

Errors in Emergency and Trauma Radiology

Michael N. Patlas
Douglas S. Katz
Mariano Scaglione
Editors

Errors in Emergency and Trauma Radiology

Michael N. Patlas · Douglas S. Katz
Mariano Scaglione
Editors

Errors in Emergency and Trauma Radiology

 Springer

Editors

Michael N. Patlas
Department of Radiology
McMaster University
Hamilton, ON
Canada

Douglas S. Katz
Department of Radiology
NYU Winthrop Hospital
Mineola, NY
USA

Mariano Scaglione
Department of Imaging
Pineta Grande Medical Center
Castel Volturno, Caserta
Italy

ISBN 978-3-030-05547-9 ISBN 978-3-030-05548-6 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05548-6>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2019931966

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2019

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

To my parents, Ludmila and Dr. Natan Patlas, who showed me the way. To my wife Nataly who made me to believe in myself and continues to inspire me. To my children Michal and Jessica who make me happy and proud.

Michael N. Patlas

To Sebastian Isaiah, who will encounter some pitfalls and will probably make some errors along the way, but whom Darienne and I are confident will find the correct path, and who will have a great journey in life.

Douglas S. Katz, MD

To my parents, Pietro and Ida, for their encouragement, support, and love.

Mariano Scaglione

Foreword

Over the past half century, emergency radiology has come into being as a subspecialty on its own. Corresponding to a dynamic period in CT technology, the evolution of the specialty has been profound. What originally began as an area of interest for some has morphed into a discipline with a potential to make a vital difference in the care of acutely ill patients and victims of trauma.

As a radiologist who trained in the late 1990s, I witnessed firsthand how imaging made major inroads in the care of the emergency department (ED) patient. When I started residency in 1995, we routinely performed angiography for the evaluation of the potentially injured aorta. Some thought that CT would never achieve the accuracy needed for this potentially lethal injury. Over two decades later, it is hard to imagine diagnosing traumatic aortic injury without CT. With the added reliance on imaging, we all became aware of potential pitfalls. Of course, we all wished to be sensitive in our diagnoses but in the ED patient, specificity is equally as important. Chasing an artifact to exclude aortic injury can potentially be lethal in the setting of a pelvic fracture or grade 5 liver laceration.

CT for pulmonary embolism (PE) provides another such example. As a resident, angiography was rarely performed, and ventilation perfusion scintigraphy was the standard for the evaluation of a patient with suspected pulmonary embolism. CT was not felt to be ready to meet this challenge. Boy, how times have changed! A night in the ED rarely passes without at least one PE CT ordered. As with any widely accepted protocol, indication creep occurs and the number of truly positive studies for PE decreases. Understanding of the potential errors helps the reading radiologist make sure they find the unusual PE and prevent overdiagnosis.

In *Errors in Emergency and Trauma Radiology*, Drs. Patlas, Katz, Scaglione, and colleagues address the potential errors and pitfalls in the ED patient. By covering all organ systems, they bring together in one place all of the ways imaging can mislead us in the care of the ED patient. Specific chapters on select patient populations are also incredibly helpful in avoiding the traps of imaging in the ED. For the experienced ED reader, this work will serve as a nice review with creative approaches to reinforce techniques to improve accuracy. For the general reader, it helps put imaging findings in context so that the radiologist may make a meaningful difference and provide effective care in some of our most vulnerable patients.

Anyone taking call will appreciate *Errors in Emergency and Trauma Radiology* as a valuable, concise resource that will help diagnostic accuracy in the ED. Drs. Patlas, Katz, Scaglione, and colleagues deserve much credit for bringing these potential errors together in one place. These chapters represent a compendium of learning in the past half century that will help increase our value in the next half.

