ISSN-E: 2617-9563

EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF CLINICAL INFORMATION ON RADIOLOGY REPORTING

Dr. Abdulaziz Shyee Al Aoun
Head of radiology department, AFH in Jubail, KSA
doc_tor_01@hotmail.com

It was published on May 29, 2022

ISSN-E: 2617-9563

ISSN-E: 2617-9563

Abstract :

The study's goal was to find out how clinical information affected the radiology report's correctness, timeliness, reporting confidence, and clinical significance. Methods: Several research investigating the relationship between what patients tell their radiologist and the report they get back were compiled into one comprehensive evaluation. Through a thorough search of electronic resources, relevant studies were discovered (PubMed, Scopus and EMBASE). Pre-determined criteria were used to narrow down the pool of potential studies. It was decided to use the JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies to assess the study's methodological quality. Narrative was used to synthesise the findings. This study adhered to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses criteria (PRISMA).result : The radiology report is the major source of value created by radiologists in the course of their work. Using this report, we can share important information with our referral sources while also setting the course for future research and management. Traditionally, this was done through the use of written reports of various quality. PACS/RIS and virtual reality have made a big impact on the way we do our jobs. Direct communication between referring physicians and radiologists is no longer necessary because to these innovations, which have both sped up the production of reports and communicated those results to them. We need to work harder to make our reports better so that they can be used to help patients in the future.

الملخص :

كان الهدف من الدراسة هو معرفة كيف أثرت المعلومات السريرية على صحة تقرير الأشعة ، وحسن توقيته ، وثقة الإبلاغ ، والأهمية السريرية. الطريقة: تم تجميع العديد من الأبحاث التي تبحث في العلاقة بين ما يقوله المرضى لأخصائي الأشعة والتقرير الذي يحصلون عليه في تقييم شامل واحد. من خلال البحث الشامل في الموارد الإلكترونية ، تم اكتشاف الدراسات ذات الصلة (PubMed و Scopus و EMBASE). تم استخدام معايير محددة مسبقًا لتضييق نطاق مجموعة الدراسات المحتملة. تقرر استخدام قائمة مراجعة التقييم النقدي JBI للدراسات شبه التجريبية لتقييم الجودة المنهجية للدراسة. تم استخدام السرد لتجميع النتائج. التزمت هذه الدراسة بعناصر الإبلاغ المفضلة للمراجعات المنهجية ومعايير التحليلات التلوية (PRISMA). النتيجة: تقرير الأشعة هو المصدر الرئيسي للقيمة التي أنشأها اختصاصيو الأشعة في سياق عملهم. باستخدام هذا التقرير ، يمكننا مشاركة المعلومات المهمة مع مصادر الإحالة الخاصة بنا مع تحديد الدورة التدريبية للبحث والإدارة في المستقبل. تقليديا ، تم ذلك من خلال استخدام تقارير مكتوبة من نوعية مختلفة. لقد كان لنظام RIS / PACSوالواقع الافتراضي تأثير كبير على الطريقة التي نؤدي بها وظائفنا. لم يعد الاتصال المباشر بين الأطباء المحالين وأخصائيي الأشعة ضروريًا بسبب هذه الابتكارات ، التي أدت إلى تسريع إنتاج التقارير وإيصال هذه النتائج إليهم. نحتاج إلى العمل بجدية أكبر لتحسين تقاريرنا بحيث يمكن استخدامها لمساعدة المرضى في المستقبل.

Keywords:
clinical information, radiology reporting

Contents

Introduction :

Radiologists routinely use clinical information provided by patients to aid in the interpretation of imaging tests and the creation of reports. Information on a patient's clinical state, including the patient's present ailment, prior medical history, current medications (including allergies), fasting status, probable diagnosis and clinical question to be addressed, is known as clinical information. The radiologist uses it to gain a better grasp of the patient's condition (Kyaw et al ,2021).

