dimple, and deviation of gluteal cleft, we recommend to perform an US during the first month of life, and if anomalies are detected, MRI should be performed. In patients with sacral dimple alone, pigmentary nevus, and little hemangioma, we recommend regular clinical follow-up and to perform a MRI only in presence of neurological or orthopedic alterations.[42]

## Conclusion

Neuroimaging is central to the multidisciplinary evaluation of children with suspected DMSSC. It is our hope that this international consensus statement will provoke the standardization of image acquisition and evaluation, thereby increasing the diagnostic yield of studies, and improving care for children worldwide.

# References

1.	Balani A, Chatur C, Biswas A, Oztekin O, Mankad K. Spinal dysraphisms: highlighting discrepancies in the current literature and emphasizing on the need for a consensus. Quantitative Imaging in Medicine and Surgery. 2020;10(3):549-53.

2.	Rossi A, Biancheri R, Cama A, Piatelli G, Ravegnani M, Tortori-Donati P. Imaging in spine and spinal cord malformations. Eur J Radiol. 2004;50(2):177-200.

3.	Copp AJ, Stanier P, Greene ND. Neural tube defects: recent advances, unsolved questions, and controversies. Lancet Neurol. 2013;12(8):799-810.

4.	Venkataramana NK. Spinal dysraphism. Journal of pediatric neurosciences. 2011;6(Suppl 1):S31-40.

5.	Tortori-Donati P, Fondelli MP, Rossi A, Raybaud CA, Cama A, Capra V. Segmental spinal dysgenesis: neuroradiologic findings with clinical and embryologic correlation. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol. 1999;20(3):445-56.

6.	Lowe LH, Johanek AJ, Moore CW. Sonography of the neonatal spine: part 1, Normal anatomy, imaging pitfalls, and variations that may simulate disorders. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2007;188(3):733-8.

7.	Lowe LH, Johanek AJ, Moore CW. Sonography of the neonatal spine: part 2, Spinal disorders. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2007;188(3):739-44.

8.	Orman G, Tijssen MPM, Seyfert D, Gassner I, Huisman T. Ultrasound to Evaluate Neonatal Spinal Dysraphism: A First-Line Alternative to CT and MRI. J Neuroimaging. 2019;29(5):553-64.

9.	Meyers AB, Chandra T, Epelman M. Sonographic spinal imaging of normal anatomy, pathology and magnetic growing rods in children. Pediatr Radiol. 2017;47(9):1046-57.

10.	Richer EJ, Riedesel EL, Linam LE. Review of Neonatal and Infant Cranial US. Radiographics. 2021;41(7):E206-E7.

11.	Tawfik NA, Ahmed AT, El-Shafei TE, Habba MR. Diagnostic value of spinal ultrasound compared to MRI for diagnosis of spinal anomalies in pediatrics. Egyptian Journal of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine. 2020;51(1):18.

12.	Ladino Torres MF, DiPietro MA. Spine ultrasound imaging in the newborn. Semin Ultrasound CT MR. 2014;35(6):652-61.

13.	Unsinn KM, Geley T, Freund MC, Gassner I. US of the spinal cord in newborns: spectrum of normal findings, variants, congenital anomalies, and acquired diseases. Radiographics. 2000;20(4):923-38.

14.	Trapp B, de Andrade Lourencao Freddi T, de Oliveira Morais Hans M, Fonseca Teixeira Lemos Calixto I, Fujino E, Alves Rojas LC, et al. A Practical Approach to Diagnosis of Spinal Dysraphism. Radiographics. 2021;41(2):559-75.

15.	Patterson S. Sonographic Assessment of the Neonatal Spine and the Potential for New Technologies to Aid in Diagnoses. Journal of Diagnostic Medical Sonography. 2009;25(1):4-22.

16.	Sacco A, Ushakov F, Thompson D, Peebles D, Pandya P, De Coppi P, et al. Fetal surgery for open spina bifida. Obstet Gynaecol. 2019;21(4):271-82.

17.	Nicolaides KH, Campbell S, Gabbe SG, Guidetti R. Ultrasound screening for spina bifida: cranial and cerebellar signs. Lancet. 1986;2(8498):72-4.

18.     Ben-Sira L, Garel C, Malinger G, Constantini S. Prenatal diagnosis of spinal dysraphism. Childs Nerv Syst. 2013;29(9):1541-52.

19.     Leighton PC, Kitau MJ, Chard T, Gordon YB, Leek AE. Levels of alpha-fetoprotein in maternal blood as a screening test for fetal neural-tube defect. Lancet. 1975;2(7943):1012-5.

20.     Ghi T, Pilu G, Falco P, Segata M, Carletti A, Cocchi G, et al. Prenatal diagnosis of open and closed spina bifida. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2006;28(7):899-903.

