



# Guide to Optimize Scan Sequences for Clinical Diagnostic Evaluation of Metal-on-Metal Hip Arthroplasty Devices using Magnetic Resonance Imaging<sup>1</sup>

This standard is issued under the fixed designation F2978; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon ( $\epsilon$ ) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

## 1. Scope

1.1 This guide describes the recommended protocol for magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) studies of patients implanted with metal-on-metal (MOM) devices to determine if the periprosthetic tissues are likely to be associated with an adverse local tissue reaction (ALTR). Before scanning a patient with a specific implant, the MR practitioner shall confirm that the device is MR Conditional and that the scan protocol to be used satisfies the conditions for safe scanning for the specific implant. This guide assumes that the MRI protocol will be applied to MOM devices while they are implanted inside the body. It is also expected that standardized MRI safety measures will be followed during the performance of this scan protocol.

1.2 This guide covers the clinical evaluation of the tissues surrounding MOM hip replacement devices in patients using MRI. This guide is applicable to both total and resurfacing MOM hip systems.

1.3 The protocol contained in this guide applies to whole body magnetic resonance equipment, as defined in section 2.2.103 of IEC 60601-2-33, Ed. 3.0, with a whole body radiofrequency (RF) transmit coil as defined in section 2.2.100. The RF coil should have quadrature excitation.

1.4 The values stated in SI units are to be regarded as standard.

1.5 *This standard does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use. The user may consider all precautions and warnings provided in the MR system and hip implant labeling prior to determining the applicability of these protocols.*

<sup>1</sup> This guide is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee F04 on Medical and Surgical Materials and Devices and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee F04.22 on Arthroplasty.

Current edition approved Dec. 1, 2013. Published May 2014. DOI: 10.1520/F2978-13.

## 2. Referenced Documents

2.1 *ASTM Standards*:<sup>2</sup>

A340 [Terminology of Symbols and Definitions Relating to Magnetic Testing](#)

F2503 [Practice for Marking Medical Devices and Other Items for Safety in the Magnetic Resonance Environment](#)

2.2 *IEC Standard*:<sup>3</sup>

IEC 60601-2-33, Ed. 3.0 [Medical Electrical Equipment—Part 2: Particular Requirements for the Safety of Magnetic Resonance Equipment for Medical Diagnosis, 2010](#)

## 3. Terminology

3.1 *Definitions*—For the purposes of this standard the following definitions shall apply:

3.1.1 *Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)*—diagnostic imaging technique that uses static and time varying magnetic fields to provide tomographic images of tissue by the magnetic resonance of nuclei.

3.1.2 *MR - Conditional*—an item that has been demonstrated to pose no known hazards in a specific MR environment with specified conditions of use. Field conditions that define the specified MR environment include field strength, spatial gradient,  $dB/dt$  (time rate of change of the magnetic field), radiofrequency (RF) fields, and specific absorption rate (SAR). Additional conditions, including specific configurations of the item, may be required (Practice F2503).

3.1.3 *Metal-on-Metal (MOM) hip replacement*—a hip arthroplasty device in which the articulating surfaces of the femoral head and the acetabular cup are fabricated from metal.

## 4. Summary of Protocol

4.1 Surface coil fast spin echo (FSE) sequences of the affected hip in three planes and a larger field-of-view (FOV) short tau inversion recovery (STIR) sequence to include both

<sup>2</sup> For referenced ASTM standards, visit the ASTM website, [www.astm.org](http://www.astm.org), or contact ASTM Customer Service at [service@astm.org](mailto:service@astm.org). For *Annual Book of ASTM Standards* volume information, refer to the standard's Document Summary page on the ASTM website.

<sup>3</sup> Available from International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), 3, rue de Varembe, P.O. Box 131, CH-1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland, <http://www.iec.ch>.

hips and the surrounding pelvis are recommended. A large FOV sequence of the entire pelvis should be included to assess for remote causes of pain, such as pelvic or sacral fractures, which may be referred to the hip.

4.2 With regards to the FSE surface coil imaging, an intermediate echo time, water-sensitive fast spin echo technique is effective in highlighting osteolysis and detecting wear-induced synovitis. The fluid-sensitive inversion recovery sequence helps outline fluid collections and will demonstrate the presence of marrow edema in the setting of implant loosening or peri-prosthetic fracture (1).