Requests for all medical imaging exams must be submitted by a referring physician. The patient's name and the type of examination sought must be included in the request. In addition, the referrer must offer appropriate clinical information to explain the rationale for the evaluation. An official signature from the person who referred you is required. Compliance with radiation safety rules and a high level of efficiency are ensured by this method (Australian,2008).

An imaging request is created based on information from the patient's past medical history and current presentation when they present to their referrer. Radiographers can either complete the imaging before sending it along with this request to radiologists, or they can send it directly to the radiologists, who then review the clinical information and decide which imaging protocol should be used before sending it on to radiographers. Both of these options are possible routes for this request from the referrer to the radiologist. To aid in the interpretation and writing of their report, radiologists have access to clinical information in the request (Loy & Irwig,2004).

Cross-sectional imaging and the widespread usage of electronic health records are examples of technical advancements (EHR). With these changes, it's possible that the referring clinician has lost sight of the critical role that clinical information plays in radiology reporting since it's thought that all physicians and medical imaging professionals have easy access to this information. Clinical information has an influence on radiology reporting accuracy, timeliness, reporting confidence and clinical relevance. For a wide range of illnesses and ailments, including fractured bones, blood clots, and digestive issues, radiology is a crucial service. Plain film X-rays, computed tomography (CT), ultrasound, and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) are all types of radiology exams (MRI) (Goldberg-Stein,2019).

The radiologist's report is critical in the care of the patient. When radiologists correctly interpret imaging scans and communicate the findings to attending doctors, they play a crucial role in patient care. Radiologists' reports, while more time-consuming and labor-intensive than those written by certain attending doctors, have been shown to be more accurate and complete, leading to improved patient care (Larso et al ,2013).

In order to improve patient care, radiology reports must be fast and reliable, and they must primarily address the clinical issue in question. There are several indicators that may be used by a health care system to measure the value of radiology services. Radiologists and diagnostic imaging residents must learn how to write a medical report as part of their training, but only one hour a year is allotted to this topic. Training and residency programs often teach reporting through watching professors, senior residents, and fellow students in the field (Brady,2018)

In the past, radiology reports have been written in narrative form using free-text. Unstructured reports written in narrative language have been shown to be a hindrance to providing effective patient care, as have studies. If the report's language, length, or style are all inconsistent, it will be more difficult for doctors to find the critical information they need to provide the best possible treatment for their patients (Plumb AAO,2009).

It has been suggested that radiological reports may be improved by using a structured format. Medical schools are increasingly emphasising the use of organised forms in radiology curriculums. Therefore, the primary goal of this study was to increase communication between radiologists and attending doctors by determining which format is favoured by attending physicians at a university medical centre. Structured reports for ultrasonography and computed tomography were evaluated as a secondary aim (CT) (Larso et al ,2013).

Problem statement :

One cannot emphasise enough the need of properly filling out the request forms in order to decrease the number of unnecessary radiography exams and to facilitate a succinct radiological diagnosis. An indirect result of the use of this technology is that patients receive better service and a faster diagnosis. Reducing the patient's radiation dosage is also helpful in justifying exposure to radiation.
It has come to our attention in our practise that radiology request cards occasionally lack sufficient information to help in the production of an improved x-ray report. Inadequate clinical information has been linked to an increase in the number of incorrect reports, according to research. By providing the radiologist with accurate clinical information, the referring practitioner will be able to more effectively manage the patient based on that knowledge.

Research Hypothesis:

There is a statistically significant relationship between clinical information and radiology reports

Significance of research:

The radiologist's report is critical in the care of the patient. A key part of radiologists' job is to interpret imaging tests correctly and effectively communicate imaging results to treating physicians. It is possible for attending doctors to interpret imaging results on their own, but a report generated by radiologists has been more accurate and complete, resulting in improved patient care.
In order to better serve patients, radiology reports must be both quick and reliable, as well as focused on the specific clinical problem at hand. These may be the most critical and readily available indicators for evaluating the value of radiology services supplied by a health care system. Resident programmes in radiology and diagnostic imaging require residents to learn how to write an imaging report, but just one hour of that year is dedicated to formal instruction .

