White Rose Research Online
eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk
Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York

Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/138246/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:
Paddock, M., Sprigg, A., Halliday, K. et al. (2018) Re: A comprehensive toolkit for imaging children who may have been abused: new guidance from the Royal College of Radiologists and the Society and College of Radiographers. Clinical Radiology, 73 (7). pp. 672-673. ISSN: 0009-9260

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crad.2018.03.010

Reuse
This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/

Takedown
If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS
University of Sheffield
UNIVERSITY of York

Re: A comprehensive toolkit for imaging children who may have been abused: new guidance from the Royal College of Radiologists and the Society and College of Radiographers.

Dr Michael Paddock[a,*], Dr Alan Sprigg[a], Dr Katharine Halliday[b], Dr Amaka C Offiah[c]

[a] Department of Radiology, Sheffield Children's Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Western Bank, Sheffield S10 2TH, UK
[b] Department of Radiology, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Derby Road, Nottingham, NG7 2UH, UK
[c] Academic Unit of Child Health, University of Sheffield, Stephenson Wing, Sheffield Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Western Bank, Sheffield S10 2TH, UK

Guarantor and correspondent
* Dr Michael Paddock, Academic Unit of Radiology, University of Sheffield, Floor C, Royal Hallamshire Hospital, Glossop Road, Sheffield, S10 2JF, United Kingdom

Telephone: +44 114 271 1643
Facsimile: +44 114 271 1714
E-mail: michael.paddock@doctors.org.uk

Funding information
Nil.

Conflict of interest
The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Submission declaration
This article has not been published previously, is not under consideration elsewhere, its publication is approved by all authors and explicitly by the responsible authorities where the work was carried, and if accepted, will not be published elsewhere.

Acknowledgments
Nil.

Sir–Following the publication of the recently updated guidance in the radiological investigation of suspected physical child abuse (1) and the excellent editorial by Dr Strouse summarising this guidance (2), we are writing to specifically update the readership regarding the initial skeletal survey (SS) imaging protocol for suspected physical abuse (non-accidental injury) in infants and young children.

In Part 1 of our pictorial review (3) we emphasised the importance of obtaining a standard set of radiographic projections in every infant or child in whom physical abuse is suspected according to the 2008 guidance (4). With the publication of the updated guidelines in 2017, the number and type of recommended radiographic projections to be obtained are determined by the size of the child: whether a whole limb is to be imaged in one projection or in separate projections, i.e. left upper limb versus dedicated left humerus and left forearm radiographs, will depend on whether the child is 'small' or 'large', respectively. Radiographers experienced in imaging children are deemed to be the best judge of which projections should be obtained based on child size. As a rough guide, a small child could be considered below the age of 12 months, and a large child above the age of 12 months. If there is any uncertainty, discussion with senior radiographers or consultant radiologists is advised. The full list of specific radiographic projections based on child size are detailed in Appendix E of the latest guidance (1).

If a child has presented acutely with a clinically suspected bony injury and good quality diagnostic radiographs have been obtained on admission, they may not need to be repeated at the time of the initial SS. We reinforce that a consultant radiologist should be involved at all stages of the imaging examination and be readily available to check the diagnostic quality of the images obtained (either before or at the time of the SS) to advise whether certain projections need to be repeated (and/or determine the need for additional projections if there is uncertainty about the findings). This can reduce the length of the examination time in addition to the radiation burden which is advantageous for all involved. The latter is particularly important in the context of the initial SS which may now comprise of up to 34 radiographic projections in a large child, including coned projections. This should be an area of future research – whether the increase in radiation dose confers additional diagnostic benefit to the identification of skeletal injury and the diagnosis of physical abuse.

In conclusion, it is important that readers using our pictorial reviews as reference (3,5) are aware of these specific changes to the imaging protocol when

investigating suspected physical child abuse in their own departments, and we strongly encourage all involved in the care and investigation of these children to read and follow the updated guidance.

References

1. The radiological investigation of suspected physical child abuse. London: Royal College of Radiologists & Society of College of Radiographers; 2017. Available at: https://www.rcr.ac.uk/system/files/publication/field_publication_files/bfcr174_suspected_physical_abuse.pdf Accessed 4 March 2018.
2. Strouse PJ, A comprehensive toolkit for imaging children who may have been abused: new guidance from the Royal College of Radiologists and the Society and College of Radiographers, Clinical Radiology (2017), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crad.2017.12.013
3. Paddock M, Sprigg A, Offiah AC. Imaging and reporting considerations for suspected physical abuse (non-accidental injury) in infants and young children. Part 1: initial considerations and appendicular skeleton. Clin Radiol 2017;72(3):179e88.
4. Standards for radiological investigations of suspected non-accidental injury. London: Royal College of Radiologists & Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health; 2008. Available at: https://www.rcr.ac.uk/docs/radiology/pdf/RCPCH_RCR_final.pdf Accessed 4 March 2018.
5. Paddock M, Sprigg A, Offiah AC. Imaging and reporting considerations for suspected physical abuse (non-accidental injury) in infants and young children. Part 2: axial skeleton and differential diagnoses. Clin Radiol 2017;72(3):189e201.

M. Paddock[a,*], A. Sprigg[a], K Halliday[b], A.C. Offiah[c]

[a] Department of Radiology, Sheffield Children's Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Sheffield, UK

[b] Department of Radiology, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Derby Road, Nottingham, NG7 2UH, UK

[c] Academic Unit of Child Health, University of Sheffield, Stephenson Wing, Sheffield Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Western Bank, Sheffield S10 2TH, UK

e-mail address: michael.paddock@doctors.org.uk (M. Paddock)

*Guarantor and correspondent