4.3 Modifications of standard pulse sequence parameters should be applied when imaging in the presence of metallic implants. Options available to reduce susceptibility artifacts on routine clinical scanners include increasing the amplitude of the readout gradient by the use of a wider receiver bandwidth and thinner slices (2, 3). Decreasing voxel size by the use of a high-resolution matrix will increase spatial resolution and trabecular detail in the face of the susceptibility artifact. However, these techniques will also decrease the signal-to-noise ratio. Orienting the frequency encoding direction along the long axis of the prosthesis can also be effective in decreasing artifacts but may not be feasible (4). In addition, view-angle tilting (VAT) gradients can be applied, which applies a section-selection gradient during the signal readout (5).

4.4 Techniques to avoid when imaging in the presence of metal include imaging at high field strengths, use of frequency-selective fat suppression and use of gradient echo sequences. Susceptibility artifact is directly proportional to the main

magnetic field ( $B_0$ ); therefore, imaging at field strengths greater than 1.5 T should be avoided when possible. When fat suppression is required, inversion recovery sequences are preferred over frequency-selective fat suppression techniques, as they are less susceptible to magnetic field inhomogeneities. Standardized gradient echo imaging should be avoided, as these sequences lack the  $180^\circ$  refocusing pulse of spin echo sequences, resulting in rapid dephasing of spins and large areas of signal void in the presence of metal.

4.5 **Table 1** outlines a suggested protocol for imaging MOM hip arthroplasty using a 1.5 Tesla (T) clinical scanner (6).

4.6 Multi-acquisition variable-resonance image combination (MAVRIC SL) is a new technique that results in an image with markedly reduced susceptibility artifact (7-9). Early studies have demonstrated decreased image distortion at the bone-implant interface and improved detection of peri-prosthetic osteolysis and synovitis when compared to conventional fast spin echo techniques (10). A recently reported study of patients with either MOM resurfacing or MOM total hip arthroplasty demonstrated synovitis using the MAVRIC sequence in 77.4% of resurfacing arthroplasty and 86.2% of total hip arthroplasty (THA) hips (11). For imaging MOM arthroplasty, the use of a MAVRIC sequence is recommended in at least one plane (coronal or axial) when this sequence is available. Specific parameters are listed in **Appendix X2**. With regards to timing, this protocol has been successful in assessing patients for both immediate and delayed complications, including fracture, nerve impingement and tendon tears in the immediate postoperative period, and adverse tissue reactions, infection and potential loosening in the later postoperative period (6, 12-14).

**TABLE 1 Suggested Protocol for Metal-on-Metal Hip Arthroplasty Imaging at a 1.5 T MRI Scanner <sup>A,B</sup>**

Timing Parameters	Axial FSE/TSE	Coronal FIR	Coronal FSE/TSE	Axial FSE	Sagittal FSE/TSE
Coil	Body Coil	Body Coil	Surface Coil	Surface Coil	Surface Coil
TR, msec	4,500 - 5 500	4,500	4,500 - 5,800	4,500-5,500	5,500-6,500
TE, msec	21.4 - 32.0	18	24 - 30	24 - 30	23 - 30
TI, msec	...	150	...	...	...
Number of echoes	16 - 20	7 - 9	10 - 20	10 - 20	14 - 20
BW, kHz	83 - 100	83 - 100	83 - 100	83 - 100	83 - 100
FOV, cm	32 - 36	34 - 36	18	17 - 19	18 - 20
Matrix	512 × 256	256 × 192	512 × 352	512 × 256 - 288	512 × 352
Slice thickness, mm	5	5	4	4	2.5 - 3
Interslice gap, mm	0	0	0	0	0
Number of averages	4	2	4 - 5	4 - 5	4 - 5
No phase wrap	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Swap phase and frequency	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Variable BW	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Frequency direction	anterior to posterior	right to left	right to left	anterior to posterior	anterior to posterior

<sup>A</sup>Abbreviations:

- BW – bandwidth.
- FIR – fast inversion recovery.
- FOV – field of view.
- FSE – fast spin echo.
- TSE – turbo spin echo.
- KHz – kiloHertz.
- TE – echo time.
- TI – inversion time.
- TR – repetition time.

