Journal of Namibian Studies, 25 S1 (2019) : 56-60 ISSN: 2197-5523 (online)

An Examination Of Perceptual Proficiency In Radiology: Present Understanding And An Innovative Approach

Yousif Hammad Alshammari[1] , Jasem Mohammad Alonazy[2] , Abdulaziz Khlef Alanazi[3] , Bandar Ayed Alruhaimi[4] , Samiyah Moqhim Almutairi[5] , Abdulmohsen Sulaiman Almutib[6] , Salman Ghassab almutairi[7], Khalid saad almajed[8]

[1-6, 8]Radiology technologist
[7]Radiology technician

Abstract:
The primary method used by radiologists to identify, characterize, and categorize findings in medical images is visual inspection. Future generations of radiologists must be taught to understand the path to radiologic expertise during image analysis, since the majority of interpretive errors in radiology are perceptual in nature. We examine the perceptual tasks and difficulties associated with radiologic diagnosis, talk about radiologic image perception models, explore the use of perceptual learning techniques in medical education, and propose a fresh way of looking at perceptional expertise. Raising the level of perceptual expertise among radiologists through specific, principled improvements to educational practices holds the potential to improve training and lower medical error rates.

Keywords: Visual Perception, Expertise, Radiology, Visual Search, Perceptual Learning, Attention, Holistic Processing.

Introduction

In radiology, optimizing perceptual expertise is highly relevant from a practical standpoint. To improve abnormality recognition, one of the main objectives of radiology education is to teach beginners how to create sophisticated, or "expert," search strategies (Wood, 1999). The fundamental ideas of radiologic expertise have significance outside of the field in which radiologists work because juries and legislators rely on them to testify and inform them of relevant medical standards (Andrew, 2006; Berlin et al., 2006). However, over the past 70 years, despite ongoing efforts to improve radiology education, the error rate in radiological readings has not decreased (Garland, 1949; Berlin, 2007), continuing to hover around 33% for abnormal studies (Waite et al., 2017). This issue, exacerbated by growing imaging volumes and examination complexity, necessitates a deeper comprehension of In this review, we argue that a lack of understanding of the mechanisms underlying expertise has contributed to radiology's error rate's resistance to improvement. We also suggest that until the precise nature of radiology expertise is understood, no principled theories for improvement will be developed.

What Is Involved in Radiologic Expertise?
Medical professionals who specialize in radiology diagnosis and treatment employ a range of medical imaging methods, including computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), Positron emission tomography (PET), ultrasound, and x-rays. Expertise in radiology is primarily perceived as perceptual, characterized by refined visual search patterns and diagnostic accuracy, in addition to an ever-expanding corpus of "fact-based" knowledge about anatomy, radiological pathology, physics, and clinical medicine (Kelly et al., 2016). As a result, skilled radiologists are better able to identify anomalies than non-skilled ones and know which ones to ignore (Gunderman and Patel, 2019).

Examination of Medical Imaging:
Fundamentally, there are two steps involved in image analysis: visual inspection and interpretation (Krupinski, 2010). In general, diagnostic radiology comprises four main tasks: (1) identifying potentially important findings that require additional investigation; (2) determining whether the findings are pathologic; (3) classifying the lesion according to its specific type; and (4) making a diagnosis. Since all subsequent steps leading to diagnosis depend on the effectiveness of detection, the first task—detection—has the utmost significance (Gray et al., 1978).

Rates of Error in Radiology:
When compared to the consensus of a group of experts, Garland (1949) found that radiologists made errors in 33% of cases when interpreting positive films (films that contain an abnormality). The diagnostic error rate in a typical clinical practice (which includes both abnormal and normal studies) is about 4% (Siegle et al., 1998), which equates to about 40 million interpretive errors annually globally (Bruno et al., 2015). While there are many ways to categorize radiologic error (Kim and Mansfield, 2014), perceptual errors and cognitive errors are typically recognized as the two main types of interpretive error (Bruno et al., 2015). When a positive result is correctly determined but is then misclassified as

a result offlawed logic or a lack, It's also critical to recognize false positive errors, which are less well covered in the literature. False positive errors are a significant issue with screening exams; they make patients anxious and frequently lead to more needless tests and procedures (Castells et al., 2016).

Interpretive errors are unlikely to be solely the result of subpar radiologists given their prevalence (Brady, 2017). In fact, considering the high rate of interpretive errors in nearly every radiologic scenario— across various imaging modalities, and in private practice as well as academic settings—it is more likely that resident education and the processes used to identify prospective radiology trainees are not any better today than they were seventy years ago.

The Growth of Radiology Perceptual Expertise:

Kelly et al. discovered that while diagnostic accuracy in pneumothorax detection improved later in training, some ocular metrics (like time to first fixation) did not. The findings of the same study indicate that expert gaze dynamics are learned more quickly than diagnostic abilities and that they plateau relatively early in formal residency training. Consultants (equivalent USA rank: attending) and registrars (equivalent USA rank: fellow) showed significant differences in diagnostic accuracy but not in ocular metrics (Kelly et al., 2016).