Sanjeev Bhalla, MD
Cardiothoracic Radiology, Emergency Radiology
Mallinckrodt Institute of Radiology
St Louis, MO
USA

Contents

1	Errors in Emergency and Trauma Radiology: General Principles	1
	Kate Hames, Michael N. Patlas, Vincent M. Mellnick, and Douglas S. Katz	
2	Mistakes in Imaging Interpretation of Traumatic and Non-traumatic Brain Emergencies	17
	Carlos Torres, Nader Zakhari, Francisco Rivas-Rodriguez, Angela Guarnizo-Capera, Ashok Srinivasan, and Diego Nunez	
3	Errors in Emergency and Trauma Radiology: C-Spine Imaging	35
	Sadia R. Qamar, Yuhao Wu, Luck Louis, and Savvas Nicolaou	
4	Errors in Imaging of Thoracic Trauma	63
	Ashwin Jain, John Lee, David Dreizin, Gene Kim, and Christina A. LeBedis	
5	Errors in Non-traumatic Thoracic Imaging	83
	Daria Manos	
6	Errors in Imaging of Abdominal and Pelvic Trauma	111
	Mariano Scaglione, Ettore Laccetti, Roberto Picascia, Michele Altiero, Francesca Iacobellis, Mathew Elameer, and Roberto Grassi	
7	Errors in Imaging of Non-traumatic Abdominal Emergencies	125
	Maria Zulfiqar, Vincent M. Mellnick, and Michael N. Patlas	
8	Errors in Imaging of the Acute Female Pelvis: Where Do They Occur and How Can We Reduce Them?	141
	Ania Z. Kielar, Shauna Duigenan, and Darcy J. Wolfman	
9	Errors in Acute Musculoskeletal Imaging	167
	Travis J. Hillen, Michael V. Friedman, and Jonathan C. Baker	
10	Mistakes in Emergency Imaging of Pregnant Patients	195
	Gabriele Masselli and Martina Derme	
11	Errors and Pitfalls in Emergency Pediatric Imaging	207
	Elka Miller, Gali Shapira-Zaltsberg, Rita Putnins, and Kristin Udjus	



Errors in Emergency and Trauma Radiology: General Principles

1

Kate Hames, Michael N. Patlas,
Vincent M. Mellnick, and Douglas S. Katz

In 2016, researchers estimated that more than 251,000 patients die in US hospitals annually as a result of preventable errors, ranking medical error as the third most common cause of death in the USA [1]. Many of these preventable deaths are due to diagnostic errors. Multiple large autopsy studies dating from 1957 [2] describe diagnostic error rates across all medical specialties ranging from anywhere between 5% and 47% [2–7]. Diagnostic errors in medicine are a major source of patient harm, and result in death more often than other medical errors including drug-related errors [8]. In addition to affecting patient morbidity and mortality, diagnostic errors also account for the leading type of paid claims (28.6%) and the highest proportion of total payments (35.2%) in malpractice lawsuits, with a 25-year sum of

diagnostic-related payments in the USA totalling \$38.8 billion [8].

A diagnostic error is defined as a medical error related to a missed, incorrect, or delayed diagnosis that is discovered by subsequent findings or tests [9, 10]. As medical imaging is central to the overall diagnostic process, it is logical to conclude that the incidence of diagnostic error (missed, incorrect, and delayed) is attributable, at least in part, to radiology-related errors [11]. For example, in a review of closed malpractice claims in the USA, diagnostic radiology was the sixth more frequent specialty involved [12], while approximately three out of four malpractice claims against radiologists mention errors in interpretation resulting in missed diagnoses [5, 13].

Radiology, similar to many other highly complex visual perception-based activities including air traffic control or operating nuclear power plants, relies on a sophisticated interplay of numerous psychophysiological factors and visual perception and is therefore prone to human error [14–17]. Radiological diagnosis also involves decision-making under conditions of often significant uncertainty in which the availability of clinical information, prior examinations, or use of proper technique may be variable [18]. These conditions are amplified in the fast-paced and high-stress environment of emergency and trauma centers in which the acuity of poly-trauma patients, involvement of a large multi-disciplinary team, and the need to make quick

K. Hames · M. N. Patlas (✉)
Department of Radiology, McMaster University,
Hamilton, ON, Canada
e-mail: kathleen.hames@medportal.ca;
patlas@hsc.ca

V. M. Mellnick
Department of Radiology, Mallinckrodt Institute of
Radiology, Washington University School of
Medicine, St. Louis, MO, USA
e-mail: mellnickv@wustl.edu

D. S. Katz
Department of Radiology, NYU Winthrop Hospital,
Mineola, NY, USA
e-mail: Douglas.Katz@nyulangone.org;
dkatz@nyuwinthrop.org

life-saving decisions all predispose the radiologist to interpretive error. Under such conditions of uncertainty, all diagnostic decisions therefore have inherent error rates [19].