<sup>B</sup>Depending on the MRI system, the BW may be reported as half-bandwidth (maximum frequency), so a reported BW of 62.5 is actually acquired at 125 Hz over the entire frequency range. For **Table 1**, to convert to Hz/pixel when implementing 512 frequency encoding steps, use the following formula: (kHz × 2000)/512.

Additional prototype sequences are in development and will become available for such imaging including slice encoding for metal artifact correction (SEMAC), which is a variant of the VAT principle that adds additional phase-encoding steps in the slice dimension (9, 15). Currently, a commercially available sequence applies the SEMAC principle and is termed the WARP sequence, which is a high bandwidth protocol that includes the VAT technique (16).

**5. Significance and Use**

5.1 Magnetic resonance imaging is ideally suited to image MOM hip arthroplasty due to its superior soft tissue contrast, multiplanar capabilities and lack of ionizing radiation. MR imaging is the most accurate imaging modality for the assessment of peri-prosthetic osteolysis and wear-induced synovitis (17-19).

5.2 Before scanning a patient with a specific implant, the MR practitioner shall confirm that the device is MR Conditional and that the scan protocol to be used satisfies the conditions for safe scanning for the specific implant.

5.3 This guide can be used to identify the following adverse events.


5.3.1 *Osteolysis*—Magnetic resonance imaging is superior to conventional radiographs and CT in the assessment of peri-prosthetic osteolysis and has been shown to be the most accurate method to locate and quantify the extent of peri-prosthetic osteolysis (17, 18). On MR imaging, osteolysis appears as well marginated intraosseous intermediate to slightly increased signal intensity lesions that contrast with the high signal intensity of the intramedullary fat. A characteristic line of low signal intensity surrounds the area of focal marrow replacement, distinguishing the appearance of osteolysis from tumoral replacement of bone or infection (20).

5.3.2 *Component Loosening*—While the data are preliminary, MR imaging can identify circumferential bone resorption that may indicate component loosening. Loosening

may result from osteolysis, circumferential fibrous membrane formation or poor osseous integration of a non-cemented component. On MR imaging, component loosening typically manifests as circumferential increased signal intensity at the metallic-bone or cement-bone interface on fat-suppressed techniques (19). The finding of circumferential fibrous membrane formation or osteolysis also indicates potential loosening; this is in contrast to a well-fixed component, with high signal intensity fatty marrow directly opposed to the implant interface.

5.3.3 *Wear-Induced Synovitis*—Magnetic resonance imaging is the most useful imaging modality to assess the intracapsular burden of wear-induced synovitis surrounding MOM arthroplasty (21). Preliminary data indicate that the signal characteristics of the synovial response on MR imaging correlate with the type of wear-induced synovitis demonstrated on histology at revision surgery (22). Low signal intensity debris is suggestive of metallic debris on histology. Mixed intermediate and low signal debris correlates with the presence of mixed polymeric (polyethylene and/or polymethyl methacrylate) and metallic debris at histology. Magnetic resonance imaging can demonstrate decompression of synovitis or fluid into adjacent bursae, such as the iliopsoas or trochanteric bursa, which can present as soft tissue masses or with secondary nerve compression. On occasion, wear-induced synovitis can result in a chronic indolent pattern of erosion of the surrounding bone, even in the absence of focal osteolytic lesions (6).

5.3.4 *Infection*—In the setting of infection, the synovium often demonstrates a hyperintense, lamellated appearance with adjacent extracapsular soft tissue edema. These appearances help to distinguish the synovial pattern of infection from wear-induced synovitis, although aspiration is still required for definitive diagnosis (14). The presence of a soft tissue collection, draining sinus or osteomyelitis further supports the diagnosis of infection on MR imaging.



NOTE 1—Note the improved visualization of synovitis (white arrows) and the bone-prosthesis interface (black arrow) on the MAVRIC image. Images courtesy of Dr. Hollis Potter.

**FIG. 1 Coronal FSE (Left) and MAVRIC (Right) Images of a Left MOM Hip Arthroplasty**



NOTE 1—There is focal osteolysis (white arrows) in the greater trochanter, which manifests as well-demarcated intermediate signal intensity, similar to that of skeletal muscle, replacing the normal high signal intensity fatty marrow. Images courtesy of Dr. Hollis Potter.