Objectives :

The objective of this research is to evaluation of the impact of clinical information on radiology reporting

Definition of research :

A radiology report :The process of interpreting a radiological study is completed with the writing of a radiology report (or detailing what happened during an intervention). It is an official document that is significant from a medical and legal standpoint, and it binds the radiologist to an official interpretation of a certain examination or operation (Wallis,2011).

Theoretical framework :

The requirements and preferences of the referring physician as well as the radiologist :
An imaging study report is typically requested by a patient's physician in order to provide a full and accurate identification of pertinent results, an opinion regarding the likely underlying cause, and recommendations for additional testing if necessary. Some radiologists believe it is best to produce a long list of both positive and negative findings and a comprehensive differential diagnosis, while others strive for an accurate but succinct report that only includes the findings and diagnoses they believe likely. Still others produce reports that are nothing more than a list of findings without any context. Many of the report variations

throughout this spectrum can accomplish the desired effect if the referrer and radiologist have mutual understanding and trust, however this is dependent on experience and trust between the referrer and reporter (Brady,2017).

Trust and experience are difficult to build in the present paradigm of radiology service provision, because there is less face-to-face interaction between radiologist and referrer and more use of off-site reporting. Referrer A may be completely unaware of the nuanced meaning that Radiologist B is attempting to express through the use of certain phrasing. Standardization of language and reporting becomes more important in a globalised world (Reiner,2013; Reiner BI,2014)

Clarity in reporting is essential to conveying meaning accurately (Brady,2018). Most people who read a report are pressed for time. Referees frequently complain about a radiologist's inability to reach a decision. A radiologist's depiction of a patient's condition that does not lead to a beneficial conclusion is a sign that he or she intends to stay disconnected from the patient's condition. We do our patients and ourselves a disservice when we write reports that are too unclear or confusing.

Referrers' preferred report formats have been identified through research. In 1995, McLoughlin et al. polled 100 referring doctors about their preferences for reporting in three distinct forms for each of six clinical circumstances. It was more common to record a normal CXR as "normal" when the patient didn't have any chest pain, while detailed comments were favoured when the patient did have chest pain. Reports reporting aberrant CXR results and indicating a diagnosis are preferred over simply stating the diagnosis. When it came to ultrasounds of the abdomen, patients favoured receiving reports that included all of the test results, even if they were all normal. As a result, the level of descriptive information sought by doctors is based on the specifics of the case, but not on the referrer's specialisation, experience, or academic standing. The authors believed that the preference of a large majority of physicians for lengthy descriptions, even if this meant stating negative findings and offering no more information, would indicate that referrers perceived these reports as suggesting that a thorough examination was undertaken (McLoughlin,1995).

the structure of a radiology report affected the reader's ability to extract information relevant to patient care. That organised reports would be simpler to read and comprehend, and that answering content-specific questions in a more efficient manner, was the hypothesis of the research team. Radiology reports were presented to sixteen senior medical students, and they were required to answer multiple-choice questions regarding particular medical content.. No significant differences were identified in terms of speed of reading the reports, accuracy of content comprehension, or efficiency of information absorption between structured and unstructured reports, even though the individuals highly favoured structured reports to free text. According to the authors, doctors who deal with a large amount of highly structured data risk losing their ability to concentrate on the task at hand, and this is true for both the radiologist who is submitting the report and the person reading it. An essential aspect of radiology's cognitive processing may be the task of writing a narrative report of the case. But they decided to go with the structure and organisation of a 'laboratory report' in order to satisfy the needs of the referrer (Sistrom CL,2005).