In the first landmark study of its kind, in 1949, California radiologist L.H. Garland published an article entitled, “On the Scientific Evaluation of Diagnostic Procedures,” in which he demonstrated a surprising degree of inaccuracy in numerous clinical, laboratory, and radiological tests [20]. Regarding radiological examinations specifically, Garland discovered a 33% retrospective error rate among radiologists interpreting positive chest radiographs and a 2% overcall rate for normal examinations [21]. This retrospective experimental error rate translates into an error rate of approximately 3–5% when evaluating the prospective interpretation of all examinations during a routine clinical day [5]. Nearly 70 years later, despite remarkable technological advances in medical imaging, Garland’s findings on the incidence of radiological error remain nearly identical. From the 1950s to the present day, studies have repeatedly demonstrated the incidence of diagnostic error in radiology to be approximately 3–5% [17, 19, 22–30].

Unlike physical examination findings, radiological examinations are now easily accessible electronic databases which are available for subsequent scrutiny and analysis. Because of the accessibility and relative permanence of radiological examinations, the extensive collection of examinations also provides a robust data source from which not only to assess inter- and intra-observer variation, but also to retrospectively detect patterns in errors or discrepancies for educational purposes. As dozens of studies have repeatedly shown, radiological errors follow predictable patterns [5, 14, 18, 22, 30–35]. By analyzing these patterns, individual and system-wide measures may be enacted to help prevent similar errors from being made in the future.

1.1 General Errors in Radiology

Radiological errors may be categorized in multiple different ways [5, 11, 30, 32, 33, 36–42]. In the broadest terms, the cause of interpretive error

may be either internal (specific to the individual radiologist) or external (due to larger systemic failures). To subdivide these categories further, internal factors include both perceptual and cognitive errors. Among internal sources of error, perceptual errors account for approximately 60–80% of missed or delayed diagnoses in radiological interpretation [5, 11, 36–38]. A perceptual error occurs during the first step of image interpretation. For an error to be categorized as a perceptual error, the imaging finding must be deemed sufficiently conspicuous and detectable in retrospect by the initial radiologist or in the consensus of his or her peers [11]. As such, not all subtle or inconspicuous findings that are subsequently identified and found to represent a pathological process would be classified as perceptual errors [11]. Considering that the radiological error rate has remained stable at 3–5% for nearly 70 years as noted, it is reasonable to assume that every radiologist has committed a perceptual error: a miss that, in retrospect, may appear obvious to both the original radiologist and to her or his peers.

The psychophysiological and cognitive processes by which an obvious abnormality can simply go unseen when it is so clearly seen in retrospect have yet to be fully explained to anyone’s satisfaction. Although an increased incidence of perception error may be due to other specific risk factors including radiologist fatigue, interruptions, distractions, reading too rapidly, satisfaction of search, or various forms of cognitive bias as this chapter will discuss, most perceptual errors lack a clear identifiable cause. However, studies on radiologist perceptual errors from around the world, involving radiologists at all levels of training and experience and across all modalities, conclude that perceptual errors are not a result of carelessness or negligence; rather, perceptual errors are deemed a consequence of the physiological processes of human perception and an inherent feature of the complex system in which radiologists operate [11, 13, 14, 26, 37, 42, 43].

While perceptual errors account for approximately 60–80% of interpretive errors, the remaining 20–40% of internal errors may be classified

as cognitive errors [5, 11, 36–38]. Cognitive errors have been defined as “judgment errors” [5], “faulty reasoning” [22], or “logic fallacies” [44], in which an abnormality is identified, but its clinical significance is misinterpreted, resulting in an inaccurate diagnosis [11]. Cognitive errors may be a result of lack of knowledge, faulty reasoning, or a multitude of cognitive biases. Additionally, these biases may be secondary to undue influence of previous erroneous reports (known as an alliterative error) or misleading clinical information that misdirects the radiological gaze. However, interpretive errors are more likely due to a combination of multiple factors, both intrinsic and extrinsic to the radiologist interpreting the imaging examination.

