

# ACR Appropriateness Criteria<sup>®</sup> Acute Trauma to the Ankle

Expert Panel on Musculoskeletal Imaging: Stacy E. Smith, MD<sup>a</sup>, Eric Y. Chang, MD<sup>b</sup>, Alice S. Ha, MD, MS<sup>c</sup>, Roger J. Bartolotta, MD<sup>d</sup>, Matthew Bucknor, MD<sup>e</sup>, Tushar Chandra, MD, MBBS<sup>f</sup>, Karen C. Chen, MD<sup>g</sup>, Tetyana Gorbachova, MD<sup>h</sup>, Bharti Khurana, MD<sup>i</sup>, Alan K. Klitzke, MD<sup>j</sup>, Kenneth S. Lee, MD, MBA<sup>k</sup>, Pekka A. Mooar, MD<sup>l</sup>, Andrew B. Ross, MD, MPH<sup>m</sup>, Richard D. Shih, MD<sup>n</sup>, Adam D. Singer, MD<sup>o</sup>, Mihra S. Taljanovic, MD, PhD<sup>p</sup>, Jonelle M. Thomas, MD, MPH<sup>q</sup>, Katherine M. Tynus, MD<sup>r</sup>, Mark J. Kransdorf, MD<sup>s</sup>

## Abstract

Acute injuries to the ankle are frequently encountered in the setting of the emergency room, sport, and general practice. This ACR Appropriateness Criteria defines best practices for imaging evaluation for several variants of patients presenting with acute ankle trauma. The variants include scenarios when Ottawa Rules can be evaluated, when there are exclusionary criteria, when Ottawa Rules cannot be evaluated, as well as specific injuries. Clinical scenarios are followed by the imaging choices and their appropriateness with an accompanying narrative explanation to help physicians to order the most appropriate imaging test.

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 include an extensive analysis of current medical literature from peer reviewed journals and the application of well-established methodologies (RAND/UCLA Appropriateness Method and Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation or GRADE) to rate the appropriateness of imaging and treatment procedures for specific clinical scenarios. In those instances where evidence is lacking or equivocal, expert opinion may supplement the available evidence to recommend imaging or treatment.

**Key Words:** Acute trauma, Ankle trauma, Appropriateness Criteria, Appropriate Use Criteria, AUC, Ligamentous injury, Osteochondral lesion, Ottawa Rules, Syndesmotic injury

J Am Coll Radiol 2020;17:S355-S366. Copyright © 2020 American College of Radiology

<sup>a</sup>Brigham & Women's Hospital & Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts.

<sup>b</sup>Panel Chair, VA San Diego Healthcare System, San Diego, California.

<sup>c</sup>Panel Vice-Chair, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>d</sup>Weill Cornell Medical College, New York, New York.

<sup>e</sup>University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, California.

<sup>f</sup>Nemours Children's Hospital, Orlando, Florida.

<sup>g</sup>VA San Diego Healthcare System, San Diego, California.

<sup>h</sup>Einstein Medical Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

<sup>i</sup>Brigham & Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts.

<sup>j</sup>Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center, Buffalo, New York.

<sup>k</sup>University of Wisconsin Hospital & Clinics, Madison, Wisconsin.

<sup>l</sup>Temple University Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons.

<sup>m</sup>University of Wisconsin School of Medicine & Public Health, Madison, Wisconsin.

<sup>n</sup>Schmidt College of Medicine, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida, American College of Emergency Physicians.

<sup>o</sup>Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, Georgia.

<sup>p</sup>University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.

<sup>q</sup>Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, Pennsylvania.

<sup>r</sup>Northwestern Memorial Hospital, Chicago, Illinois; American College of Physicians.

<sup>s</sup>Specialty Chair, Mayo Clinic, Phoenix, Arizona.

Corresponding author: Stacy E. Smith, MD, Chief and Distinguished Barbara N. Weissman Chair, Division of Musculoskeletal Imaging and Intervention, Department of Radiology, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, 75 Francis Street, Boston, MA 02115; e-mail: [ssmith@bwh.harvard.edu](mailto:ssmith@bwh.harvard.edu).

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](mailto:publications@acr.org).

The authors state that they have no conflict of interest related to the material discussed in this article.

**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.

**Variant 1.** Adult or child 5 years of age or older. Acute trauma to the ankle or acute trauma to the ankle with persistent pain for more than 1 week but less than 3 weeks. No exclusionary criteria present. Initial imaging. Patient meets the requirements for evaluation by the Ottawa Ankle Rules, which are positive:

1. Inability to bear weight immediately after the injury, OR
2. Point tenderness over the medial malleolus, the posterior edge or inferior tip of the lateral malleolus, talus, or calcaneus, OR
3. Inability to ambulate for 4 steps in the emergency department.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
Radiography ankle	Usually Appropriate	⦿
US ankle	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI ankle without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI ankle without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
CT ankle with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿
CT ankle without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿
CT ankle without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿
Bone scan ankle	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿

**Variant 2.** Adult or child 5 years of age or older. Acute trauma to the ankle. No exclusionary criteria present (eg, neurologically intact [including no peripheral neuropathy]). Patient meets the requirements for evaluation by the Ottawa Ankle Rules, which are negative: No point tenderness over the malleoli, talus, or calcaneus on physical examination. Able to walk. Initial imaging.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
US ankle	Usually Not Appropriate	○
Radiography ankle	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿
MRI ankle without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI ankle without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
CT ankle with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿
CT ankle without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿
CT ankle without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿
Bone scan ankle	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿⦿⦿

**Variante 3.** Adult or child 5 years of age or older. Acute trauma to the ankle. Exclusionary criteria are present (eg, neurologic disorder, neuropathy, or other). Patient does not meet requirements for evaluation by the Ottawa Ankle Rules. Initial imaging.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
Radiography ankle	Usually Appropriate	☼
CT ankle without IV contrast	May Be Appropriate	☼
US ankle	Usually Not Appropriate	○
Radiography ankle stress views	Usually Not Appropriate	☼
MRI ankle without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI ankle without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
CT ankle with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☼
CT ankle without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☼
Bone scan ankle	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼

