From the Cockpit to Control Room: Engineering Aviation-Grade Safety into Radiology

Executive Summary

Every day, millions of patients depend on radiology to guide their diagnosis and treatment. Yet unlike the aviation industry, which has engineered safety into every process, radiology operates in fragmented systems where critical errors remain common. This policy paper presents a compelling case for adopting aviation grade safety standards in radiology departments, supported by rigorous data from the United States, United Kingdom, international sources and proven implementation frameworks.

The evidence demonstrates significant opportunity: more than one in ten patients experience harm in medical care settings, with approximately 12% of adverse events causing permanent disability or patient death. In radiology specifically, diagnostic errors occur in approximately 3 to 5% of radiological studies, while up to 30% of radiology reports contain discrepancies, with 11 to 12% impacting clinical outcomes.

By contrast, aviation has achieved a fatal accident rate of 1 per 880,000 flights, with an individual needing to fly every day for approximately 15,871 years to experience a fatal accident. This transformation was not achieved through better pilots alone, but through standardized protocols, structured communication, simulation training, and a culture of continuous improvement that healthcare systems are now positioned to adopt.

The case for change is both moral and financial. Diagnostic errors cause an estimated 795,000 serious harms annually in the USA alone, while medical malpractice claims reached 11,440 nationally in 2023, resulting in $4.8 billion in settlements. Contrastingly, in the UK, clinical negligence claim costs have more than tripled in two decades, rising from £1.1 billion in 2006 to 2007 to £3.6 billion in 2024 to 2025, with projections indicating costs will reach £4.1 billion by 2029 to 2030. In India, the situation is equally urgent: medical negligence cases have witnessed a 110% rise in consumer court filings, with courts awarding compensation ranging from ₹15 lakh to ₹11 crore in landmark cases.

This paper outlines a practical roadmap for transforming radiology departments into high reliability organizations by implementing evidence-based safety frameworks, structured communication protocols, simulation training, real time dashboards, and a just culture. The result: improved patient outcomes, reduced litigation risk, enhanced operational efficiency, and stronger institutional trust.

Radiology: Your Hospital's Flight Deck

Radiology is no longer a support service; it is the diagnostic control centre of modern medicine. Imaging findings guide cancer diagnoses, drive trauma protocols, inform stroke pathways, and shape surgical decisions. Much like an aircraft's cockpit, it is the primary source of situational awareness for the entire medical crew. From the emergency department to oncology, no clinical team moves forward without the "clearance" provided by diagnostic imaging.

When the flight deck operates with precision, the hospital stays on course; when it faces turbulence, either through missed findings or communication gaps, the "cost of harm" ripples through every department, affecting both patient survival and hospital solvency. As of 2026, the NHS reports that over 50 million diagnostic imaging tests are performed annually in England, making it the most frequently deployed diagnostic tool in healthcare.

The Post-Pandemic Pressure Gap

This "flight deck" seems to be operating under extreme turbulence. The Royal College of Radiologists (RCR) 2024/25 Census, highlights a **29% shortfall** in the consultant workforce, a deficit projected to reach **39% by 2029**.

- **The Demand Mismatch:** While the radiology workforce grew by 4.7% last year, the demand for complex CT and MRI imaging increased by 8%, creating a widening "reporting gap" that leads to systemic delays.
- **The Error Rate:** Working under these conditions has a human cost. HSSIB (Health Services Safety Investigations Body) reports in 2026 that approximately **20% of lung cancers** are initially missed on chest X-rays, often due to perceptual errors and the sheer volume of cases.
- **The Tracking Gap:** The "lost" result remains a critical failure point. In a 2025 thematic review, investigators found that **failed communication or follow-up of unexpected radiological findings** is a recurring theme in avoidable patient harm, particularly in oncology.

The Escalating "Cost of Harm"

The financial and legal implications of these diagnostic gaps have reached record highs. For policy-makers, the "cost of harm" is now a staggering line item:

- **Liability Crisis:** NHS Resolution's 2024/25 Annual Report identifies that the government's total provision for clinical negligence claims has hit **£60 billion**.
- **Radiology's Share:** While other specialties have seen claim volumes stabilize, radiology reported a **30% increase** in settled claims, one of the largest percentage increases across all medical specialties, primarily due to failures in diagnostic accuracy and result communication.

- **Non-Compliance:** Audits continue to show that nearly half of all reviewed cases fail to strictly follow RCR guidelines on reporting clinically significant unexpected findings, meaning the "safety net" is currently fragmented.

Systemic Solutions for a Digital Era

These variations are not a reflection of individual skill, but of system fatigue. Research shows that system-related factors contribute to diagnostic error in 65% of cases, driven by overstretched workflows and technical infrastructure that has not kept pace with demand.