Of the numerous cognitive biases that may influence a radiologist’s interpretive process, four primary types have been repeatedly identified as potential causes of diagnostic error: anchoring, framing, availability, and alliterative [11, 31, 44–46]. Anchoring bias occurs when the radiologist fails to alter his or her initial interpretation despite being provided with contrary information [11, 31, 44]. Framing bias occurs when the radiologist is unduly influenced by the wording or framing of the clinical problem, which leads to restricted diagnostic possibilities [31, 44]. Availability bias is defined as the propensity to consider a diagnosis that comes to mind more readily to be the correct diagnosis [11, 31, 44]. This is more likely to occur after the radiologist has committed an interpretive error, which predisposes him or her to mistakenly attribute the previously “missed” diagnoses to a similar finding in a subsequent patient [44]. An alliterative error occurs when the results from the interpretation of a previous imaging examination biases the radiologist toward the same diagnosis when interpreting the current examination, which results in a diagnostic error [11, 31, 44]. Another cognitive bias described by Bruno et al. [11] is the “zebra retreat,” which occurs when the radiologist resists proposing a rare diagnosis (despite supportive findings) due to the rarity of the diagnosis.

Additional cognitive errors include complacency, faulty reasoning, lack of knowledge on the part of the viewer, and underreading [30, 42,

47]. Underreading is the equivalent to a perceptual miss, where the finding is identifiable but was overlooked by the first radiologist [30, 42]. Complacency occurs when a finding is identified but is attributed to the wrong cause and not deemed pathological, while faulty reasoning occurs when a finding is seen and interpreted as abnormal but is subsequently attributed to an incorrect etiology [30, 42]. Satisfaction of search is another common radiological interpretive error and one that produces nearly as much frustration in the radiologist as perceptual errors. Satisfaction of search is the premature discontinuation of a diagnostic search pattern after a primary, usually more obvious abnormality is detected [34, 48–51]. Once a single prominent abnormality is identified, the “search for meaning” is satisfied, and the interpreter ceases to search for additional, usually more subtle abnormalities.

In addition to internal factors, there are numerous external factors that also play a substantial role in radiological error. These external, or system-based, factors include poor or limited radiological technique, lack of access to potentially relevant prior imaging, inadequate or misdirected clinical history, increasing volume and complexity of cases, staff shortages, constant interruptions, and reader fatigue, to list just a few of the more significant external sources potentially contributing to interpretive error [5, 18, 30, 32, 42, 44, 52]. The lack of prior imaging examinations, or the failure to review relevant examinations, also contributes to interpretive error [32, 42]. Both scenarios suggest that interconnected networks of electronic medical records including radiological examinations, and increased ease of access to such prior exams, would help reduce interpretive error.

The ever-increasing volume and complexity of radiological examinations, in addition to staff shortages, have led to mounting pressure on radiologists to read more in a shorter period, which in turn results in longer work hours and mounting reader fatigue, all of which contribute to diagnostic error [44, 53–57]. Not surprisingly, increasing one’s speed at image interpretation is also a source of error. Sokolovskaya et al. [58] demonstrated that when radiologists interpreted

examinations at twice the speed of their baseline, the number of significant errors increased from 10% to 26.6%. Constant interruptions and multi-tasking may also result in increased interpretive error. Balint et al. [59] studied the number of telephone calls on-call radiology residents received at night, and compared the increased interruptions to the rate of interpretive error (defined as a resident-attending discordant report). The study found that in the hour preceding the interpretive error, a single additional phone call above the baseline increased the likelihood of a major discrepancy by 12% [59].

One of the most important sources of radiological error occurs at the start of the imaging cycle with the examination requisition and clinical history. Pinto et al. [40] noted that the study of radiological errors has traditionally been limited to errors in the radiologist's report, which are frequently taken out of the larger diagnostic context, thereby omitting the integral role of the referring physicians. In the majority of studies on radiological errors, researchers have found that a relevant clinical history can improve diagnostic accuracy during both the perception and interpretation phases [46, 60–63]. Loy and Irwig's [60] examination of 16 studies analyzing the accuracy of reports with and without clinical history found that providing relevant clinical history improved the sensitivity of findings without decreasing specificity. Similarly, Leslie et al. [63] found that when referring clinicians provided a clinical history, radiologists changed 19% of their CT reports, more than half of which reflected major changes. Providing accurate clinical information also ensures that the appropriate radiological examination is performed, and ultimately assists the diagnostic workup [44, 46, 64].

