



Get Clarity On Generics

Cost-Effective CT & MRI Contrast Agents



FRESENIUS
KABI

WATCH VIDEO

AJNR

A Public Health Perspective on Radiologists' Interpretation Volumes

Jeffrey P. Guenette, Geoffrey S. Young, Rajiv Gupta, Javier M. Romero and Raymond Y. Huang

AJNR Am J Neuroradiol published online 2 May 2024

<http://www.ajnr.org/content/early/2024/05/02/ajnr.A8240>

This information is current as
of August 24, 2025.

A Public Health Perspective on Radiologists' Interpretation Volumes

In the recent *AJNR* study by Ivanovic et al,¹ interpretation volume is associated with diagnostic error at the time of interpretation, presumably in the form of a missed diagnosis or misdiagnosis. The actual error rates may be even higher since RADPEER likely biases reviewers to save time and protect colleagues by minimizing discrepancy. While we support the goal to limit volumes, we note that suddenly limiting ourselves to 32 or 40 neuroradiology examinations per shift would rapidly lead to large queues of unread examinations and would inevitably delay many diagnoses. A delay in diagnosis is also a diagnostic error as defined by the National Academies. In England, delays in reporting have contributed to one-third of examined radiology systems failures.²

Also, we cannot estimate how volume limits would reduce error without knowing the degree to which the study model explains error. In our experience, regression models in radiology quality studies often explain only 10%–15% of the studied effect. We, thus, advocate for including the R^2 value to help elucidate the potential impact of interventions on the studied outcome.

Furthermore, as illustrated by the cited airline and anesthesiology experiences, risk mitigation entails addressing many factors that contribute both directly and indirectly to error. For example, examination types are associated with radiologists' recommendation rates,³ due to diagnostic uncertainty, and there is likely a similar association with error. The Ivanovic et al¹ study did not address whether the small fraction of studied shifts with <26 examinations included a high proportion of high-certainty/low-error examination types. Additional unstudied factors that potentially contribute to or confound the error association are noninterpretative responsibilities,⁴ case complexity, and shift time of day.

Radiologists largely agree that higher interpretation volumes are psychologically unacceptable and unsustainable. Nevertheless, imaging volumes continue increasing, and our work is most valuable to patients and referring providers when performed promptly. Increasing the number of radiologists is virtually impossible in the short term given the 10-year American train-

ing pipeline and the barriers to hiring foreign-trained radiologists.⁵ Meanwhile, strategies to limit radiologists' workloads and mitigate error should include the following: clinical trial-validated technologies, including artificial intelligence tools, to reduce ancillary and repetitive tasks and interruptions; reduction of clinically unnecessary imaging; examination scheduling triage based on urgency; and evidence-based guidelines that rank and reward quality and safety to counterbalance the incentive for workflows that maximize revenues and profits.

Disclosure forms provided by the authors are available with the full text and PDF of this article at www.ajnr.org.

REFERENCES

1. Ivanovic V, Broadhead K, Chang YM, et al. **Shift volume directly impacts neuroradiology error rate at a large academic medical center: the case for volume limits.** *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2024 Jan 18. [Epub ahead of print] [CrossRef Medline](#)
2. Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman. **Unlocking Solutions in Imaging: working together to learn from failings in the NHS.** July 2021. <https://www.ombudsman.org.uk/publications/unlocking-solutions-imaging-working-together-learn-failings-nhs>. Accessed January 23, 2024
3. Guenette JP, Lynch E, Abbasi N, et al. **Actionability of recommendations for additional imaging in head and neck radiology.** *J Am Coll Radiol* 2024 Jan 12. [Epub ahead of print] [CrossRef Medline](#)
4. Glover M, Almeida RR, Schaefer PW, et al. **Quantifying the impact of noninterpretive tasks on radiology report turn-around times.** *J Am Coll Radiol* 2017;14:1498–503 [CrossRef Medline](#)
5. Khoshpour P, Khalili N, Khalili N, et al. **Visa opportunities for international medical graduates applying for U.S. academic radiology department faculty positions: A national survey.** *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2024;222:e2330008 [CrossRef Medline](#)

 **Jeffrey P. Guenette**
Division of Neuroradiology
Brigham and Women's Hospital
Boston, Massachusetts
Center for Evidence-Based Imaging
Brigham and Women's Hospital
Boston, Massachusetts

 **Geoffrey S. Young**
Division of Neuroradiology
Brigham and Women's Hospital
Boston, Massachusetts

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3174/ajnr.A8240>

Rajiv Gupta
 **Javier M. Romero**
Division of Neuroradiology
Massachusetts General Hospital
Boston, Massachusetts

 **Raymond Y. Huang**
Division of Neuroradiology
Brigham and Women's Hospital
Boston, Massachusetts