Because radiology is inherently digital and structured, it is also the medical domain most suited to **targeted systematic solutions**. By automating the "closing of the loop", ensuring every scan is not just performed, but reported, communicated, and acted upon, hospitals can mitigate multi-billion pound risks and, more importantly, ensure that the "Flight Deck" remains a place of safety.

Why Does Aviation Get It Right?

Commercial aviation has achieved something which healthcare has not been able to: engineered reliability.

In 2024, seven fatal accidents occurred among 40.6 million flights, yielding an accident rate of 1.13 per million flights, one accident per 880,000 flights. Put another way, an individual would need to fly every day for approximately 15,871 years to experience a fatal accident.

This exceptional safety did not emerge from hiring the best pilots. It emerged from recognizing a fundamental truth: human beings are fallible, and complex systems must be designed to absorb and mitigate human error.

Aviation's operational framework rests on several interdependent pillars:

Structured Communication and Crew Resource Management (CRM). CRM formalizes how teams interact, communicate uncertainty, and escalate problems before they cascade. Implementation of CRM in intensive care units was associated with a lower incidence of predefined complications in critically ill patients, reduced cardiac arrests, and higher CPR success rates. In aviation, CRM is mandatory for all flight crew, cabin crew, and technical staff, not a one time event, but integrated into annual recurrent training.

Standardized Protocols and Checklists. Aviation operates with detailed, regularly audited protocols for every phase of operation: pre-flight, in flight, and post flight. These protocols are standardized across all aircraft and all teams, reducing dangerous variation. In aviation, compliance isn’t merely a checkbox exercise, but an exercise to ensure all loops around safety mechanisms are closed.

Simulation Training. Pilots train regularly in high fidelity simulators for rare but catastrophic scenarios. This approach translates directly to healthcare. Meta analytic evidence shows that technology enhanced simulation training for healthcare professionals yields an overall effect size of 0.80 compared with traditional teaching, with the greatest impact on expert rated product metrics such as procedural success and process metrics such as efficiency. The impact is particularly strong for nurses, nursing students, and resident physicians.

Just Culture. Aviation encourages transparent reporting of near misses and errors without the fear of punishment, distinguishing between human error, at risk behaviour, and reckless action. This creates a learning system rather than a blame focused one.

Real Time Monitoring and Feedback. Modern aircraft are instrumented to the point where every significant parameter is tracked, logged, and available for analysis. Trends are monitored, and corrective action is taken proactively.

The result: not zero accidents, an unrealistic standard for any complex system, but a catastrophically low rate of preventable harm.

Where Radiology Falls Short

Diagnostic Errors and Communication Gaps

Radiology errors follow predictable patterns. Approximately 3 to 5% of radiological studies contain errors in daily practice, and surprisingly, this number seems to be a constant statistic that has remained unchanged since the 1960s , with retrospective analysis revealing error rates as high as 30%. More critically, 36% of abnormal radiology results fail to be acknowledged by referring physicians, with 4% lost to follow up entirely. In the UK Emergency Department specifically, among 2,288 confirmed diagnostic errors, 1,973 (86%) were delayed diagnoses and 315 (14%) were wrong diagnoses, with 25% of these involving inappropriate response to diagnostic imaging.

The Burden of Harm

Diagnostic errors are not benign. The USA experiences an estimated 795,000 serious misdiagnosis related harms annually, encompassing permanent morbidity and mortality, derived from the 'Big Three' dangerous disease categories: vascular events, infections, and cancers. At the population level, unsafe care causes more than 3 million preventable deaths globally each year.

In the UK NHS, the scale of patient safety incidents is substantial: 832,301 incidents were reported in Quarter 4 2024 to 2025 (January to March 2025), with 4,777 (0.64%) resulting in fatal outcomes and 38,025 (5.11%) causing moderate harm. While not all incidents are

radiology related, imaging errors represent a significant proportion of serious incidents with preventable harm.

Financial Impact and Litigation

The financial consequences are staggering. In 2023, there were 11,440 national malpractice claims reported to the National Practitioner Data Bank, resulting in settlement payouts of $4.8 billion, an average of approximately $420,000 per claim. More troubling, claims exceeding $2 million rose from 0.3% in 1990 to 3.2% in 2023, with such high severity claims now accounting for 24% of total malpractice payouts, the highest share since the early 2000s.