While 40–54% of medical malpractice lawsuits against radiologists are due to diagnostic errors [65], the majority of the remaining legal complaints are due to failure to communicate the findings in a timely manner, and the failure to suggest the next appropriate procedure or examination (imaging or otherwise) [47]. Failure to communicate clinically significant findings rapidly is the fourth most frequent medical malpractice claim made against radiologists [66].

Therefore, it is in the patients' and the radiologists' best interests to communicate – and document – urgent findings quickly, and to explicitly recommend appropriate additional imaging or clinical/laboratory follow-up as necessary.

1.2 Errors in Emergency and Trauma Radiology

The potential for diagnostic error, whether due to perceptual errors, cognitive biases, or technical errors, is further magnified in emergency departments and trauma centers. The fast-paced setting and high-stress environment of emergency and trauma departments create a potential “perfect storm” for diagnostic errors: medically unstable and/or uncooperative patients, insufficient histories, multiple concurrent tasks, involvement of a large multidisciplinary trauma team, severity and complexity of trauma injuries, quick life-saving decisions, and often junior physicians with less experience working after hours when the trauma volume is typically highest [67–70]. Radiological errors may also be caused by radiologist fatigue and ocular strain from longer work hours, multiple interruptions, lack of prior imaging for comparison, the pressure to read examinations quickly, and the variable conspicuity of acute abnormalities in difficult-to-image poly-trauma patients. Patients who present to emergency and trauma departments are typically those with more acute injuries, and therefore carry an increased risk of morbidity and mortality at baseline. As such, the diagnostic errors committed in this acute setting carry a greater risk of severe complications and worse patient outcomes, including death.

Multiple studies evaluating missed injuries and delayed diagnoses in the emergency setting have been published, with a reported incidence of 1.3–39% [67, 71–77]. Among patients with missed injuries, 15–22.3% had clinically significant findings [77]. Gruen et al. [67] found that among trauma patients who died from recognizable errors, 16% died from delayed operative or angiographic control of an acute abdominal or pelvic hemorrhage, and 9% died from delayed intervention for on-going intratho-

racic hemorrhage. In autopsy studies involving poly-trauma patients, researchers found that the primary cause of death was due to severe hemorrhage from traumatic bronchopulmonary vessel injury [78]. Of all the missed injuries in emergency and trauma centers, Teixeira et al. [72] report that diagnostic errors are responsible for approximately 10–15% of preventable deaths in trauma center audits. As selective non-operative management has become increasingly feasible after abdominopelvic trauma, diagnosis of injuries requiring surgery or interventional radiology has become more imperative. As such, injuries missed on multi-detector computed tomography (MDCT) have the potential to result in more dire consequences.

Multiple studies have proven MDCT to be superior to both clinical evaluation and diagnostic peritoneal lavage for the diagnosis of clinically significant abdominal injuries in poly-trauma patients [71, 79–82]. Due to multiple factors including decreased consciousness, unreliable histories, and distracting injuries, clinical examination of trauma patients is frequently unreliable [69, 83]. A physical examination of a trauma patient with abdominal injuries is only about 60% reliable [69, 84, 85]. As missed abdominal injuries are a well-documented cause of increased morbidity and mortality in trauma patients [71, 81, 82], early detection of these injuries by CT is crucial to improving patient outcomes. MDCT is also critical to the assessment of head trauma, which is particularly difficult to assess clinically in many poly-trauma patients due to decrease levels of consciousness, distracting injuries, and drug and/or alcohol intoxication. Studies have shown that 25% of unconscious patients with a serious head injury have misleading or equivocal clinical findings on examination [69]. In patients with poly-trauma, blunt cerebral-vascular injuries with associated vertebral and/or carotid injuries in particular are frequently missed if they are only investigated with ultrasound, which has been shown to have a sensitivity of 38.5%, compared to a 100% sensitivity with CT angiography [86].