**FIG. 2 Coronal (Left) and Axial (Right) FSE Images of a Left MOM Hip Arthroplasty**



NOTE 1—Wear-induced synovitis decompresses into the abductor musculature where there is low signal intensity debris (arrow), consistent with metallic debris. Images courtesy of Dr. Hollis Potter.


**FIG. 3 Axial (Left) and Coronal (Right) FSE Images of a Left MOM Hip Arthroplasty**

5.3.5 *Adverse Local Tissue Response*—Adverse local tissue reactions can manifest as synovitis, bursitis, osteolysis and cystic or solid masses adjacent to the arthroplasty, which may be termed pseudotumors (17-19). ALTR can also include the histopathologic feature of aseptic lymphocytic vasculitis-associated lesions (ALVAL), which can be confirmed using histology. A relatively common appearance of joints with ALVAL is expansion of the pseudocapsule with homogenous high signal fluid interspersed with intermediate signal intensity foci. More recent studies suggest that maximum synovial thickness and the presence of more solid synovial deposits

highly correlate with tissue damage at revision surgery and necrosis at histologic inspection (12).


## 6. Apparatus

6.1 *MRI Specification*—The MRI apparatus consists of a magnet using whole body RF quadrature excitation (refer to 1.3). Imaging is recommended to be conducted at a magnetic field strength of 1.5 T and should have the capabilities to perform the sequences suggested in 4.5. Higher field open systems, such as 1.0 T and 1.2 T open systems, may also provide acceptable performance provided the protocols are



NOTE 1—There is a lamellated synovitis (black arrow) with adjacent extracapsular soft tissue edema (white arrow). Infection was confirmed at subsequent aspiration. Images courtesy of Dr. Hollis Potter.

**FIG. 4 Axial FSE (Left) and Inversion Recovery (Right) Images of a Right MOM Hip Arthroplasty**



NOTE 1—**Fig. 5** demonstrates a large collection of fluid in the trochanteric bursa (arrow), which communicates with the hip joint via a dehiscence in the posterior pseudocapsule (not shown in these images). The fluid is high signal with fine intermediate signal intensity debris. A high ALVAL score was confirmed on histology at revision surgery. Images courtesy of Dr. Hollis Potter.

**FIG. 5 Axial FSE Image in a Right MOM Hip Arthroplasty**

optimized. In cases where such higher field open scanners or 1.5 T scanners are unavailable, parameters can be modified according to recommendations in 4.4.

## 7. Report

### 7.1 Include in the MRI Report:

7.1.1 The presence of synovitis. If present, a description of the signal characteristics, particularly the presence of solid synovial deposits and the maximum thickness of the capsule.


7.1.2 Decompression of synovitis into adjacent bursae (iliopsoas/ trochanteric).

7.1.3 Presence of extracapsular disease.

7.1.4 Presence of signs associated with infection (laminar appearance with extracapsular soft tissue edema).

7.1.5 Presence and location of osteolysis, fibrous membrane formation or poor osseous integration.

7.1.6 Presence of component loosening.



NOTE 1—Fig. 6 demonstrates expansion of the pseudocapsule with fluid signal intensity decompressing into the trochanteric bursa. The pseudocapsule is thickened and of intermediate signal intensity (black arrows). There is additional solid extracapsular disease anteriorly (white arrow). At revision surgery, a mixed picture of ALVAL and metallosis was seen.

**FIG. 6 Axial FSE Image in a Right MOM Hip Resurfacing Arthroplasty**

7.1.7 Presence of neurovascular compression (for example, obturator, femoral, sciatic nerves).

7.1.8 Presence of tendinopathy and/or tendon tears.

7.1.9 Presence of peri-prosthetic or pelvic fractures.

## 8. Keywords

8.1 orthopedic device; magnetic resonance imaging; metal-on-metal hip prosthesis; metal-on-metal total hip arthroplasty; modular acetabular system; MRI; musculoskeletal joint replacement

## APPENDIXES

### X1. CASE STUDY/EXAMPLE


X1.1 The patient is a 57-year-old male who presented with degenerative joint disease and subsequently underwent a right MOM total hip arthroplasty. An institutional review board (IRB) approval was obtained for this study. The patient initially saw improvement in his symptoms, but presented with right hip and leg pain three years following arthroplasty. The pain was initially attributed to lumbar nerve root compression and the patient underwent multiple epidural injections, without relief of his symptoms.