**Variante 4.** Adult or child 5 years of age or older. Acute trauma to the ankle with persistent pain for more than 1 week but less than 3 weeks. No exclusionary criteria present. Initial radiographs negative. Next study.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
MRI ankle without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
CT ankle without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	☼
Radiography ankle	May Be Appropriate	☼
Radiography ankle stress views	May Be Appropriate	☼
US ankle	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI ankle without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
CT ankle with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☼
CT ankle without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☼
Bone scan ankle	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼

**Variante 5.** Adult or child 5 years of age or older. Acute trauma to the ankle. No exclusionary criteria present. Radiographs demonstrate fracture or potential osteochondral injury. Next study.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
MRI ankle without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	○
CT ankle without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	☼
Radiography ankle Broden's view	May Be Appropriate	☼
US ankle	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI ankle without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
CT ankle with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☼
CT ankle without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☼
Bone scan ankle	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼

**Variant 6.** Adult or child 5 years of age or older. Acute trauma to the ankle. Radiographs negative for osseous injury and physical examination or radiographs demonstrate alignment abnormality suggesting syndesmotic/ligamentous injury or dislocation. Next study.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
Radiography ankle stress views	Usually Appropriate	☼
Radiography leg	Usually Appropriate	☼
MRI ankle without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	O
CT ankle without IV contrast	Usually Appropriate	☼
US ankle	Usually Not Appropriate	O
MRI ankle without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O
CT ankle with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☼
CT ankle without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	☼
Bone scan ankle	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.

## SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW

### Introduction/Background

Ankle injuries are the most common injury presenting to primary care and emergency rooms [1,2], accounting for 4.4% of United States emergency room visits [3]. Acute ankle sprains (pain, swelling, limited mobility) make up the majority of these injuries, with an estimated incidence of 2 million per year [4]. Diagnosis of presence and degree of sprain, fracture, subluxation, dislocation, cartilage abnormalities, foreign bodies, or neurovascular involvement are critical in determining appropriate and timely orthopedic fixation/treatment planning [1,5] and to avoid chronic pain and immobility. Appropriate use of ankle imaging guidelines and clinical decision support mechanisms is paramount [6,7].

The current standard clinical imaging guidelines to determine if radiographs are necessary are the Ottawa Ankle Rules (OAR), instituted in 1992. The OAR have been

**Table 2.** Relative radiation level designations

RRL	Adult Effective Dose Estimate Range (mSv)	Pediatric Effective Dose Estimate Range (mSv)
O	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."

validated for adults and children >5 years of age [8] and recommend ankle radiographs in patients with the following clinical criteria in the acute setting: 1) inability to bear weight; 2) point tenderness over the medial malleolus, the posterior edge or inferior tip of the lateral malleolus, talus, or calcaneus; or 3) inability to ambulate for 4 steps. For the purposes of this document, the OAR will still apply during the first 1- to 3-week interval following initial injury. Multiple validation studies have confirmed OAR effectiveness and utility in obtaining appropriate imaging, reducing unnecessary radiographs and costs, and improving clinical outcomes [8-13].

Two recent meta-analyses concluded that the OAR are the most accurate in excluding fractures in the acute ankle setting with sensitivity of 92% to 100% and specificity of 16% to 51%, respectively [13,14]. Including an added criterion of swelling has been shown to increase the sensitivity and specificity for fracture to 100% and 55% for the malleolar region. Recent implementation of nurse triage programs using the radiographic OAR protocol have shown a reduction in emergency room patient stay by up to 20 minutes [3,15-17]. In an effort to decrease the use of radiographs, other rules, including the Bernese Ankle Rules, have been evaluated but have shown lower sensitivity to the OAR [18,19]. Evidence-based clinical treatment guidelines and systematic review of economic analyses support the role of radiography in evaluation of select patients suspected of having an ankle fracture with a limited role of cross-sectional imaging primarily as a tool for preoperative planning and as a problem-solving technique in patients with persistent symptoms and suspected of occult fracture [5,6,20-23].

Application of the OAR for evaluation of acute trauma to the foot is reported in the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® topic on “Acute Trauma to the Foot” [24].

## Exclusionary Criteria

OAR should not be used in children <5 years of age or in those patients with a neurologic abnormality affecting the lower leg with decreased sensation (eg, diabetic), altered sensorium, or inability to communicate [8,25,26]. Other possible cautionary or exclusionary scenarios include pregnancy, penetrating trauma, or presence of prior recent outside radiographs on transfer.

## Special Imaging Considerations

Avoidance of manipulation of the ankle prior to radiographs in the absence of neurovascular deficit or critical skin injury is recommended in order to avoid remanipulation or complication in this setting [27]. Advances in MRI technology have facilitated

short dedicated extremity MRI protocols in some centers that may be used as an emergent adjunct to radiographs [28].

## Initial Imaging Definition

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

## DISCUSSION OF PROCEDURES BY VARIANT

**Variant 1: Adult or child 5 years of age or older. Acute trauma to the ankle or acute trauma to the ankle with persistent pain for more than 1 week but less than 3 weeks. No exclusionary criteria present. Initial imaging. Patient meets the requirements for evaluation by the Ottawa Ankle Rules, which are positive:**

1. Inability to bear weight immediately after the injury, OR
2. Point tenderness over the medial malleolus, the posterior edge or inferior tip of the lateral malleolus, talus, or calcaneus, OR
3. Inability to ambulate for 4 steps in the emergency department.

**Bone Scan Ankle.** Bone scan is not routinely used as the first imaging study for the evaluation of acute trauma to the ankle with positive OAR.

**CT Ankle.** Although CT may be used in polytrauma patients to determine the extent of injury in complex fractures, CT is not routinely used as the first imaging study of acute trauma to the ankle with positive OAR when exclusionary criteria do not apply.

