## Comparison of radiography, CT, and MRI for the evaluation of spinal involvement in Morquio A<sup>5</sup>

	Strengths	Limitations
Radiography	<ul> <li>Assess bone malformation</li> <li>Assess spinal canal stenosis</li> <li>Assess malalignment</li> <li>Flexion-extension instability</li> <li>Rapid</li> <li>Inexpensive</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Poor soft tissue discrimination</li> <li>Limited by overlapping structures</li> <li>Ionizing radiation</li> <li>Limited to ossified structures</li> </ul>
CT	<ul> <li>Rapid (may obviate need for anaesthesia)</li> <li>Multiplanar imaging of bony structures</li> <li>Alternative method for assessing flexion-extension instability in difficult cases (recommend low radiation dose protocol<sup>a</sup>)</li> <li>Can assess some soft tissue components of canal stenosis and cord compression with appropriate filtering</li> <li>Preoperative planning</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Suboptimal for visualizing soft tissues and the spinal cord</li> <li>Ionizing radiation</li> <li>More expensive and less accessible than plain film radiography</li> </ul>
MRI	<ul> <li>Multiplanar imaging</li> <li>Ideal for soft tissue imaging</li> <li>Preferred method for assessing spinal cord compression and myelomalacia</li> <li>Flexion-extension imaging directly visualizes spinal cord</li> <li>Demonstrate venous collaterals</li> <li>Non-ionizing radiation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Long imaging times</li> <li>May require anaesthesia</li> <li>Metal and motion artifacts</li> <li>Limited access</li> <li>Expensive</li> </ul>

Adapted from Solanki, J Inherit Metab Dis, 2013.

<sup>&</sup>quot;Focus on area of interest only, with lowest possible dose technique to yield adequate signal-to-noise at bone algorithm displayed at bone window.