X1.2 Radiographs of the right hip were performed and demonstrated anatomic alignment of the components, without evidence of osteolysis or component loosening. The patient was referred for MRI of the right hip.

X1.3 The MRI demonstrated severe synovial expansion,

decompressing into the posterior soft tissues and adductor musculature, causing compression of the obturator and sciatic nerves in mass. There was no osteolysis or evidence of component loosening. Note the markedly thickened lining of the capsule, which is indicative of tissue necrosis (see Fig. X1.1).

X1.4 Given the MRI findings and clinical symptoms, the patient underwent revision surgery with conversion to a metal-on-polyethylene implant. At revision surgery, there was a large amount of proliferative tissue around the hip, which was resected. There was no osteolysis or visible metallosis. Tissue samples were taken from the hip capsule, acetabulum and femur and sent for microbiology and histology.



NOTE 1—**Fig. X1.1** demonstrates severe synovial expansion (white arrows) expanding into the adductor musculature and posterior soft tissues, resulting in compression of the sciatic nerve (black arrow). This image was collected as part of an IRB-approved research study. Images courtesy of Dr. Hollis Potter.

**FIG. X1.1 Coronal Inversion Recovery (Top Left), Axial FSE (Top Right), Coronal FSE (Bottom Left) and Coronal MAVRIC (Bottom Right) Sequences**

X1.5 Pathology demonstrated extensive tissue necrosis and fibrinous exudate. A mild inflammatory infiltration of lymphocytes was seen. A moderate histiocytic infiltrate was present with evidence of corrosion products throughout the infarcted

tissue. There was no metallic debris. The pathology confirmed the intraoperative findings and MRI findings of an adverse local tissue response in the setting of a MOM hip arthroplasty. The patient's symptoms improved following revision.

## X2. RECOMMENDED PARAMETERS FOR SPECIALIZED METAL ARTIFACT REDUCTION SEQUENCES

X2.1 A metal artifact reduction sequence or techniques such as MAVRIC, SEMAC, or VAT should be used when available. Other specialized sequences that reduce metal artifacts may be

in development by various MR scanner manufacturers, and this standard guide will be updated with such developments.

**TABLE X2.1 Recommended Parameters for MAVRIC<sup>A</sup>**

Timing Parameters	Coronal MAVRIC FSE PD	Coronal MAVRIC IR
TR, msec	4000	4234
TE, msec	10	40
TI, msec	...	150
Number of echoes	24	24
BW, kHz	125	125
FOV, cm	38	38
Matrix	512 × 256	256 × 192
Slice thickness, mm	3.6	3.6
Interslice gap, mm	0	0
Number of averages	0.5	0.5

<sup>A</sup>Abbreviations:

BW – bandwidth.  
 FIR – fast inversion recovery.  
 FOV – field of view.  
 FSE – fast spin echo.  
 TSE – turbo spin echo.  
 PD – proton density.  
 IR – inversion recovery.  
 KHz – kiloHertz.  
 TE – echo time.  
 TI – inversion time.  
 TR – repetition time.