Over the past two decades, significant developments in CT technology, including faster image

acquisition, higher spatial resolution, multi-planar and 3D reformats, and decreased radiation, have resulted in the increased use of MDCT in the emergency setting. The integration of MDCT in emergency departments has improved both the speed and accuracy of diagnostic procedures and has led to early detection of clinically significant injuries [77, 87–89], thereby decreasing mortality in trauma patients [90]. With peritoneal lavage becoming increasingly obsolete [79, 91], the diagnosis of poly-trauma injuries, including acute arterial hemorrhage, now relies almost exclusively on the swift and accurate interpretation of findings from properly performed CT examinations acquired in a timely fashion [83]. In poly-trauma patients in particular, the panscan CT (head, chest, abdomen, pelvis, and full spine) is now considered the reference standard for the early assessment of acute potentially life-threatening injuries.

As a key member of the multidisciplinary trauma team, the radiologist not only plays a critical role in diagnosing acute life-threatening injuries but also helps direct the clinical decision-making process for surgical or conservative management. Therefore, errors in image acquisition and image interpretation may lead to suboptimal treatment and potential patient harm. Radiological errors in the emergency setting follow predictable patterns, and recognition of these patterns is crucial to avoiding error and improving patient outcomes.

1.3 Perception and Recognition Errors in Emergency Radiology

Although diagnostic radiology errors are often associated with perception, studies have shown that only 10% of interpretive errors are due to human perception or other nonvisual cues [67, 72, 92], while approximately 60% of radiologic errors are caused by poor technique or image quality [93, 94]. One of the most frequent causes of diagnostic error in trauma patients is the failure to identify fractures on radiographs, which accounts for 41–80% of interpretive errors

in the emergency department [17, 74, 95, 96]. Moreover, missed or delayed diagnosis of skeletal injuries, particularly fractures of the appendicular skeleton, accounts for the majority of malpractice claims against radiologists [74]. The most commonly missed fractures involve the periarticular regions, shoulder girdle, and feet [97]. Approximately 10% of missed fractures involve the spine, with the cranio-cervical junction (40–50%) and the cervicothoracic junction being the most common sites of missed injury [97]. While spinal fractures can have significant orthopedic and neurological implications, they may also direct the radiologist to other associated injuries. For example, although transverse process fractures are only associated with vertebral body fractures in 1% of cases, 50% of patients with transverse process fractures have intra-abdominal injuries [98, 99].

Due to the higher sensitivity and specificity of CT compared to traditional radiography [100], delayed or missed diagnoses of abdominal and pelvic injuries are less frequent than orthopedic injuries; however, interpretive errors in abdominopelvic injuries carry a greater risk of severe complications due to the potentially life-threatening nature of solid and hollow organ injury and active hemorrhage. Among solid organs, injuries of the liver and spleen each account for approximately 10–15% of missed or delayed diagnoses [97]. Although diaphragmatic injuries are relatively uncommon and represent only 5% of delayed diagnoses [101], they remain difficult to detect [102]. Radiological suspicion, attention to secondary signs, and use of multiplanar reconstructed CT images are crucial for the correct identification of diaphragmatic injuries. In addition, vascular injuries account for approximately 5% of delayed diagnoses [97]. In pediatric trauma patients, injuries to the ureteropelvic junction are overlooked in approximately 50% of affected patients on the initial image interpretation [103], which may be due to perceptual error as well as technical error if delayed CT images are not performed. More than 80% of female trauma patients with a previously unknown first-trimester pregnancy are not found to be pregnant during the initial evaluation prior to undergoing

CT examination, thereby exposing the embryo to potentially harmful radiation [104].

Other commonly missed injuries in trauma patients involve bowel and mesenteric injuries, which account for approximately 15–20% of diagnostic errors [105]. From a clinical perspective, acute bowel injury often implies surgical exploration, and missed or delayed diagnoses may significantly increase patient morbidity and mortality from sepsis and hemorrhage [106]. However, bowel and mesenteric injuries pose a unique challenge to radiologists, as 9.1–19.4% of patients with surgically proven bowel and mesenteric injuries do not have any identifiable findings on the preoperative MDCT [107, 108]. More recent surgical literature has shown an increased mortality in patients with a diagnostic delay in bowel injury in as little as 5 h [106]; therefore, Patlas et al. [109] suggest that it may be prudent to perform a follow-up CT in 6–8 h for patients with clinically suspected bowel injury or new clinical symptoms concerning for bowel injury.