**MRI Ankle.** Although MRI may be used for occult injuries or suspicion for ligamentous tears in inversion injuries [29], it is not the first imaging study for the evaluation of acute trauma to the ankle with positive OAR.

**Radiography Ankle.** Radiographs are indicated in patients who meet OAR criteria as the initial imaging study. Studies demonstrate between 92% and 99% sensitivity for detecting ankle fracture using these guidelines, with <2% of those who are negative for fracture using the OAR actually having

a fracture [13-15,30]. The OAR are validated in children >5 years of age and should not be used in patients meeting the exclusionary criteria listed above [8]. Typical radiographic protocols should include three standard views: anteroposterior, lateral, and mortise views to include the base of the fifth metatarsal bone distal to the tuberosity [31]. Although foot and ankle radiographs have been performed together in clinical settings in the past, in a retrospective study of 243 patients with both radiographs performed, no foot fractures other than the base of the fifth metatarsal were noted. In the presence of inversion injury or fracture of the ankle, foot or knee radiographs should not be performed owing to low yield [32,33].

Weight-bearing radiographs, if possible, provide important information, particularly with fractures of uncertain stability, because the most important criterion in treatment of malleolar fractures is stability. A medial clear space of <4 mm should confirm stability. Increased incidence of fracture and instability is noted with medial tenderness, bruising, or swelling, fibular fracture above the syndesmosis, bi- or trimalleolar fractures, open fracture, or high-energy fracture injury [34]. Special scenarios that warrant special mention and additional views include:

- **Axial Harris-Beath view:** The axial Harris-Beath view is used for suspected calcaneal fractures and to determine intra-articular extent.
- **Broden view:** The Broden view is a supine flexed knee view with 30° to 45° internal rotation that can be used for specific improved evaluation of the lateral process fracture of the talus (commonly known as snowboarder's fracture). It may be of use when further evaluation of the fracture is needed.
- **Bicycle spoke injuries in children:** These injuries are unusual but can occur with entrapment of the leg in the spokes of the bicycle wheel. In a study by Slaar et al [35], if no fracture is noted on ankle radiographs, then no further imaging is warranted. However, if an ankle fracture is present, lower leg imaging may be important to assess the distal tibia and fibula but not the foot.
- **Snowboarder's fracture (lateral talar process or V sign on radiographs):** These fractures may be overlooked on routine radiographs between 40% and 50% of the time [36]. Special attention to this area is recommended in patients with swelling inferior to the lateral malleolus in the appropriate clinical setting to exclude an erroneous diagnosis of a lateral ankle sprain [37]. Lateral inversion stress radiographs may be useful for full evaluation [38].
- **Anterior talofibular ligament view radiograph:** This view may be useful for diagnosis of distal fibular avulsion

fractures in children with lateral ankle sprain if not seen on traditional three-view radiographs. Identification of an occult fibular fracture is noted using this view in 26% of lateral ankle sprain patients [39].

- **The gravity stress view:** This view is more reliable and easier to perform than a manual stress view in supination-external rotation injuries of the ankle with higher suspected incidence of deltoid ligament disruption [40].

**US Ankle.** Ultrasound (US) may be useful but is not typically considered the first line of imaging for the evaluation of acute trauma to the ankle with positive OAR [41].

**Variant 2: Adult or child 5 years of age or older. Acute trauma to the ankle. No exclusionary criteria present (eg, neurologically intact [including no peripheral neuropathy]). Patient meets the requirements for evaluation by the Ottawa Ankle Rules, which are negative: No point tenderness over the malleoli, talus, or calcaneus on physical examination. Able to walk. Initial imaging**

**Bone Scan Ankle.** Bone scan is not routinely indicated as the first imaging study for evaluation of acute trauma to the ankle in this clinical scenario.

**CT Ankle.** CT is not routinely indicated as the first imaging study for evaluation of acute trauma to the ankle in this clinical scenario.

**MRI Ankle.** MRI is not routinely indicated as the first imaging study for evaluation of acute trauma to the ankle in this clinical scenario.

**Radiography Ankle.** Radiography is not routinely indicated as the first imaging study for evaluation of acute trauma to the ankle in this clinical scenario.

**US Ankle.** US is not routinely indicated as the first imaging study for evaluation of acute trauma to the ankle in this clinical scenario.

**Variant 3: Adult or child 5 years of age or older. Acute trauma to the ankle. Exclusionary criteria are present (eg, neurologic disorder, neuropathy, or other). Patient does not meet requirements for evaluation by the Ottawa Ankle Rules. Initial imaging**

OAR should not be used in patients with neurologic abnormality involving the lower leg or those with decreased sensation (eg, diabetics), altered sensorium, or inability to



communicate [25,26]. Other possible cautionary or exclusionary scenarios include pregnancy, penetrating trauma, or presence of prior recent outside radiographs on transfer.

**Bone Scan Ankle.** Bone scan is not routinely used as the first imaging study for the evaluation of acute trauma to the ankle in the setting of peripheral neuropathy or other exclusionary criteria.

**CT Ankle.** The imaging pathway is dependent on the severity of the trauma in patients within this particular clinical scenario. In the high-energy trauma patient or polytrauma patient, fractures and dislocations may be more difficult to identify clinically in the neurologically impaired or neuropathy patient. Occasionally, multidetector CT can be useful as first-line imaging study, particularly for complex injuries such as posterior malleolar fracture and posterior pilon variant fractures, which fall outside the typical classification systems. In a study of 270 patients by Switaj et al [41], the frequency of posterior malleolus fractures and posterior pilon variants was 50% and 20%, respectively; both were found more commonly in older females and diabetic patients. Recent studies of use and implementation of low-dose weight-bearing cone beam CT, particularly in the pediatric population, may be a viable alternative to standard CT studies [42].

**MRI Ankle.** MRI is not routinely used as the first imaging study for the evaluation of acute trauma to the ankle in the setting of peripheral neuropathy or neurological disorder or other exclusionary criteria.