Findings from ECR 2017 contradicted these results. There were structured and unstructured reports prepared by the authors for CT angiographic investigations and CTs of the abdomen, respectively. To gather information from over 150 doctors, an online survey administered multiple-choice questions based on the content of each of the surveys' submitted reports (while being unable to return to the report). 34.9 percent of unstructured reports and 17.3 percent of structured reports omitted critical findings. In 18.1 percent of unstructured reports and 6.2 percent of structured reports, the subjects chose the wrong diagnosis. In the long run, organised reporting resulted in greater recall of results and fewer inaccurate diagnoses. Unstructured CT coronary angiograms had the lowest results, with the authors stating: "It seems the more difficult the investigation, the higher value that you may get from having a structured report" (Buckley,2017)

GPs (COVER) and radiologists (ROVER) were polled in 2011 on how they feel about and what they want in terms of radiology reports by Bosmans and colleagues. Radiology reports are regarded essential by 87% of referrers, however only 63% believe they are better qualified to evaluate imaging studies in their particular field than a radiologist. Clinical information and a clear question are the two most important things to include in a clinical question, according to the majority of respondents. Radiologists and 84.5 percent of those who referred patients favoured itemised reports for complicated exams, but 56.5 percent of physicians and 72.9 percent of radiologists disagreed with the premise that a radiology report should be prose-based for less complex cases A little more than half of the radiologists believed that clinicians would presume that a radiologist did not look at a specific characteristic if it was not specifically stated in the report. The authors came to the conclusion that there is no universal agreement on what makes a good report and that the literature on this topic is primarily based on the insights and lifetime experience of specific authors rather than a formal assessment of the views and needs of referrers or radiologists. They say that "one size does not fit all" and suggest that the report be tailored to the referring physician's profile. As a final note, they say, "Medicine undoubtedly needs talented and competent radiologists (Plumb AAO,2009).

It is possible for doctors working in the hospital to interact with radiologists on a daily basis in the same way that they would if they were working in a private practise or clinic. Most or all of these options are not available to primary care practitioners, thus they are forced to depend more heavily on the findings and suggestions provided by radiologists in their reports. Furthermore, a primary care physician may not be conversant with terms or concepts used by specialists. Even while nephrologists are familiar with the usual range of kidney size measures on ultrasonography, it may be necessary for the family practitioner to be told if a certain value is normal or not. GPs have also been demonstrated to be uninterested in the specifics of the examination or the contrast media utilised. Reporting radiologists must consider the reader of a report while determining what to dictate and how to arrange that dictation, so that they may express their message properly to the reader (Grieve FM,2010).

Communication with patients :

The audience for our reports has broadened beyond the referring doctor to also include patients, their families (and, occasionally, their legal representatives) (and, sometimes, their legal representatives). Providing radiology reports (or important results) directly to patients is contentious , but is anticipated to represent an increasing future trend, with patient advocacy organisations requesting the freedom to directly consult with all medical practitioners, including radiologists(Garvey CJ,2006) . Inappropriate or flippant language must be avoided. Radiology reports are communications between doctors, not directly between a radiologist and a patient, and should be factual, utilising clear and exact terminology. However, the wording selected should reflect the likelihood that the patient may also be seen the report; some sensitivity is essential (Reiner BI (2014).

Methodology :

Search strategy:

This study was conducted in accordance with a protocol published in the PROSPERO database (CRD42019138509). PubMed, Scopus and EMBASE databases were searched for relevant papers using relevant keywords for clinical information, diagnostic imaging and radiology report to locate articles that were of interest.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria :

Studies were taken into consideration if they met the criteria listed below: Studies published in peer-reviewed publications :

(1) looked at the link between the main transmission of clinical information to the radiologist and the subsequent radiology report.

(2) looked at diagnostic imaging for any group of human patients. For the purposes of this study,

(3) "primary communication" was defined as any manner of direct contact between a patient's referring physician and a radiologist, such as medical imaging requests and any extra information supplied at the time of the imaging procedure.
Non-English language research was not included. Letters of criticism and criticism were also omitted from the list of items that might be included in the conference proceedings.

