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What is it?
The RAYUS Radiology Quality Institute is a non-profit (501c6) entity that is affiliated with and sponsored by RAYUS Radiology.

Governed by the Council of Medical Directors
- Made up of RAYUS Radiology market medical directors and/or leaders of partnering radiologist groups
- National Section Leaders are elected annually by the Council and have significant subspecialized expertise

Primary Purpose
- Develop and advance the science and art of medicine and medical education
- Promote public health
- Provide continuous quality improvement, peer review, and mentoring to providers affiliated with RAYUS Radiology

Chief Initiatives
- Development of appropriate use criteria as a CMS-qualified Provider Led Entity (PLE)
- Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROM)
- Peer review through the Radiologist Quality and Mentoring (RQM®) program
Industry peer review systems vary in effectiveness and may contain limitations of reactive case assignment, undefined time limits, or score-based approaches. These can lead to biased case selection and subjectivity.

In contrast, a learning approach to peer review encourages best practice sharing.

The purpose of this initiative was to develop an in-house alternative to traditional peer review, the Radiologist Quality & Mentoring program (RQM®).
METHODS – DEVELOPMENT & ADMINISTRATION

The RQM® is a web-based peer review program that is administered by the RAYUS Quality Institute and satisfies both CMS and ACR requirements. This program was designed and developed with value and ease of use for our affiliated providers as top priorities

- Confidential, legally protected, well documented process to improve patient care outcomes by reassessing each other’s work
- Allows for anonymous discussion between providers
- Selects only current cases, organized by subspecialty for more meaningful mentorship

Peer review assignments include only recent cases, with a focus on advanced imaging

- Cases are randomly assigned via an algorithm of ~3% interpretation volume per subspecialty on a rotating monthly schedule
- Participants are given one month to complete cases from initial release date
- Program settings and administer oversight result in assignments that are personalized to individual providers
- Easy-to-follow worklist clearly shows all assignments and due dates
- Automatic email notifications are sent to participants when new cases are assigned, and for incomplete cases with upcoming deadlines
RQM® Provider Feedback

The RQM® encourages conversation and sharing of best-practices amongst RAYUS’ nationwide network of Radiologist partners through anonymization and the ability to respond back-and-forth.
METHODS - REPORTING

Data compiled via an in-house reporting system and can be accessed at any time

REPORTS:

• Accuracy assessment
• Participation rate
• Volume by subspecialty
• Volume by modality
• Results by individual provider

Formalized reporting occurs on a scheduled cycle

In general, reports blind the names of individual providers, preserving peer review protection and the purpose of a non-punitive learning environment.

Customizable reports harness the data that comes from the use of the program to demonstrate to payors that the continued pursuit of high-quality patient care is a top priority for our affiliated providers.
In 2021, a total of 240 reviewers from 32 independent groups completed 14,501 reviews, with an overall participation rate of 95%.

To date in 2022, reviews are up ~12% year-over-year from 2021, with an overall participation rate of 97%.
The RQM® Accuracy Assessment revealed a below industry average error rate for participants, leading to more critical findings at earlier stages.

The 2021 Accuracy Assessment error rate was 1.42%; lower than the industry average (3-5% in the peer-reviewed literature).

1.42% Error Rate

3% - 5% Error Rate


*RQM® Conclusions report excludes radiology groups no longer participating in RQM® and special "non-routine" review cases.*