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Background

• Medical imaging plays a major role in the evaluation of patients in the emergency department

• Growth in utilization of medical imaging has been cited as a factor in rising healthcare costs

• Despite evidence that the growth rate of imaging utilization has decreased over the past few years, utilization rates continue to increase in the emergency department setting

Background

• Use of evidence-based guidelines for decisions about ordering medical imaging studies is becoming not just beneficial, but essential
  – Nationwide transition to value-based reimbursement models
  – Upcoming federal mandate for use of clinical decision support tools before ordering advanced imaging studies

• Available evidence has suggested that the proficiency of emergency medicine residents in choosing appropriate imaging studies does not improve significantly over the course of residency training
Purpose

• We sought to improve awareness and knowledge about how to make appropriate decisions about ordering medical imaging studies in the emergency department at our institution

• We developed a lecture series based on the American College of Radiology Appropriateness Criteria® (ACR-AC) targeting clinical practitioners ordering medical imaging studies in our ED

Methods: Pre-lecture Survey

• Before the first lecture, a four-item survey (SurveyMonkey; Palo Alto, CA) was sent out via email to clinical practitioners in our emergency department

• Respondents included residents (PGY-1, 2, and 3 levels) and attending physicians

• Questions assessed provider familiarity with the ACR-AC, comfort in selecting appropriate imaging studies, and attitudes regarding the use of scientific evidence and cost/resource considerations when selecting imaging studies
Methods: Lecture Series

- A series of ten lectures was then given to emergency department practitioners over a five-month period (December-April) in the middle of the academic year
  - Lecture topics (based on ACR-AC topics) were chosen by the emergency medicine chief residents
  - Lectures were given during the weekly EM residency program didactic conference block
  - Each lecture was approximately 20-25 minutes in length, with two consecutive lectures given on each of five different dates

Methods: Lecture Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Trauma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Chest Pain – Suspected Pulmonary Embolism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Chest Pain – Suspected Aortic Dissection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Pelvic Pain In The Reproductive Age Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Lower Quadrant Pain – Suspected Appendicitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspected Spine Trauma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute (Nonlocalized) Abdominal Pain And Fever Or Suspected Abdominal Abscess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspected Small Bowel Obstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Trauma to the Knee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbits, Vision, and Visual Loss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methods: Quizzes

• Prior to delivering two consecutive lectures, a pre-lecture quiz was given to those in attendance
  – Three questions assessing knowledge about each ACR-AC topic
  – Respondents included medical students, EM residents, and attending EM physicians

• Following the lectures, a post-lecture quiz was given to the attendees consisting of questions identical to those on the pre-test quiz to assess for an increase in number of correct answers following the delivery of the lectures

Methods: Statistical Analysis

• After the conclusion of the lecture series, we analyzed the aggregate pre- and post-lecture quiz results:
  – Data from total of 30 pre-lecture questions and 30 identical post-lecture questions
  – Paired two-tailed t-test was performed to assess for overall differences in the mean scores on the pre- and post-lecture quizzes
    • Subgroup analysis performed for each training level (medical students, PGY-1, 2, 3 residents, and attendings)
Methods: Post-lecture Survey

- After the final lecture in the series, a six-item survey (SurveyMonkey; Palo Alto, CA) was again sent out via email to clinical practitioners in our emergency department
- Questions assessed for changes in awareness and knowledge about the ACR-AC and resource-conscious imaging utilization
- We also asked for feedback regarding the quality of the lecture series and provided the opportunity for free-text responses

Results: Aggregate Quiz Scores

- A total of 228 pre- and post-lecture quizzes were completed over the course of the ten-lecture series
- *Significant improvement* \((p < 0.01)\) in overall percent of questions correct between the pre- and post-lecture quizzes
  - Pre-lecture average score: \(55.7\%\)
  - Post-lecture average score: \(80.5\%\)
- Significant improvement \((p < 0.05)\) was also seen within each training level subgroup
Score improvement was also seen for each individual lecture:

Quiz Score Improvement by Lecture Topic
Results: Pre- and Post-lecture Surveys

- Data from the online surveys sent to EM residents and attendings before and after the lecture series demonstrated a change in subjective knowledge and attitudes about imaging utilization decisions.

- Responses were measured using a standard Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Pre-test mean (n = 38)</th>
<th>Post-test mean (n = 26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable selecting the most appropriate imaging modality to work-up common emergency complaints.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with the indications for different imaging modalities in the diagnostic work-up of common emergency complaints.</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable using the medical literature to assist me in determining the most appropriate imaging study.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with the relative radiation doses associated with the various imaging modalities.</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: Post-lecture Feedback

- When asked on the post-lecture survey, “Would you like to see this lecture series, in some form, repeated in the future?”, 26/26 respondents (100%) answered “Yes”

- Free text comments on the post-lecture survey were almost entirely positive

Sample comments from post-lecture survey:

- “These lectures also provide a forum for dialogue between our departments.”
- “This lecture series should become a standard part of our academic curriculum. Superb presentations with great clinical relevance.”
- “Very well done and appropriate series! Keep it going!”
- “Really appreciated the Radiology department taking the time to educate us on the most appropriate tests to order.”
- “Awesome job by radiology residents and attendings. Would love to have you back next year”
- “the lectures were great! very helpful”
- “this series increased the "appropriateness" and "usefulness" of our ED weekly conference 100-fold!”
Discussion

• Our results indicate that a lecture series based on the ACR-AC can result in increased knowledge about appropriate utilization of medical imaging studies among EM practitioners in an academic emergency department.

• Additionally, our survey data suggests that a project like ours can improve comfort with using evidence-based guidelines for selecting imaging studies and be positively received by an EM training program.

Discussion

• Some limitations of our study:
  – We measured short-term knowledge using a quiz immediately after the relevant lecture; longer-term retention was not tested.
  – We did not directly evaluate whether any of the information transmitted by the lectures was translated into clinical practice in our ED.
  – Only a limited number of attending physicians participated in the lectures (constituting less than 10% of quiz responses). Our lectures were not attended by any nurse practitioners or other mid-level providers, though they have a role in ordering imaging studies in our ED.
Conclusion

• Given the increasing need to use evidence-based guidelines for diagnostic imaging selection in the ED setting, the possibility of improving practitioners’ knowledge about this topic by lecture-based instruction is very promising.

• Further study would be valuable to determine if these knowledge gains persist over time and, most importantly, if they translate into meaningful changes in clinical practice.
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