In addition to recognition errors, interpretive errors may also occur when the radiologist appropriately identifies an abnormality, but mistakenly attributes it to an incorrect etiology. This type of error has been classified as faulty reasoning or a misclassification of a true-positive finding [30, 42]. Provenzale and Kranz [41] use the example of venous infarction and dural venous sinus thrombosis (DST) to illustrate this category of interpretive error. While the radiologist may accurately detect the presence of infarction, she or he may fail to appreciate a thrombosed cortical vein or dural sinus, and mistakenly interpret the finding as an arterial infarct. Similarly, when patients with DST receive IV contrast-enhanced CT and MRI, the abnormal dural enhancement due to collateral vessels may be mistaken for alternative pathologies such as neurosarcoidosis or dural metastases [41, 110].

Errors also occur when the radiologist mistakenly interprets a normal finding as abnormal, which has been described as overcalling or false-positive findings [41, 42, 70]. These findings may be attributed to poor technique, such as artifact, or anatomical variants mistaken for pathology. This type of diagnostic error is more

likely to occur among radiology residents or less experienced radiologists who both lack experience and who tend to be overly cautious [41]. For example, on CT images, respiratory motion artifact may produce an indistinct gray margin around the liver, spleen, kidney, abdominal wall, or ribs [70]. This linear or halo-like appearance may be mistaken for a subcapsular hematoma or even rib fractures [70]. Similarly, cardiac motion artifact in the mediastinum may obscure the aortic root and produce crescentic gray bands within the ascending aorta, which may be mistaken for acute aortic injury. In addition to motion artifact, anatomical variants such as a splenic cleft may also be mistaken for a low-grade splenic laceration [70]. Although this category of error may not result in immediate harm, unlike a missed acute positive finding, it may result in unnecessary hospital admission for observation [70] and unnecessary follow-up examinations, which may indirectly lead to patient harm.

In contrast to overcalling, under-calling is another type of diagnostic error that has the potential to contribute to patient morbidity and mortality. Under-calling occurs when the radiologist identified an abnormality but dismissed it as normal or secondary to artifact. While over-calling may occur more frequently among cautious junior radiologists, under-calling may be more common among experienced radiologists who are accustomed to seeing artifacts and are therefore seemingly more confident in their interpretations. Provenzale and Kranz [41] suggest under-calling may occur subconsciously, without deliberation about the nature of the findings; however, Scaglione et al. [69] suggest these types of errors may occur as a result of external pressure to reduce the number of false-positive interpretations in order to minimize unnecessary follow-up. It may be reasonable to assume these errors may also be a result of lack of knowledge, whereby an abnormality is identified, but because its etiology cannot be confidently deduced, it is erroneously dismissed as insignificant, thus resulting in a missed or delayed diagnosis.

In the faced-paced and high-pressure evaluation of poly-trauma patients, many of whom

present with potentially life-threatening injuries, radiologists are particularly vulnerable to satisfaction of search errors. In satisfaction of search errors, as previously described, once a major abnormality is identified, the radiologist may rapidly shorten her or his search time, thereby overlooking additional abnormalities [30]. As Berbaum et al. [51] noted, satisfaction of search errors are the result of a deliberate truncation of a search rather than a faulty search pattern. Poly-trauma patients, by definition, present with multiple injuries, many of which may be life-threatening. It is therefore the radiologist's responsibility to quickly and accurately identify the most urgent findings that require immediate surgical or other clinical interventions, carefully characterize the findings, and directly communicate critical findings to the appropriate clinical team members. When injuries such as active vascular extravasation, acute aortic injury, pneumoperitoneum, or massive pneumothorax are identified, the radiologist may focus on these findings, and inadvertently abbreviate the remainder of the search, thereby overlooking more subtle, but potentially just as clinically significant abnormalities.

Due to the acuity of patients in the emergency department and the speed with which clinical decisions must be made, strong communication between the radiologist and the treating physician is critical. In many instances, a final written report is not sufficient, as the time delay between the radiologist completing the report and the ER physician or surgeon reading the report is unpredictable. This delay in communication is one of the most frequent causes of medical malpractice claims made against radiologists [66]. In cases of acute, life-threatening findings that require immediate intervention, direct verbal communication between the radiologist and clinician may avoid delays in treatment and prevent any confusion about the severity of injury. Documentation of all verbal reports should include the date, time, name of the clinician(s) with whom the radiologist discussed the findings, and a detailed account of what was discussed [111].

Another important communication error occurs when the radiologist does not expressly