**Radiography Ankle.** In patients with diabetic neuropathy, neurologic compromise of the lower leg, or other exclusionary criteria in which application of the OAR is not possible and fracture is suspected, ankle radiographs are considered the initial imaging study. These patients may have no pain or point tenderness and may walk without discomfort despite fracture because of poor pain proprioception [25]. If there is high suspicion for foreign body, radiographs may also be useful for identification if the foreign body is radiopaque in nature.

**Radiography Ankle Stress Views.** Ankle stress views are not the first imaging study for the evaluation of acute trauma to the ankle in the setting of peripheral neuropathy or other exclusionary criteria.

**US Ankle.** US is not routinely used as the first imaging study for the evaluation of acute trauma to the ankle in the setting of peripheral neuropathy or other exclusionary criteria. US may be useful as a secondary step in evaluation of foreign bodies or focal fluid collections.

#### **Variant 4: Adult or child 5 years of age or older. Acute trauma to the ankle with persistent pain for more than 1 week but less than 3 weeks. No exclusionary criteria present. Initial radiographs negative. Next study**

Acute trauma includes immediate time of injury to <3 weeks, whereas subacute trauma includes 3 weeks to <6 months. The time frame of this clinical scenario is at the intersection of the late acute and subacute phases, and the OAR criteria can still apply for acute ankle trauma in this setting. Persistent pain may be associated with a radiographically occult fracture, bone contusion, subtle cartilage injury, soft-tissue injury, or foreign body not visible on radiographic examination. Diagnosis is critical in determining appropriate and timely orthopedic fixation/treatment planning [1,5].

**Bone Scan Ankle.** Bone scan is typically not used as the next step in this clinical scenario.

**CT Ankle.** CT of the ankle without intravenous (IV) contrast is useful in the trauma setting as the next study to evaluate for radiographically occult fractures and soft-tissue abnormalities. It is rare (<1%) for patients with a large joint effusion but no discernible fracture on radiographic examination; however, CT proved useful in demonstrating a fracture in one-third of cases in one large study [43,44]. Talar fractures (lateral process or comminuted talar body/dome fractures) and fractures associated with the subtalar joint can be difficult to detect on radiographs but are well identified on CT [45,46]. In patients with spiral fractures of the tibia, there is a higher incidence of nondisplaced posterior malleolar fractures that may be missed on radiographic examination [47].

A comparison of multidetector CT versus radiography for ankle fracture detection demonstrated only 87% and 78% sensitivity, respectively, for calcaneal fracture and talar fractures by radiography as compared with CT [48]. Occult osteochondral fractures of the subtalar joint may only be visualized on CT, particularly in patients without dislocation, with fractures involving the posterior facet, with associated massive swelling, or with failure to regain subtalar motion after a period of immobilization [49].

CT with IV contrast is not indicated in this scenario because soft-tissue abnormalities and fluid collections can be identified on noncontrast high-resolution CT studies.

**MRI Ankle.** MRI of the ankle without IV contrast is most sensitive for evaluation of occult fractures with associated bone marrow edema patterns, particularly in inversion injuries and persistent lateral ankle pain, as well as presence

and extent of soft-tissue injuries [29]. Stress injuries of bone, including those of the weekend warrior, are best depicted by MRI [50].

MRI is the reference standard for ligamentous injury and assessment of stability, which is particularly important in athletes, in whom determination of grade (1, 2, or 3) of syndesmotic ligament, anterior tibiofibular ligament, and deltoid injuries is critical for treatment planning and return to sport assessment [51]. High-resolution evaluation of the tendons and ligaments allows distinction between tendinopathy, sprain, and partial or complete tears.

Ligament and tendon injuries can occur without fracture on radiography. Grossterlinden et al [52] compared MRI and radiography and showed that 15% of ligamentous injuries (including sprains, partial tears, and complete tears) at the syndesmosis in acute ankle injuries on MRI demonstrated no fracture on radiography. Presence of bone bruise and adjacent soft-tissue edema have shown a higher association with acute ligamentous injuries (anterior talofibular ligament most common) and tendon abnormalities [53,54] in patients with negative radiographs. MRI can also help exclude Salter 1 fractures in the pediatric population [55].

**Radiography Ankle.** Repeat radiographs are not typically the next study but may be of use to identify early callous formation at an occult fracture line or possible mineralization at a site of intramuscular hematoma if contusion occurred during trauma. Radiographs with better technique may assist in diagnosis of subtle injuries such as the lateral talar process avulsion, which may erroneously be diagnosed as a lateral ankle sprain [37].

**Radiography Ankle Stress Views.** Although ankle stress views are not the typical next best study for this patient group, if there is clinical evidence of instability on physician maneuvers, ankle stress views may be of benefit for identification of occult avulsion injury at ligamentous attachments that may contribute to widening of the joint space on radiographic stress views.

**US Ankle.** US is not typically the next imaging study. US may be useful as a secondary evaluation modality for focused evaluation of underlying soft-tissue injuries and ligaments, with the added benefit of dynamic imaging. This includes focused high-resolution US of the peroneal tendons and the superior peroneal retinaculum [56], stress US (during anterior drawer) to assess joint laxity or chondral avulsion fractures associated with lateral ligament injury in children with negative radiographs [57,58], and potential detection of superficial occult fractures at the base of the fifth metatarsal, lateral malleolus, and malleolus [41].

**Variant 5: Adult or child 5 years of age or older. Acute trauma to the ankle. No exclusionary criteria present. Radiographs demonstrate fracture or potential osteochondral injury. Next study**

**Bone Scan Ankle. Osteochondral Lesions.** Bone scan is not the next imaging study in this clinical scenario.

**Fractures.** Bone scan is not the next imaging study in this clinical scenario. Bone scan may be used in rare setting in polytrauma cases for evaluation of multiple fractures.

