

PL faculty survey items and responses^a

Item No.	Item	Answer Choices	Responses (n = 5)
1	Have you previously participated in score-based random review (RADPEER or similar)?	Yes or no	5 yes
2	Comparing your score-based random review experience to the peer learning experience, please list any differences favoring score-based random review: Open-text responses: 1) Faster 2) Simple, provides an easy number metric to follow (prior experiences I have had with score-based reviewing were not truly randomized) 3) Mix of agree and disagree cases, gives a sense of relative accuracy (because only the missed diagnoses are discussed on peer learning) 4) More objectivity	Open text	4 Responses
3	Comparing your score-based random review experience to the peer learning experience, please list any differences favoring peer learning: Open text responses: 1) More fun, learning something, discovering improvement opportunities 2) Allows group discussion, brings up educational points or quality improvement opportunities (such as protocol tweaks) 3) More interactive and constructive feedback ensures input from colleagues, as to steps to minimize errors 4) Better experience overall, better for learning and improving	Open text	4 Responses
4	Have you previously participated in peer learning (nonrandom, learning jointly from mistakes)?	Yes or no	2 Yes, 3 no
5	How would you rate the ease of meeting the 100% peer learning attendance requirement?	1–5 Stars	Average rating, 4.8
6	How would you rate the learning value for peer learning, on average?	1–5 Stars	Average rating, 4.8
7	Please rate how safe you feel during discussions of mistakes?	1–5 Stars	Average rating, 4.6
8	How do you rate the value of obtaining CME credits with peer learning?	1–5 Stars	Average rating, 4.6
9	How would you rate the effectiveness of improvements being made as a result of peer learning discussions?	1–5 Stars	Average rating, 4.2
10	How would you rate the ease of reporting cases for peer learning?	1–5 Stars	Average rating, 4.6
11	Please add any comments/suggestions for improving the peer learning meetings: Open text responses: 1) Use 80% participation target 2) Sometimes improvements are too quick and reactive (can lead to things like sequence bloat with too many extra images to be reviewed); we have multiple methods of reporting cases for review, but at times it may be too many options of different methods 3) May include good call cases, even of the reviewer agrees with interpretation	Open text	3 Responses

^a A total of 5 full-time pediatric neuroradiologists responded; the response rate was 100%.

Table 2: The number of cases submitted per faculty per month in 2021. Faculty A and D joined the Peer Learning program in August of 2021.

Faculty	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Ma	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
A								8	8	21	10	10
B	4	16	9	2	9	4	4	8	8	4	15	6
C	3	21	7	0	7	5	5	8	8	10	26	8
D								8	8	1	0	3
E	3	7	1	2	1	4	4	1	1	16	10	0