The UK situation reflects even more dramatic escalation. Clinical negligence claim costs have more than tripled over two decades: from £1.1 billion in 2006 to 2007 to £3.6 billion in 2024 to 2025. More concerning, NHS legal costs have risen from £76 million in 2006 to 07 to £159 million in 2024 to 25. Looking forward, NHS Resolution and the Government Actuary's Department estimate that the cost of clinical negligence cases will reach £4.1 billion by 2029 to 2030, continuing the upward trajectory.

In India, the trend is even more alarming. Medical negligence cases have increased by 110%, with courts awarding landmark compensation, notably, an ₹11 crore award by the Supreme Court for wrongful death due to medical negligence, representing the largest compensation in Indian medical negligence litigation history.

Root Causes: Systems, Not People

The barriers to safer radiology are well understood but rarely addressed holistically:

- **Fragmentation across departments and IT systems:** Healthcare lacks unified workflows across facilities and specialties. Radiology information systems (RIS) often do not integrate with electronic health records or picture archiving and communication systems (PACS), creating information silos.
- **Professional silos:** Radiologists, technologists, referring clinicians, and administrators often operate in isolation. Decision making power is dispersed, making standardization difficult to enforce.
- **Resistance to standardization:** Some clinicians perceive protocols as restrictive. Without organizational mandate and leadership buy in, compliance remains inconsistent.
- **Workload and time pressure:** In high volume settings, safety initiatives feel burdensome unless tightly integrated into workflows. Radiologists managing 100+ studies daily have little time for additional processes.
- **Lack of unified governance:** Without system wide oversight, safety efforts remain localized and inconsistent. In the UK, despite Royal College of Radiologists guidance, compliance audits show only 95 to 97% adherence to standard reporting criteria in even best case pilot implementations.

Applying the Aviation Model to Radiology

The question is not whether aviation's model can apply to radiology, but how to implement it systematically. The following framework is evidence based and already being piloted by leading hospital systems in the USA, UK, and India.

Structured Communication and Closed Loop Protocols

Replace ad hoc notification with standardized, documented workflows. Critical findings must follow a closed loop process: radiologist reports, referring clinician acknowledges, action is documented.

Example protocol aligned with Royal College of Radiologists guidance:

- **Critical findings (requiring emergency action immediately):** Phone call + electronic notification + documentation of acknowledgment within 30 minutes
- **Urgent findings (requiring evaluation within 24 hours):** Electronic notification + documented acknowledgment within 2 hours
- **Unexpected significant findings:** Electronic notification + documented acknowledgment within 24 hours

Implementation of such policies has demonstrated measurable improvements in physician adherence to critical result communication protocols.

Standardized Reporting and Protocols

Establish institution-wide standards aligned with Royal College of Radiologists guidance for report structure and content, MRI safety checklists, contrast administration protocols, vetting and appropriateness criteria for imaging requests, and escalation procedures for unexpected or discrepant findings.

Audit these protocols monthly. Track protocol drift (deviation from standards) and investigate root causes. Recent UK audits demonstrate that even with clear RCR guidelines, achieving 95% compliance requires structured audit cycles and focused quality improvement initiatives. Additionally, guided reporting strategies that provide structured templates have been shown to minimize error rates and reduce combined reading and reporting times, with streamlining evidence demonstrating that radiologists can learn these new processes quickly.

Simulation Training and Competency Assessment

Implement quarterly high fidelity simulation sessions covering contrast reactions and anaphylaxis management, equipment failures and troubleshooting, code blue in the MRI suite, difficult communication scenarios, and response to adverse events.

Research confirms that simulation based training yields an effect size of 0.80 compared with traditional teaching, with the strongest results for procedural success and efficiency metrics.

These benefits are particularly pronounced for nurses, nursing students, and resident physicians. Recent systematic reviews confirm that interventions to improve safety culture, when implemented with fidelity, significantly enhance teamwork and collaboration, leadership support for safety, and reporting within just culture frameworks.

Real Time Dashboards and Audits

Track and display (in real time or weekly) report turnaround times by modality and shift, critical result communication rates and acknowledgment times, error rates and near misses, protocol adherence metrics, and comparison across teams and shifts.

These dashboards transform auditing from a compliance checkbox into a learning tool, enabling rapid identification of system problems. UK hospitals implementing such dashboards report significant improvements in communication timeliness and error detection. Organizations implementing comprehensive quality improvement initiatives have documented streamlined processes with lower reading times, minimized error rates, and measurable reductions in therapeutic faults and litigation.

Just Culture and Transparent Reporting

Establish a non punitive reporting system for near misses and errors. Distinguish between:

- **Human error:** Unintentional mistakes by competent professionals (no punishment, focus on system improvement)
- **At risk behaviour:** Choices that increase risk (requires coaching and retraining)
- **Reckless action:** Deliberate disregard for safety (subject to disciplinary action)

This framework, adapted from aviation, creates psychological safety and encourages transparency without sacrificing accountability.