**CT Ankle. Osteochondral Lesions.** Although MRI is the reference standard, CT is also of utility to identify, locate, and quantify cortical and subcortical involvement or loss as well as presence of intra-articular ossific bodies or associated fractures. In a prospective study of 399 patients, uncontained osteochondral lesion of the talus shoulder, as determined arthroscopically, had a more complicated clinical outcome than those with nonshoulder lesions, confirming the importance of imaging localization for clinical outcome [59]. An inverted osteochondral fracture of the lateral talus (lateral, inverted, fracture talus, also known as the LIFT lesion) can occur after twisting injury to the ankle. Initial radiographs should be followed by CT and MRI [60,61]. These lesions are treated successfully with combined open approach and arthroscopy.

**Fractures.** CT is the first-line imaging study after radiographs to determine extent, displacement, comminution, intra-articular extension, associated injuries, and potential classification of fractures [48]. This is particularly important in subtalar, calcaneal, and talar fractures because of the complex anatomy and in high-impact polytrauma or complex comminuted injuries in which multiplanar CT imaging is recommended to help direct the preoperative planning evaluation process [62].

**MRI Ankle. Osteochondral Lesions.** MRI without IV contrast is considered the study of choice for assessment of cartilage abnormalities and bone contusions related to acquired osteochondral lesion, particularly in patients with symptoms of persistent pain, stiffness, locking, clicking, and ankle swelling [22,55-57,63]. Although radiographs and CT depict ossific fragments and fracture lines, cartilage abnormalities and bone contusions related to osteochondral lesion are best seen on MRI. Seventy percent of ankle fractures and 50% of ankle sprains have been shown to result in some variation of cartilage injury [57,58,61,64].



**Fractures.** Although CT is more commonly used as the next step in fracture assessment in known fractures, MRI can be useful as a follow-up imaging modality for assessment of associated bone marrow contusions, stress injuries, or fractures [65]. MRI is especially important in fracture sites such as the talus, which are at higher risk for osteonecrosis. MRI is highly accurate for associated soft-tissue abnormalities including tendon entrapment/dislocation and for ligamentous injuries [66].

**Radiography Ankle Broden's View.** The Broden view is a supine flexed knee view with 30° to 45° internal rotation that can be used for specific improved evaluation of the lateral process fracture of the talus (commonly known as snowboarder's fracture). It may be of use when further evaluation of the talar fracture is needed.

**US Ankle. Osteochondral Lesion.** US is not the next step in this clinical scenario.

**Fractures.** US has been shown to be useful for identification of lateral malleolar, medial malleolar, and fifth metatarsal fractures [41] but is not considered a first-line assessment tool or next imaging study in this clinical scenario.

**Variant 6: Adult or child 5 years of age or older. Acute trauma to the ankle. Radiographs negative for osseous injury and physical examination or radiographs demonstrate alignment abnormality suggesting syndesmotic/ligamentous injury or dislocation. Next study**

Lateral sprain is more common than medial strain, with the anterior talofibular ligament most commonly torn. High sprain and fractures are more common in high-collision sport injuries [60], with higher incidence of ankle injuries during winter months [67] and increased incidence in military recruits [68]. Inversion injuries of the ankle account for 25% of musculoskeletal system injuries and 50% of all sports-related injuries [1].

**Bone Scan Ankle.** Bone scan is not routinely the next line of imaging in this clinical scenario.

**CT Ankle.** CT is useful for evaluation of dislocation and can be used to detect syndesmotic injuries, although MRI is better for soft-tissue evaluation. Nault et al [69] validated CT scan measurements that can identify syndesmotic injuries seen on MRI (retrospective study of MRI and CT) as a result of modification of distal tibiofibular relationship after a mild syndesmotic injury. The transsyndesmotic ankle fracture dislocation ("logsplinter injury") results from high-energy trauma disruption of the

syndesmosis with axial displacement of the talus into the distal tibia and fibula with or without fractures of the plafond, which can be noted on CT [70].

Rare pantalar dislocations without associated talar or other fracture can be assessed on CT or MRI and have high rates of osteonecrosis, osteoarthritis, and infection [71].

**MRI Ankle.** MRI is the reference standard for ligamentous injury and assessment of stability, which is particularly important in athletes, in whom determination of grade (1, 2, or 3) of syndesmotic ligament, anterior tibiofibular ligament, and deltoid injuries is critical for treatment planning and return to sport assessment [51].

Ligamentous injuries can occur without fracture on radiography. Grossterlinden et al [52] compared MRI and radiography and showed that 15% of ligamentous injuries (including sprains, partial tears, and complete tears) at the syndesmosis in acute ankle injuries on MRI demonstrated no fracture on radiography.

Rare pantalar dislocations without associated talar or other fracture can be assessed on CT or MRI and have high rates of osteonecrosis, osteoarthritis, and infection [71].

**Radiography Ankle Stress Views.** Stress radiographs may be useful in assessing syndesmotic instability, particularly in supination external rotation ankle injuries according to the Lauge-Hansen classification. Lee et al [72] noted that tibiotalar tilt angle and anterior tibiofibular space measurements were affected when the anterior tibiofibular and posterior talofibular ligaments were injured (confirmed on MRI) in 299 patients. Lateral stress testing with widening of the tibiofibular clear space has been shown to be an indicator of syndesmotic injury, with the traditional external rotation stress test shown to be a poor indicator when the deltoid ligament is injured [73].

**Radiography Leg.** Maisonneuve fracture (syndesmotic injury of the ankle in combination with a proximal fibular fracture) may be overlooked as a result of lack of pain at the fibula. Careful palpation of the proximal fibula should be performed with radiographic evaluation of the entire tibia and fibula if focal tenderness is present [74].

**US Ankle.** US is not typically the next line of evaluation of syndesmotic injuries. Although some studies have suggested focused US could be beneficial for ligamentous evaluation, others have shown limited utility in lateral ankle ligament sprains [75].