21.     Budorick NE, Pretorius DH, Nelson TR. Sonography of the fetal spine: technique, imaging findings, and clinical implications. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 1995;164(2):421-8.

22.     Sherrod BA, Ho WS, Hedlund A, Kennedy A, Ostrander B, Bollo RJ. A comparison of the accuracy of fetal MRI and prenatal ultrasonography at predicting lesion level and perinatal motor outcome in patients with myelomeningocele. Neurosurg Focus. 2019;47(4):E4.

23.     Antonov NK, Ruzal-Shapiro CB, Morel KD, Millar WS, Kashyap S, Lauren CT, Garzon MC. Feed and Wrap MRI Technique in Infants. Clin Pediatr (Phila). 2017;56(12):1095-103.

24.     Bharti B, Malhi P, Khandelwal N. MRI Customized Play Therapy in Children Reduces the Need for Sedation--A Randomized Controlled Trial. Indian J Pediatr. 2016;83(3):209-13.

25.     Barkovich MJ, Xu D, Desikan RS, Williams C, Barkovich AJ. Pediatric neuro MRI: tricks to minimize sedation. Pediatr Radiol. 2018;48(1):50-5.

26.     Tanenbaum LN. Clinical 3T MR imaging: mastering the challenges. Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am. 2006;14(1):1-15.

27.     Phalke VV, Gujar S, Quint DJ. Comparison of 3.0 T versus 1.5 T MR: imaging of the spine. Neuroimaging Clin N Am. 2006;16(2):241-8, ix.

28.     Layard Horsfall H, Chari A, Huttunen T, Simcock C, D'Arco F, Thompson D. Whole spine MRI is not required in investigating uncomplicated paediatric lumbosacral lipoma. A retrospective single-institution review. Childs Nerv Syst. 2019;35(11):2163-9.

29.     Delfaut EM, Beltran J, Johnson G, Rousseau J, Marchandise X, Cotten A. Fat suppression in MR imaging: techniques and pitfalls. Radiographics. 1999;19(2):373-82.

30.     O'Neill BR, Gallegos D, Herron A, Palmer C, Stence NV, Hankinson TC, et al. Use of magnetic resonance imaging to detect occult spinal dysraphism in infants. J Neurosurg Pediatr. 2017;19(2):217-26.

31.     Subhas N. Establishing a New Normal: The 5-Minute MRI. Radiology. 2021;299(3):647-8.

32.     Griffiths PD, Widjaja E, Paley MN, Whitby EH. Imaging the fetal spine using in utero MR: diagnostic accuracy and impact on management. Pediatr Radiol. 2006;36(9):927-33.

33.     Hayashibe H, Asayama K, Dobashi K, Kato K. Prenatal development of antioxidant enzymes in rat lung, kidney, and heart: marked increase in immunoreactive superoxide dismutases, glutathione peroxidase, and catalase in the kidney. Pediatr Res. 1990;27(5):472-5.

34.     Shekdar K, Feygin T. Fetal neuroimaging. Neuroimaging Clin N Am. 2011;21(3):677-703, ix.

35.     Nagaraj UD, Bierbrauer KS, Peiro JL, Kline-Fath BM. Differentiating Closed Versus Open Spinal Dysraphisms on Fetal MRI. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2016;207(6):1316-23.

36.     Nagaraj UD, Bierbrauer KS, Stevenson CB, Peiro JL, Lim FY, Zhang B, Kline-Fath BM. Spinal Imaging Findings of Open Spinal Dysraphisms on Fetal and Postnatal MRI. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol. 2018;39(10):1947-52.

37.      Nagaraj UD, Bierbrauer KS, Stevenson CB, Peiro JL, Lim FY, Habli MA, Kline-Fath BM. Prenatal and postnatal MRI findings in open spinal dysraphism following intrauterine repair via open versus fetoscopic surgical techniques. Prenat Diagn. 2020;40(1):49-57.

38.      Jaspan T, Worthington BS, Holland IM. A comparative study of magnetic resonance imaging and computed tomography-assisted myelography in spinal dysraphism. Br J Radiol. 1988;61(726):445-53.

39.      Yoshioka K, Niinuma H, Ehara S, Nakajima T, Nakamura M, Kawazoe K. MR angiography and CT angiography of the artery of Adamkiewicz: state of the art. Radiographics. 2006;26 Suppl 1:S63-73.

40.      Ruiz Santiago F, Lainez Ramos-Bossini AJ, Wang YXJ, Martinez Barbero JP, Garcia Espinosa J, Martinez Martinez A. The value of magnetic resonance imaging and computed tomography in the study of spinal disorders. Quant Imaging Med Surg. 2022;12(7):3947-86.

41.      Uffmann M, Schaefer-Prokop C. Digital radiography: the balance between image quality and required radiation dose. Eur J Radiol. 2009;72(2):202-8.