## REFERENCES

- (1) Cook, S.M., P.M. Pellicci, and H.G. Potter, *Use of magnetic resonance imaging in the diagnosis of an occult fracture of the femoral component after total hip arthroplasty. A case report.* J Bone Joint Surg Am, 2004. 86-A(1): p. 149-53.
- (2) Sofka, C.M. and H.G. Potter, *MR imaging of joint arthroplasty.* Semin Musculoskelet Radiol, 2002. 6(1): p. 79-85.
- (3) Suh, J.S., et al., *Minimizing artifacts caused by metallic implants at MR imaging: experimental and clinical studies.* AJR Am J Roentgenol, 1998. 171(5): p. 1207-13.
- (4) Henk, C.B., et al., *The postoperative spine.* Top Magn Reson Imaging, 1999. 10(4): p. 247-64.
- (5) Cho, Z.H., D.J. Kim, and Y.K. Kim, *Total inhomogeneity correction including chemical shifts and susceptibility by view angle tilting.* Med Phys, 1988. 15(1): p. 7-11.
- (6) Hayter, C.L., M.F. Koff, and H.G. Potter, *Magnetic resonance imaging of the postoperative hip.* J Magn Reson Imaging, 2012. 35(5): p. 1013-25.
- (7) Koch, K.M., et al., *A multispectral three-dimensional acquisition technique for imaging near metal implants.* Magn Reson Med, 2009. 61(2): p. 381-90.
- (8) Koch, K.M., et al., *Imaging near metal with a MAVRIC-SEMAC hybrid.* Magn Reson Med, 2011. 65(1): p. 71-82.
- (9) Koch, K.M., et al., *Magnetic resonance imaging near metal implants.* J Magn Reson Imaging, 2010. 32(4): p. 773-87.
- (10) Hayter, C.L., et al., *MRI after arthroplasty: comparison of MAVRIC and conventional fast spin-echo techniques.* AJR Am J Roentgenol, 2011. 197(3): p. W405-11.
- (11) Hayter, C.L., et al., *MRI findings in painful metal-on-metal hip arthroplasty.* AJR Am J Roentgenol, 2012. 199(4): p. 884-93.
- (12) Nawabi, D.H., et al., *MRI Predicts ALVAL and Tissue Damage in Metal-on-Metal Hip Arthroplasty.* Clin Orthop Relat Res, 2013.
- (13) Nawabi, D.H., et al., *Magnetic resonance imaging findings in symptomatic versus asymptomatic subjects following metal-on-metal hip resurfacing arthroplasty.* J Bone Joint Surg Am, 2013. 95(10): p. 895-902.
- (14) Plodkowski, A.J., et al., *Lamellated hyperintense synovitis: potential MR imaging sign of an infected knee arthroplasty.* Radiology, 2013. 266(1): p. 256-60.
- (15) Lu, W., et al., *SEMAC: Slice Encoding for Metal Artifact Correction in MRI.* Magn Reson Med, 2009. 62(1): p. 66-76.
- (16) Sutter, R., et al., *Reduction of metal artifacts in patients with total hip arthroplasty with slice-encoding metal artifact correction and view-angle tilting MR imaging.* Radiology, 2012. 265(1): p. 204-14.
- (17) Walde, T.A., et al., *Comparison of CT, MRI, and radiographs in assessing pelvic osteolysis: a cadaveric study.* Clin Orthop Relat Res, 2005(437): p. 138-44.
- (18) Weiland, D.E., et al., *Magnetic resonance imaging in the evaluation of periprosthetic acetabular osteolysis: a cadaveric study.* J Orthop Res, 2005. 23(4): p. 713-9.
- (19) Potter, H.G. and L.F. Foo, *Magnetic resonance imaging of joint arthroplasty.* Orthop Clin North Am, 2006. 37(3): p. 361-73, vi-vii.
- (20) Potter, H.G., et al., *Magnetic resonance imaging after total hip arthroplasty: evaluation of periprosthetic soft tissue.* J Bone Joint Surg Am, 2004. 86-A(9): p. 1947-54.
- (21) Hayter, C.L., H.G. Potter, and E.P. Su, *Imaging of metal-on-metal hip resurfacing.* Orthop Clin North Am, 2011. 42(2): p. 195-205, viii.
- (22) Hayter, C.L., et al., *MRI assessment of wear-induced synovitis, in ISMRM Annual Conference.* 2011: Montreal.



*ASTM International takes no position respecting the validity of any patent rights asserted in connection with any item mentioned in this standard. Users of this standard are expressly advised that determination of the validity of any such patent rights, and the risk of infringement of such rights, are entirely their own responsibility.*

*This standard is subject to revision at any time by the responsible technical committee and must be reviewed every five years and if not revised, either reapproved or withdrawn. Your comments are invited either for revision of this standard or for additional standards and should be addressed to ASTM International Headquarters. Your comments will receive careful consideration at a meeting of the responsible technical committee, which you may attend. If you feel that your comments have not received a fair hearing you should make your views known to the ASTM Committee on Standards, at the address shown below.*

*This standard is copyrighted by ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, PO Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, United States. Individual reprints (single or multiple copies) of this standard may be obtained by contacting ASTM at the above address or at 610-832-9585 (phone), 610-832-9555 (fax), or [service@astm.org](mailto:service@astm.org) (e-mail); or through the ASTM website ([www.astm.org](http://www.astm.org)). Permission rights to photocopy the standard may also be secured from the ASTM website ([www.astm.org/COPYRIGHT/](http://www.astm.org/COPYRIGHT/)).*