Results:

Study characteristics:
Six studies (Maizlin,2019; Lacson et al ,2018; Sarwar,et al ,2014; Mullins,et al ,2002; Berbaum et al ,1988) examined the impact of clinical information on report accuracy, three studies examined the effect of clinical information on reporting confidence, three studies examined the impact of clinical information on clinical relevance, and two studies examined the impact of clinical information on reporting time (Sarwar,et al ,2014; Doshi,et al ,2017; Berbaum et al ,1988). A total of three research examined the impact of clinical data on several outcomes. Reporting accuracy, confidence, and timeliness were examined in a single research. Another research looked at the impact on both accuracy and timeliness of reporting, while a third examined the impact on both accuracy and confidence in reporting (Cohen,et al ,2012; Littlefair,et al ,2016).
The number and consistency of reviewers, as well as the size and scope of data sets, varied widely between research. From seven to 561 instances were included in the data sets that were studied (Mullins et al ,2002). More than a dozen reviewers participated in the study's evaluation process. Studies that utilised radiologists on call at the time of reporting and did not disclose the precise number of assessors used a consistent group of readers before and after treatment was administered (Cohen et al ,2011).
Many research utilised a similar approach, which involved a sample set of photographs being examined twice by a panel of reviewers, in 16 out of 20 cases (Lacson R et al ,2018; Sarwar et al ,2014; Berbaum, et al ,1994). There was a wide range of variation in the quantity and quality of clinical data included in each review. There were three studies that asked radiologists to score the influence of accessible clinical information on reporting, and one research investigated the impact of clinical information in two samples, both before and after intervention (Mullins et al ,2002). This research was one of two that used departmental criteria to categorise clinical information in requests as appropriate or lacking. In one study, researchers looked examined how stroke-related CT and MRI requests affected final discharge diagnoses (Lacson R et al ,2015). Study looked at the relationship between clinical information contained in imaging requests and clinical information readily available to referrers while requests for imaging were being made. Additional clinical information provided by imaging technicians was examined in another study14 combining X-rays and ultrasounds. In order to participate in this study, imaging technicians had to provide clinical information on patients' symptoms, such as the length of time from the beginning of symptoms and when they first occurred (Maizlinet al ,2019).

Interpretation accuracy :
Studies covered in this review support the idea that clinical information has a favourable impact on reporting. Improvements in clinical relevance and reporting confidence were shown to be achieved in studies (Sarwar et al ,2014 ; Mullins et al ,2002; Doubilet& Herman ,1981). Reporting time was not significantly affected by include clinical information. A median quality and bias risk assessment score of 4 out of 9 formed the basis for these findings, which were based on research of moderate quality. There was insufficient statistical analysis in studies assessed to be of lower quality to indicate a statistically significant effect (Tufanaru et al ,2017).
According to a systematic study, the use of clinical information enhanced the accuracy of the results. Our evaluation includes papers that have been published after our first assessment, five of which deal with cross-sectional imaging (e.g. MRI, CT and ultrasound). Clinical information can have a wider impact on reporting than just accuracy, according to one analysis (Loy & Irwig,2004).

The introduction of clinical information at the appropriate time was the subject of one of the investigations. A study by Berbaum et al.20 indicated that radiologist perception was improved when clinical information was provided at the time of interpretation rather than thereafter. Educating referrers to offer quality clinical information to radiologists, rather than radiologists matching results with patient notes, was found to have a higher impact on reporting outcomes (Berbaum, et al ,1994).