42.      Ausili E, Maresca G, Massimi L, Morgante L, Romagnoli C, Rendeli C. Occult spinal dysraphisms in newborns with skin markers: role of ultrasonography and magnetic resonance imaging. Childs Nerv Syst. 2018;34(2):285-91.

43.      Choi SJ, Yoon HM, Hwang JS, Suh CH, Jung AY, Cho YA, Lee JS. Incidence of Occult Spinal Dysraphism Among Infants With Cutaneous Stigmata and Proportion Managed With Neurosurgery: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Netw Open. 2020;3(7):e207221.

| Sequence | Plane | Imaging parameters | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Essential sequences** | | | |
| 3 plane scout / localizer | Axial, sagittal, coronal | | For subsequent planning |
| T1-weighted TSE whole spine | Sagittal | 3.0mm thickness (TR – 600ms, TE – 30ms) | - |
| T2-weighted TSE whole spine | Sagittal | 3.0mm thickness (TR – 3000ms, TE – 120ms) | - |
| T2-weighted FS, Dixon, or STIR | Coronal | 3.0mm thickness (TR – 3000ms, TE – 40ms) | FS preferred over STIR whole spine |
| T1-weighted TSE | Axial | ≤3.0mm thickness | Lumbosacral region (conus and filum terminale) and the suspected area of abnormality (group of axial images through the disc level are not applied) |
| T2-weighted DRIVE, CISS, or FIESTA | Sagittal | 0.6mm thickness | Sagittal acquisition centered on the area of suspected abnormality with 3D reconstructions |
| **Optional sequences** | | | |
| T2-weighted TSE | Axial | 3.0mm thickness, non-fat suppressed | Suspected area of abnormality (group of axial images through the disc level are not applied) |
| T1-weighted TSE | Coronal | 3.0mm thickness | Centered onto and along the major axis of the sacrum (for suspected sacral abnormalities) |
| T1-weighted FS | Sagittal | 3.0mm thickness | Confirmation of lipoma |
| T1-weighted FS C+ | Axial, sagittal, coronal | 3.0mm thickness | Suspected infections/tumors |
| DWI | Axial or sagittal | 3.0-4.0mm thickness | Suspected dysontogenic abnormalities, epidermoids, dermoids, |

| | | | abscesses |
|---|---|---|---|
| T2-weighted GRE or EPI-GRE | Axial | 3.0mm thickness | Evaluation of bony septum in diastematomyelia |
| T1-weighted TSE C+ | Axial, sagittal, coronal | 3.0mm thickness | Suspected mass lesions, dysontogenic abnormalities, or infections |

**Table 1 |** Recommended MRI sequences and parameters for the assessment of children with suspected DMSSC. Abbreviations: TSE – turbo spin echo; FS – fat-saturated; STIR – short tau inversion recovery; DRIVE – driven equilibrium; C+ – post-contrast; DWI – diffusion-weighted imaging; GRE – gradient echo; EPI-GRE – echo-planar gradient imaging.

| Sequence | Plane | Imaging parameters | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Essential sequences** | | | |
| 3 plane scout / localizer | Axial, sagittal, coronal | - | For subsequent planning |
| T2-weighted TSE maternal pelvis | Sagittal | - | To assess the position of the fetus. Reposition the coil if the fetal region of interest is not in the center of the coil |
| T2-weighted SSFSE or HASTE | Axial, sagittal, coronal* | 3-4mm thickness, no intersection gaps (TR-2000-3000ms, TE-150ms), FOV – 340mm, flip angle 160 degree | Provides excellent anatomic detail |
| T2-weighted EPI-GRE or trueFISP | Axial, sagittal, coronal* | 4mm thickness, no intersection gap (TR – 4.22ms, TE – 1.75ms), FOV – 380 mm, flip angle 65 degree | Evaluation of bony and vascular structures |
| **Optional sequences** | | | |
| T1-weighted SPGR | Sagittal, coronal | 5mm thickness, no intersection gaps (TR-600ms, TE-30ms), FOV – 340mm | Improves spatial resolution with increasing gestational age |
| Cine imaging | Volumetric acquisition | - | Assesses fetal extremity mobility |

**Table 2 |** Recommended MRI sequences and parameters for the assessment of fetuses with suspected DMSSC. Abbreviations: TSE – turbo spin echo; HASTE – half-fourier single-shot turbo spin echo; trueFISP – true fast imaging with steady state precession; SPGR – spoiled gradient recalled echo. *Acquisition of all three planes in T2-weighted SSFSE (HASTE) and T2-weighted trueFISP may not be feasible if the fetus is moving excessively and, in such scenario, the protocol can be curtailed with T2-weighted SSFSE in axial and coronal planes (providing anatomical detail) and T2-weighted trueFISP in sagittal plane (providing assessment of osseous structures).