Eye tracking metrics and performance on questions involving image interpretation indicate that the development of image analysis skills outpaces that of factual knowledge. Factual knowledge specific to radiology plays a minor role in the initial development of radiologists' perceptual skills, which start to grow as soon as they are exposed to imaging (Ravesloot et al., 2017).

Obstacles to the Useful Definition of Specialization:

There are several reasons why the functional definition of expertise in the literature is inadequate. According to Gunderman et al. (2001), radiologic learners are frequently categorized into general categories such as experts versus novices, which drastically oversimplifies reality and ignores intermediate training stages. According to Kundel et al. (2007), even studies that include intermediate stages in their analyses classify their participants based on their professional training level. In fact, a thorough meta-analysis of eye tracking studies in professional fields revealed that professional training levels and/or years of experience were the only factors used to determine expertise in 6 out of 8 studies based on radiology (Gegenfurtner et al., 2011). According to Fox and Faulkner-Jones (2017), experimental designs typically involve three participant groups at most, classifying radiology residents as intermediate-level professionals and medical students as novices.

Subspecialty Training's Function:

Some writers have suggested that radiology groups adopt a subspecialization model in light of the growing specialization in medicine (Strax, 2012; Gunderman and Stevens, 2014; Arenson, 2018). In fact, a number of studies have demonstrated that subspecialists outperform general radiologists in their respective subfields in terms of accuracy (Sickles et al., 2002; Briggs et al., 2008; Bell and Patel, 2014; Kligerman et al., 2018). This may be because subspecialists have more specialized networks with other medical specialists in their field who can offer timely feedback. Focusing on a specific area of study could therefore be a means of obtaining the volume of cases and feedback required to guarantee expertise.

Recommendations:

We suggest that identifying the specific differences between abnormalities and normal tissue—that is, the textures that provide the most information—and then training medical professionals to use their peripheral vision to identify these textures can help them identify abnormalities in medical images. Instead of waiting (and hoping) for sensitivity improvements to occur during routine radiologic practice, this knowledge could enable focused perceptual learning, which would supplement conceptual knowledge and provide the exposure to abnormalities necessary for sensitivity improvements to occur during residency.

Furthermore, our literature review highlights the need for a more thorough comprehension of individual differences in oculomotor behavior related to expertise, particularly concerning the informativeness of image regions. We might be able to optimize heuristics for training on each of these skills by carefully describing their contributions to the radiologist's toolkit (as well as any possible overlap).

Conclusion:

For the foreseeable future, radiologic interpretation will probably still require human intervention, despite recent advancements in computer- aided detection (CAD) and machine learning algorithms. While many radiologists fear artificial intelligence (AI) will replace them, the majority of academics now believe AI will complement radiologists rather than replace them. In order to increase accuracy and lower medical error, educational and practical interventions to improve human perception and decision-making skills will continue to be required in a future where radiologists are required as component human authorities.

References:

1. Alexander R. G., Zelinsky G. J. (2009). The frankenbear experiment: looking for part-based similarity effects on search guidance with complex objects. J. Vis. 9 1184–1184. 10.1167/9.8.1184.
2. Andriole K. P., Wolfe J. M., Khorasani R., Treves S. T., Getty D. J., Jacobson F.

   L. (2011). Optimizing analysis, visualization, and navigation of large image data sets: one 5000-section CT scan can ruin your whole day. Radiology 259 346–362. 10.1148/radiol.11091276.
3. Andriole K. P., Wolfe J. M., Khorasani R., Treves S. T., Getty D. J., Jacobson F.

   L. (2011). Optimizing analysis, visualization, and navigation of large image data sets: one 5000-section CT scan can ruin your whole day. Radiology 259 346–362.
4. Anton-Erxleben K., Carrasco M. (2013). Attentional enhancement of spatial resolution: linking behavioural and neurophysiological evidence. nature reviews. Neuroscience 14 188–200.
5. Arenson R. L. (2018). Factors affecting interpretative accuracy: how can we reduce errors? Radiology 287 213–214.
6. Armato S. G., McLennan G., Bidaut L., McNitt-Gray M. F., Meyer C. R., Reeves A.

   P. (2011). The lung image database consortium (LIDC) and image database resource initiative (IDRI): a completed reference database of lung nodules on CT scans. Med. Phys. 38 915–931.
7. Balas B., Nakano L., Rosenholtz R. (2009). A summary-statistic representation in peripheral vision explains visual crowding. J. Vis. 9:13.
8. Banaste N., Caurier B., Bratan F., Bergerot J. F., Thomson V., Millet I. (2018). Whole-body CT in patients with multiple traumas: factors leading to missed injury. Radiology 289 374–383.
9. Bass J. C., Chiles C. (1990). Visual skill. correlation with detection of solitary pulmonary nodules. Invest. Radiol. 25 994–998.
10. Beam C. A., Conant E. F., Sickles E. A. (2006). Correlation of radiologist rank as a measure of skill in screening and diagnostic interpretation of mammograms. Radiology 238 446–453.
11. Bergen J. R. (1991). “Theories of visual texture perception,” in Vision and Visual Dysfunction, ed. Regan D. (New York, NY: Macmillan;), 114–134.