Other studies, which were not included in this review, have examined the impact of radiologists' diagnostic performance on their belief in the prevalence of a disease. Preconceptions about the prevalence of a disease can have a significant impact on the diagnosis accuracy of radiologists, according to a new study. Overcalling may be caused by providing clinical information, however the factors studied were severe and not necessarily representative of actual reality, as shown in this report. recommendations for people seeking referrals, which are also the result of our review. Overcalling is the subject of yet another research. When it comes to improving location sensitivity, a recent study found that participants' expectations of abnormality and prior knowledge of the outcome had the most impact. Radiologists can be more accurate and relevant to patients if they are given precise clinical information prior to picture interpretation (Littlefai et al ,2016).

For example, three of the most recent included studies' rationales may indicate a problem with the current clinical information that radiologists are receiving. There appears to be a paucity of meaningful clinical information in requests for reporting that may be confidently reported on, according to patient surveys. The radiologists' higher trust in their results as a result of the information patients supplied on the day of their CT scan suggests that requests lacked important clinical information. A different approach to addressing the gap was taken by demonstrating that additional clinical information provided by radiologists had an impact on the final report, even though they were aware of the limitations of their request, they looked into the value of other sources of information, such as the EHR. Health professionals (and others) employ these three instances as workarounds, defined as methods that help them avoid obstacles and enhance workflow. There is a need to enhance communication between the referring physician and the radiologist, according to these research (Littlefair et al ,2016).

There was no gold standard or standardisation of criteria for clinical information across the included research, despite the fact that several of the trials had identical design characteristics. Many studies depended on the professional opinion of radiologists to assess whether or not clinical information was significant or useful when reporting, making it impossible to compare results. This rating of clinical information's value differed among research because radiologists participating in studies had various training, abilities, and specialisations. There is a danger of missing diagnosis and decreased trust in incidental discoveries if there is a lack of clinical information In such circumstances, radiologists may benefit from proper clinical information in order to contextualise the results and so add value to the report.

The study's findings showed that the criteria for clinical information were generic and could be used to any examination. In contrast, the department's clinical information requirements for CT temporal bone exams were specified. The recommendations were shown to have a beneficial influence on clinical relevance and reporting confidence (Qureishi et al ,2011). It's probable that advances in CT technology and the greater usability of that technology have inspired more research into the issue of clinical information to help with reporting, given the long time lag between publications. This view is reinforced by those who observed that the amount of pictures generated and the lengthening list of differential diagnoses raised the value of clinical information as imaging complexity increased (Leslie et al ,200). As a result, the significance of clinical data is highlighted. Possible risk factors for missed diagnosis and decreased trust in incidental discoveries include a lack of clinical information. In certain circumstances, radiologists may benefit from proper clinical information in order to better understand and interpret the results of their studies (Bercovich & Javitt,2018).

There is little doubt that the lack of clinical details in requests has an impact on the quality of the reports. Referring doctors may not be aware of or educated on what constitutes important clinical information, which might be one reason for this. Educating referrers on the

importance of high-quality clinical information and how it affects diagnostic accuracy may be in the best interests of radiologists. In a recent study, it was shown that young doctors in Australia lack the confidence to request medical imaging tests correctly. It is predicted that developing criterion requirements for clinical information when seeking medical imaging will help improve the quality of radiology reports, as 66% of Australian junior physicians claim to request imaging once a day or more (Glenn-Cox et al ,2019).

Conclusion:

Not all radiologists have a firm grasp on their responsibilities, and even fewer put in the necessary amount of effort to approach a diagnostic challenge with the well-defined objectives of gleaning information from studies and transforming that data into a diagnosis or a game plan to accomplish what is required diagnostically. Some people believe that simply reciting the findings is enough to fulfil their responsibility, which can damage the reputation of radiology and lead other medical professionals to believe that they are capable of performing our duties more effectively than we are within their own area of expertise. They might be able to if they grasp the most important clinical question and make it a priority to address it more thoroughly than we do. In order for us to continue to be useful, we need to adopt a clinical mindset and provide something new and valuable to the investigation and treatment of patients.

