



1. From the Pending Dictation Reporting window, select the Peer Review option from the Selected Attachments or Selected Report panes. Studies not signed by you (the logged in Radiologist) *and* in signed status are displayed.



**Note** that only the studies in signed status *and* not signed by you are available for peer review. A prompt will notify the user of this if another selection is made. Also, any study read by an inactive Radiologist will not be presented for peer review.

2. Select a study to peer review. The Peer Review window displays. The performed data, accession number, procedure performed, patients name, MRN and date of birth are all shown.



Peer Review

Performed: 04-06-2015 1:27 PM    Acc #: 1067865  
Procedure: MA Digital Mammo Diag Bilat [G0204]  
Patient: O'Dell, Jayne Demo 47y 5m (F)  
MRN: z40000004    DOB: 01-04-19...

1 - Concur  
 2 - Discrepancy - understandable  
 3 - Discrepancy - should have been made  
 4 - Discrepancy - misinterpretation

Likely to be clinically significant

Notes:  
Enter notes

1 - Concur with interpretation

OK    Cancel

The window presents seven possible scoring options—values 1-4 plus a checkbox that is activated if values 2, 3, or 4 are selected. Thus, the scoring possibilities are:

- 1      Select option 1 to concur with the interpretation.
- 2a     Select option 2 and clear the checkbox.  
        This indicates a miss on the interpretation that is understandable and *unlikely* to be clinically significant
- 2b     Select option 2 and check the checkbox.  
        This indicates a miss on the interpretation that is understandable but *likely* to be clinically significant.
- 3a     Select option 3 and clear the checkbox.  
        This indicates a discrepancy that the original radiologist should have caught during interpretation but that is *unlikely* to be clinically significant.

3b Select option 3 and check the checkbox.  
This indicates a discrepancy that the original radiologist should have caught during interpretation and that is *likely* to be clinically significant.


4a Select option 4 and clear the checkbox.  
This indicates a misinterpretation that is *unlikely* to be clinically significant.

4b Select option 4 and check the checkbox.  
This indicates a misinterpretation that is *likely* to be clinically significant.

3. Make a selection and enter comments in the Notes field. A prompt will indicate whether Notes are required (if the score passes a certain threshold).

Once a study is peer reviewed, it is sent (if it meets the Peer Review score threshold) to the “All Peer Review Pending Action” worklist. This worklist can be accessed from the Radiologist and Editor menus and each is controlled by its own new access string.

This worklist shows the score and score description along with some details attached to the Peer Review and the study itself. From this worklist, the user can “Mark as Completed,” which removes the item from the worklist, or double-click to review.



Site	Peer Review Score	Description	Clinically Significant	Peer Reviewed By	Peer Reviewed Date	Interpretation Peer Review Key	Peer Review Ver
156] - Cervical spine	Maple 3b	Discrepancy in interpretation/should be made most of time - Likely to be significant	✓	eRAD Skinner, Chris (chriss)	06-08-2017 10:47 AM	9	1