NYU School of Medicine

#### MACRO CRITICAL: Standardizing Documentation of Radiology Critical Test Results

The NYU Experience

Lindsay M Griffin MD Joseph Sanger MD Dana Ostrow Danny Kim MD

RSNA Quality Storyboard Annual Meeting December 2, 2015

#### Example Case

- Friday 4PM, inpatient brain MRI showed acute stroke
- Report says: Findings were discussed with house staff at time of dictation
- Team says they were not aware of findings until Sunday morning
- Although no harm came to the patient, management would have been different had they been aware of the finding on Friday at time the study was interpreted
- Who is responsible?
- Does the phrase 'discussed with house staff' meet the standard of care?



















## Intervention

Create a macro or smart phrase to use within the voice dictation system

- Improve work flow by embedding in application already open
- Improve efficiency by including all required aspects (name, date/time, diagnosis, read back confirmation) in the phrase
- <u>Reduce error</u> by standardizing format



#### Measurement

- <u>Outcome measures</u> Is there improved completeness of reporting?
- <u>Process measures</u> How are radiologists documenting critical results reporting?
- <u>Balancing measures</u> Are there trade offs being created? What work arounds are being used?

For first cycle: We will query our critical results database prior to and post implementation to assess **usage** and **completeness** of documentation









## Results

- 399 studies were logged before the macro
- 495 were logged after the macro
- Average of 45 critical test results/month after vs 27/month before (T-test p <.001)</li>

# Retrospective review of radiology reports submitted to the critical test result database from 10/1/2013 - 10/20/2015



NYU School of Medicine

### Results

- Macro was used most in chest and abdomen
- Average time to report did not change
- Complete reporting increased from 35% to 100% (p <.0001 overall and for each detail independently)