The radiology report is the primary value contribution that results from the activity of radiologists. This report is utilised as a way of communicating pertinent information to referrers and as a means of leading future research and management. This has, in the past, typically been presented in the form of written reports of varying degrees of quality. PACS/RIS and VR have brought about significant changes to the way in which we carry out our work. These advancements have not only accelerated the generation of reports and the communication of those reports to referrers, but they have also reduced the necessity of direct contact between referrers and radiologists. In order to continue being useful in the field of patient care, we have to redouble our efforts to improve the overall quality of our reports. These technology advancements also present a chance to achieve this by easing the general adoption of structured reporting, which is an important step toward achieving this goal. Those of us who take pleasure in the practise of carefully drafting reports as a prose exercise might still find an opportunity for this activity in the process of writing report conclusions. Those individuals who do not find the manipulation of language to be interesting might rely on report templates, which will enable them to concentrate on their abilities to understand information. Those individuals who struggle to articulate their thoughts in a clear and concise manner may find that the framework provided by templates is helpful in guiding them through the process of doing so.

According to the findings of this research, clinical information that is conveyed to the radiologist has a beneficial effect on the report generated by the radiological examination. These findings are significant for the most common users of medical imaging, who are known as referrers, as well as for the patients referred by them. These findings are particularly useful to radiologists because they illustrate the potential for improvement in reporting quality that may be achieved via the transmission of clinical information. [Cause and effect] It is in the best interest of radiologists to communicate the significance of clinical information for reporting through the development of criterion standards in order to direct the requesting procedures of medical imaging referrers.

Reference :

Maizlin, N. N., & Somers, S. (2019). The role of clinical history collected by diagnostic imaging staff in interpreting of imaging examinations. Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Sciences, 50(1), 31-35.

Australian, R. P. (2008). Joint convention on the safety of spent fuel management and on the safety of radioactive waste management. National Report from the Commonwealth of Australia 2008 (No. INIS-AU--0065). Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA).

Berbaum, K. S., El-Khoury, G. Y., Franken Jr, E. A., Kathol, M., Montgomery, W. J., & Hesson, W. (1988). Impact of clinical history on fracture detection with radiography. Radiology, 168(2), 507-511.

Berbaum, K. S., Franken Jr, E. A., Dorfman, D. D., & Lueben, K. R. (1994). Influence of clinical history on perception of abnormalities in pediatric radiographs. Academic Radiology, 1(3), 217-223.

Bercovich, E., & Javitt, M. C. (2018). Medical imaging: from roentgen to the digital revolution, and beyond. Rambam Maimonides medical journal, 9(4).

Brady AP (2017) Error and discrepancy in radiology—inevitable or avoidable? Insights Imaging 8:171–182.

Brady, A. P. (2018). Radiology reporting—from Hemingway to HAL?. Insights into imaging, 9(2), 237-246.

Buckley B, Allen GN, Daly L, Ridge CA (2017) Recall of unstructured radiology reports is significantly inferior to that of structured reports. ECR 2017-B1204 (poster).

Cohen, M. D., & Ellett, M. (2012). Quality of communication: different patterns of reporting the location of the tip of a nasogastric tube. Academic Radiology, 19(6), 651-653.

Doshi, A. M., Huang, C., Ginocchio, L., Shanbhogue, K., & Rosenkrantz, A. B. (2017). Impact of patient questionnaires on completeness of clinical information and identification of causes of pain during outpatient abdominopelvic CT interpretation. Abdominal Radiology, 42(12), 2946-2950.

Doubilet, P., & Herman, P. G. (1981). Interpretation of radiographs: effect of clinical history. American Journal of Roentgenology, 137(5), 1055-1058.

Garvey CJ, Connolly S (2006) Radiology reporting: where does the radiologist's duty end? Lancet 367:443–445.