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Variant 1:** Ankle radiographs are usually appropriate for the initial imaging of patients 5 years of age or older with acute trauma to the ankle or acute

trauma to the ankle with persistent pain for more than 1 week but less than 3 weeks with no exclusionary criteria present and the OAR are positive: 1. Inability to bear weight immediately after the injury, OR 2. Point tenderness over the medial malleolus, the posterior edge or inferior tip of the lateral malleolus, talus, or calcaneus, OR 3. Inability to ambulate for 4 steps in the emergency department.

■ **Variant 2:** Imaging is usually not appropriate for patients 5 years of age or older with acute trauma to the ankle when the patient is able to walk and there are no exclusionary criteria present (eg, neurologically intact [including no peripheral neuropathy]) and the OAR are negative: No point tenderness over the malleoli, talus, or calcaneus on physical examination.

■ **Variant 3:** Ankle radiographs are usually appropriate for the initial imaging of patients 5 years of age or older with acute trauma to the ankle when exclusionary criteria are present (eg, neurologic disorder, neuropathy, or other) and the patient does not meet requirements for evaluation by the OAR.

■ **Variant 4:** MRI ankle without IV contrast or CT ankle without IV contrast is usually appropriate for patients 5 years of age or older with acute trauma to the ankle with persistent pain for more than 1 week but less than 3 weeks that had negative initial radiographs and no exclusionary criteria are present. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care).

■ **Variant 5:** CT ankle without IV contrast or MRI ankle without IV contrast is usually appropriate for patients 5 years of age or older with acute trauma to the ankle that had radiographs demonstrating fracture or potential osteochondral injury and have no exclusionary criteria present. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care). CT ankle without IV contrast is more likely to be performed for known fracture evaluation with MRI ankle without IV contrast more likely to be performed for potential osteochondral injury evaluation.

■ **Variant 6:** MRI ankle without IV contrast or radiography ankle stress views or radiography leg or CT ankle without IV contrast is usually appropriate for patients 5 years of age or older with acute trauma to the ankle whose initial radiographs were negative for osseous injury or had radiographs or physical

examination demonstrating alignment abnormality suggesting syndesmotic/ligamentous injury or dislocation. These procedures are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care). CT ankle without IV contrast is more likely to be performed for dislocation injuries, with MRI ankle without IV contrast typically used in evaluation of syndesmotic/ligamentous injury. Proximal fibular tenderness on clinical exam should lead to radiography of the leg to evaluate for Maisonneuve fracture.

## 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 go to [www.acr.org/ac](http://www.acr.org/ac).

## 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 [76].

## REFERENCES

1. Czajka CM, Tran E, Cai AN, DiPrea JA. Ankle sprains and instability. *Med Clin North Am* 2014;98:313-29.
2. Lambers K, Ootes D, Ring D. Incidence of patients with lower extremity injuries presenting to US emergency departments by anatomic region, disease category, and age. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2012;470:284-90.
3. Curr S, Xyrichis A. Does nurse-led initiation of Ottawa ankle rules reduce ED length of stay? *Int Emerg Nurs* 2015;23:317-22.

4. Nazarenko A, Beltran LS, Bencardino JT. Imaging evaluation of traumatic ligamentous injuries of the ankle and foot. *Radiol Clin North Am* 2013;51:455-78.
5. Seah R, Mani-Babu S. Managing ankle sprains in primary care: what is best practice? A systematic review of the last 10 years of evidence. *Br Med Bull* 2011;97:105-35.
6. Lin CW, Uegaki K, Coupe VM, Kerkhoffs GM, van Tulder MW. Economic evaluations of diagnostic tests, treatment and prevention for lateral ankle sprains: a systematic review. *Br J Sports Med* 2013;47:1144-9.
7. Tajmir S, Raja AS, Ip IK, et al. Impact of clinical decision support on radiography for acute ankle injuries: a randomized trial. *West J Emerg Med* 2017;18:487-95.
8. Dowling S, Spooner CH, Liang Y, et al. Accuracy of Ottawa Ankle Rules to exclude fractures of the ankle and midfoot in children: a meta-analysis. *Acad Emerg Med* 2009;16:277-87.
9. Stiell IG, Greenberg GH, McKnight RD, Nair RC, McDowell I, Worthington JR. A study to develop clinical decision rules for the use of radiography in acute ankle injuries. *Ann Emerg Med* 1992;21:384-90.
10. Stiell IG, Greenberg GH, McKnight RD, et al. Decision rules for the use of radiography in acute ankle injuries. Refinement and prospective validation. *JAMA* 1993;269:1127-32.
11. Leddy JJ, Smolinski RJ, Lawrence J, Snyder JL, Priore RL. Prospective evaluation of the Ottawa Ankle Rules in a university sports medicine center. With a modification to increase specificity for identifying malleolar fractures. *Am J Sports Med* 1998;26:158-65.
12. Keogh SP, Shafi A, Wijetunge DB. Comparison of Ottawa ankle rules and current local guidelines for use of radiography in acute ankle injuries. *J R Coll Surg Edinb* 1998;43:341-3.
13. Jonckheer P, Willems T, De Ridder R, et al. Evaluating fracture risk in acute ankle sprains: any news since the Ottawa Ankle Rules? A systematic review. *Eur J Gen Pract* 2016;22:31-41.
14. Barelds I, Krijnen WP, van de Leur JP, van der Schans CP, Goddard RJ. Diagnostic accuracy of clinical decision rules to exclude fractures in acute ankle injuries: systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Emerg Med* 2017;53:353-68.
15. Bachmann LM, Kolb E, Koller MT, Steurer J, ter Riet G. Accuracy of Ottawa ankle rules to exclude fractures of the ankle and mid-foot: systematic review. *BMJ* 2003;326:417.
16. Lee WW, Filiatrault L, Abu-Laban RB, Rashidi A, Yau L, Liu N. Effect of triage nurse initiated radiography using the Ottawa Ankle Rules on emergency department length of stay at a tertiary centre. *CJEM* 2016;18:90-7.
17. Ho JK, Chau JP, Cheung NM. Effectiveness of emergency nurses' use of the Ottawa Ankle Rules to initiate radiographic tests on improving healthcare outcomes for patients with ankle injuries: a systematic review. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2016;63:37-47.
18. Derksen RJ, Knijnenberg LM, Fransen G, Breederveld RS, Heymans MW, Schipper IB. Diagnostic performance of the Bernese versus Ottawa ankle rules: results of a randomised controlled trial. *Injury* 2015;46:1645-9.
19. Egli S, Sclabas GM, Egli S, Zimmermann H, Exadaktylos AK. The Bernese ankle rules: a fast, reliable test after low-energy, supination-type malleolar and midfoot trauma. *J Trauma* 2005;59:1268-71.
20. Polzer H, Kanz KG, Prall WC, et al. Diagnosis and treatment of acute ankle injuries: development of an evidence-based algorithm. *Orthop Rev (Pavia)* 2012;4:e5.
21. Dunlop MG, Beattie TF, White GK, Raab GM, Doull RI. Guidelines for selective radiological assessment of inversion ankle injuries. *Br Med J (Clin Res Ed)* 1986;293:603-5.
22. Mosher TJ, Kransdorf MJ, Adler R, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria Acute Trauma to the Ankle. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2015;12:221-7.
23. Diehr P, Highley R, Dehkordi F, et al. Prediction of fracture in patients with acute musculoskeletal ankle trauma. *Med Decis Making* 1988;8:40-7.
24. American College of Radiology. ACR Appropriateness Criteria®: Acute Trauma to the Foot. Available at: <https://acsearch.acr.org/docs/70546/Narrative/>. Accessed March 27, 2020.
25. McLaughlin SA, Binder DS, Sklar DP. Ottawa ankle rules and the diabetic foot. *Ann Emerg Med* 1998;32:518.
26. Coll AP. Ottawa rules, OK? Rules are different in diabetes. *BMJ* 2009;339:b3507.
27. Hastie GR, Divecha H, Javed S, Zubairy A. Ankle injury manipulation before or after X-ray—does it influence success? *Injury* 2014;45:583-5.
28. Nikken JJ, Oei EH, Ginai AZ, et al. Acute ankle trauma: value of a short dedicated extremity MR imaging examination in prediction of need for treatment. *Radiology* 2005;234:134-42.
29. Meehan TM, Martinez-Salazar EL, Torriani M. Aftermath of ankle inversion injuries: spectrum of MR imaging findings. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am* 2017;25:45-61.
30. Wang X, Chang SM, Yu GR, Rao ZT. Clinical value of the Ottawa ankle rules for diagnosis of fractures in acute ankle injuries. *PLoS One* 2013;8:e63228.
31. Brandser EA, Berbaum KS, Dorfman DD, et al. Contribution of individual projections alone and in combination for radiographic detection of ankle fractures. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2000;174:1691-7.
32. Petsavage J, Baker SR, Clarkin K, Luk L. Overuse of concomitant foot radiographic series in patients sustaining minor ankle injuries. *Emerg Radiol* 2010;17:261-5.
33. Antoci V Jr, Patel SP, Weaver MJ, Kwon JY. Relevance of adjacent joint imaging in the evaluation of ankle fractures. *Injury* 2016;47:2366-9.
34. Hastie GR, Akhtar S, Butt U, Baumann A, Barrie JL. Weightbearing radiographs facilitate functional treatment of ankle fractures of uncertain stability. *J Foot Ankle Surg* 2015;54:1042-6.
35. Slaar A, Karsten IH, Beenen LF, et al. Plain radiography in children with spoke wheel injury: a retrospective cohort study. *Eur J Radiol* 2015;84:2296-300.
36. Valderrabano V, Perren T, Ryf C, Rillmann P, Hintermann B. Snowboarder's talus fracture: treatment outcome of 20 cases after 3.5 years. *Am J Sports Med* 2005;33:871-80.
37. von Knoch F, Reckord U, von Knoch M, Sommer C. Fracture of the lateral process of the talus in snowboarders. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2007;89:772-7.
38. Jentzsch T, Hasler A, Renner N, et al. The V sign in lateral talar process fractures: an experimental study using a foot and ankle model. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2017;18:284.
39. Kwak YH, Lim JY, Oh MK, Kim WJ, Park KB. Radiographic diagnosis of occult distal fibular avulsion fracture in children with acute lateral ankle sprain. *J Pediatr Orthop* 2015;35:352-7.
40. Schock HJ, Pinzur M, Manion L, Stover M. The use of gravity or manual-stress radiographs in the assessment of supination-external rotation fractures of the ankle. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2007;89:1055-9.
41. Switaj PJ, Weatherford B, Fuchs D, Rosenthal B, Pang E, Kadakia AR. Evaluation of posterior malleolar fractures and the posterior pilon variant in operatively treated ankle fractures. *Foot Ankle Int* 2014;35:886-95.
42. Lepojarvi S, Niinimäki J, Pakarinen H, Leskela HV. Rotational dynamics of the normal distal tibiofibular joint with weight-bearing computed tomography. *Foot Ankle Int* 2016;37:627-35.
43. Clark TW, Janzen DL, Ho K, Grunfeld A, Connell DG. Detection of radiographically occult ankle fractures following acute trauma: positive predictive value of an ankle effusion. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1995;164:1185-9.
44. Clark TW, Janzen DL, Logan PM, Ho K, Connell DG. Improving the detection of radiographically occult ankle fractures: positive predictive value of an ankle joint effusion. *Clin Radiol* 1996;51:632-6.
45. Burton T, Sloan J. Comminuted fracture of the talus not visible on the initial radiograph. *Emerg Med J* 2003;20:E1.
46. Rodop O, Mahiroglu M, Akyuz M, Sonmez G, Turgut H, Kuskucu M. Missed talar neck fractures in ankle distortions. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc* 2010;44:392-6.
47. Hou Z, Zhang L, Zhang Q, et al. The "communication line" suggests occult posterior malleolar fracture associated with a spiral tibial shaft fracture. *Eur J Radiol* 2012;81:594-7.