Glenn-Cox, S., Hird, K., Sweetman, G., & Furness, E. (2019). Radiology teaching for interns: Experiences, current practice and suggestions for improvement. Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Oncology, 63(4), 454-460.

Goldberg-Stein, S., & Chernyak, V. (2019). Adding value in radiology reporting. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 16(9), 1292-1298.

Grieve FM, Plumb AA, Khan SH (2010) Radiology reporting: a general practitioner's perspective. Br J Radiol 83:17–22

Kyaw, M. M., Dedova, I., Young, N., & Moscova, M. (2021). Quality of radiology training and role of Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Radiology in supporting radiology trainees in NSW: Results of the first radiology trainee survey. Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Oncology, 65(3), 261-271.

Lacson, R., Laroya, R., Wang, A., Kapoor, N., Glazer, D. I., Shinagare, A., ... & Khorasani, R. (2018). Integrity of clinical information in computerized order requisitions for diagnostic imaging. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 25(12), 1651-1656.

Larson, D. B., Towbin, A. J., Pryor, R. M., & Donnelly, L. F. (2013). Improving consistency in radiology reporting through the use of department-wide standardized structured reporting. Radiology, 267(1), 240-250.

Leslie, A., Jones, A. J., & Goddard, P. R. (2000). The influence of clinical information on the reporting of CT by radiologists. The British journal of radiology, 73(874), 1052-1055.

Littlefair, S., Brennan, P., Mello-Thoms, C., Dung, P., Pietryzk, M., Talanow, R., & Reed, W. (2016). Outcomes knowledge may bias radiological decision-making. Academic radiology, 23(6), 760-767.

Littlefair, S., Mello-Thoms, C., Reed, W., Pietryzk, M., Lewis, S., McEntee, M., & Brennan, P. (2016). Increasing prevalence expectation in thoracic radiology leads to overcall. Academic radiology, 23(3), 284-289.

Loy, C. T., & Irwig, L. (2004). Accuracy of diagnostic tests read with and without clinical information: a systematic review. Jama, 292(13), 1602-1609.

McLoughlin RF, So CB, Gray RR, Brandt R (1995) Radiology reports: how much descriptive detail is enough? AJR 165:803–806

Mullins, M. E., Lev, M. H., Schellingerhout, D., Koroshetz, W. J., & Gonzalez, R. G. (2002). Influence of availability of clinical history on detection of early stroke using unenhanced CT and diffusion-weighted MR imaging. American Journal of Roentgenology, 179(1), 223-228.

Plumb AAO, Grieve FM, Khan SH (2009) Survey of hospital clinicians' preferences regarding the format of radiology reports. Clin Radiol 64:386–394

Qureishi, A., Garas, G., Shah, J., & Birchall, J. (2014). A two-cycle prospective audit of temporal bone computed tomography scan requests: improving the clinical applicability of radiology reports. The Journal of Laryngology & Otology, 128(1), 49-52.

Reiner BI (2013) Strategies for radiology reporting and communication. Part 1: challenges and heightened expectations. J Digit Imaging 26:610–613

Reiner BI (2014) Strategies for radiology reporting and communication. Part 4: quality assurance and education. J Digit Imaging 27:1–6

Sarwar, A., Wu, J. S., Kung, J., Brook, A., Lee, K. S., Gauguet, J. M., & Rosen, M. P. (2014). Graphic representation of clinical symptoms: a tool for improving detection of subtle fractures on foot radiographs. American Journal of Roentgenology, 203(4), W429-W433.

Sistrom CL, Honeyman-Buck J (2005) Free-text versus Structuired format: information transfer efficiency of radiology reports. AJR 185:804–812

Tufanaru, C., Munn, Z., Aromataris, E., Campbell, J., & Hopp, L. (2017). Systematic reviews of effectiveness. Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer's Manual. Adelaide: Joanna Briggs Institute.

Wallis A, McCoubrie P (2011) The radiology report—are we getting the message across? Clin Radiol 66:1015–1022