48. Haapamaki VV, Kiuru MJ, Koskinen SK. Ankle and foot injuries: analysis of MDCT findings. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2004;183:615-22.
49. Choi CH, Ogilvie-Harris DJ. Occult osteochondral fractures of the subtalar joint: a review of 10 patients. *J Foot Ankle Surg* 2002;41:40-3.
50. Gonzalez FM, Morrison WB. Magnetic resonance imaging of sports injuries involving the ankle. *Top Magn Reson Imaging* 2015;24:205-13.
51. Martella I, Azzali E, Milanese G, et al. MRI in acute ligamentous injuries of the ankle. *Acta Biomed* 2016;87(Suppl 3):13-9.
52. Grossterlinden LG, Hartel M, Yamamura J, et al. Isolated syndesmotric injuries in acute ankle sprains: diagnostic significance of clinical examination and MRI. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2016;24:1180-6.
53. Longo UG, Loppini M, Romeo G, van Dijk CN, Maffulli N, Denaro V. Bone bruises associated with acute ankle ligament injury: do they need treatment? *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2013;21:1261-8.
54. Roemer FW, Jomaah N, Niu J, et al. Ligamentous injuries and the risk of associated tissue damage in acute ankle sprains in athletes: a cross-sectional MRI study. *Am J Sports Med* 2014;42:1549-57.
55. Tamam C, Tamam MO, Yildirim D, Mulazimoglu M. Diagnostic value of single-photon emission computed tomography combined with computed tomography in relation to MRI on osteochondral lesions of the talus. *Nucl Med Commun* 2015;36:808-14.
56. Kok AC, Terra MP, Muller S, et al. Feasibility of ultrasound imaging of osteochondral defects in the ankle: a clinical pilot study. *Ultrasound Med Biol* 2014;40:2530-6.
57. Hunt KJ, Githens M, Riley GM, Kim M, Gold GE. Foot and ankle injuries in sport: imaging correlation with arthroscopic and surgical findings. *Clin Sports Med* 2013;32:525-57.
58. Leontaritis N, Hinojosa L, Panchbhavi VK. Arthroscopically detected intra-articular lesions associated with acute ankle fractures. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2009;91:333-9.
59. Choi WJ, Choi GW, Kim JS, Lee JW. Prognostic significance of the containment and location of osteochondral lesions of the talus: independent adverse outcomes associated with uncontained lesions of the talar shoulder. *Am J Sports Med* 2013;41:126-33.
60. Darrow CJ, Collins CL, Yard EE, Comstock RD. Epidemiology of severe injuries among United States high school athletes: 2005-2007. *Am J Sports Med* 2009;37:1798-805.
61. Dhanaraj D, Chapman C. Osteochondral lesions of the talus revisited emerging technologies. *Bull Hosp Jt Dis* (2013) 2015;73:134-40.
62. Lopez-Ben R. Imaging of the subtalar joint. *Foot Ankle Clin* 2015;20:223-41.
63. McCollum GA, Calder JD, Longo UG, et al. Talus osteochondral bruises and defects: diagnosis and differentiation. *Foot Ankle Clin* 2013;18:35-47.
64. Saxena A, Eakin C. Articular talar injuries in athletes: results of microfracture and autogenous bone graft. *Am J Sports Med* 2007;35:1680-7.
65. Mandell JC, Khurana B, Smith SE. Stress fractures of the foot and ankle, part 1: biomechanics of bone and principles of imaging and treatment. *Skeletal Radiol* 2017;46:1021-9.
66. Crim J, Longenecker LG. MRI and surgical findings in deltoid ligament tears. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2015;204:W63-9.
67. Morris N, Lovell ME. Demographics of 3929 ankle injuries, seasonal variation in diagnosis and more fractures are diagnosed in winter. *Injury* 2013;44:998-1001.
68. Waterman BR, Belmont PJ Jr, Cameron KL, Deberardino TM, Owens BD. Epidemiology of ankle sprain at the United States Military Academy. *Am J Sports Med* 2010;38:797-803.
69. Nault ML, Gascon L, Hebert-Davies J, Leduc S, Laflamme GY, Kramer D. Modification of distal tibiofibular relationship after a mild syndesmotric injury. *Foot Ankle Spec* 2017;10:133-8.
70. Bible JE, Sivasubramaniam PG, Jahangir AA, Evans JM, Mir HR. High-energy transsyndesmotric ankle fracture dislocation—the “logs-plitter” injury. *J Orthop Trauma* 2014;28:200-4.
71. Boden KA, Weinberg DS, Vallier HA. Complications and functional outcomes after pantalar dislocation. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2017;99:666-75.
72. Lee KM, Chung CY, Kwon SS, et al. Relationship between stress ankle radiographs and injured ligaments on MRI. *Skeletal Radiol* 2013;42:1537-42.
73. Jiang KN, Schulz BM, Tsui YL, Gardner TR, Greisberg JK. Comparison of radiographic stress tests for syndesmotric instability of supination-external rotation ankle fractures: a cadaveric study. *J Orthop Trauma* 2014;28:e123-7.
74. Taweel NR, Raikin SM, Karanjia HN, Ahmad J. The proximal fibula should be examined in all patients with ankle injury: a case series of missed Maisonneuve fractures. *J Emerg Med* 2013;44:e251-5.
75. Wiebking U, Pacha TO, Jagodzinski M. An accuracy evaluation of clinical, arthrometric, and stress-sonographic acute ankle instability examinations. *Foot Ankle Surg* 2015;21:42-8.
76. American College of Radiology. ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Radiation Dose Assessment Introduction Available at: <https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/Appropriateness-Criteria/RadiationDoseAssessmentIntro.pdf>. Accessed March 27, 2020.