Opportunities and Challenges

Opportunities

Implementing aviation grade safety in radiology yields tangible benefits. **Better patient outcomes and reduced litigation exposure:** Over 80% of identified diagnostic adverse events are preventable, with the main causes being human errors stemming from system failures rather than individual incompetence. Standardizing protocols, communication, and training directly addresses these preventable errors. Furthermore, structured guided reporting and quality improvement initiatives have been shown to reduce reporting errors, leading to fewer therapeutic faults and lawsuits against radiologists.

Stronger safety culture: Structured safety practices and transparent reporting promote team accountability and shared vigilance. Staff report higher job satisfaction and lower burnout

when they feel part of a system designed to protect them and their patients. Hospitals with accredited patient safety programs report 77.5% positive response rates for management support for patient safety and 81.8% for organizational learning, representing strong organizational commitment to safety.

Reduced variation across sites and teams: Standardized protocols aligned with RCR guidance increase predictability and auditability, making radiology performance more consistent and benchmarkable.

Improved efficiency: Contrary to intuition, safety systems reduce waste. Standardized protocols minimize scan repetition due to unclear technique. Closed loop communication prevents downstream delays. Faster turnaround times follow naturally from clear workflows.

Challenges

Realistic implementation requires acknowledging barriers. **Fragmentation across systems and departments:** Healthcare institutions often lack unified IT infrastructure. Radiology systems may not integrate with EHR or PACS. Addressing this requires investment in interoperable technology and governance.

Professional silos and resistance: Radiologists may view protocols as threatening autonomy. Referring clinicians may resist new communication requirements. Overcoming resistance requires visible leadership support, clinician engagement in protocol design, and clear communication of the rationale. UK audits show that even with RCR guidelines available, compliance remains inconsistent without structured organizational commitment.

Workload and time pressure: Adding processes without reducing overall workload compounds frustration. Effective implementation requires workflow redesign, not simply task addition. This may require temporary staffing augmentation. UK data indicates that 54% of NHS hospitals do not have working time regulations compliant provision of seven day radiology services, creating additional pressure and risk.

Lack of unified governance: Without clear leadership mandate, safety initiatives become voluntary and inconsistent. Successful implementation requires radiologist leadership, IT support, and administrative commitment from the C suite.

Training and change management: Simulation training, protocol training, and culture change all require investment in time, personnel, and resources. Without structured change management, initiatives fail or remain superficial.

Economic Case and Strategic Return on Investment

For healthcare leaders and policymakers, patient safety is not only a clinical priority but also a strategic and financial imperative. Radiology safety programs represent one of the few quality initiatives capable of delivering measurable returns across multiple dimensions: risk reduction, operational efficiency, regulatory readiness, and institutional reputation. When

evaluated through a system-wide lens, the economic case for aviation-grade safety frameworks becomes compelling.

Direct Financial Impact

Reduced malpractice exposure and litigation costs

Diagnostic errors remain among the most costly categories of medical negligence claims. In the United States alone, malpractice payouts reached $4.8 billion in 2023, with average settlements exceeding $420,000 per claim. In the United Kingdom, the projected annual cost of clinical negligence is expected to reach £4.1 billion by 2030. Even a modest reduction in diagnostic errors or communication failures can therefore generate significant financial protection for hospitals and healthcare systems.

Structured communication protocols, closed-loop reporting systems, and standardized escalation pathways directly target the most common causes of radiology litigation: missed findings, delayed diagnoses, and unacknowledged critical results. Preventing even a handful of high-severity claims annually can offset the cost of implementing comprehensive safety programs.

Reduction in unnecessary repeat imaging

Workflow standardization and guided reporting reduce repeat scans caused by protocol inconsistencies, incomplete imaging requests, or unclear diagnostic findings. In high-volume hospitals performing tens of thousands of imaging studies annually, even a small reduction in repeat imaging translates into meaningful cost savings through decreased scanner utilization, reduced contrast usage, and lower staffing burden.

Improved throughput and reduced length of stay

Reporting delays frequently can cascade into extended patient stays, delayed procedures, and inefficiencies across clinical departments. Real-time reporting dashboards and standardized workflows help ensure predictable turnaround times, enabling faster clinical decision making and improving hospital throughput.

For hospitals operating under fixed reimbursement models or value-based care frameworks, even marginal reductions in average length of stay can translate into substantial financial gains.

Strategic and Organizational Benefits

Workforce sustainability and retention

Radiology professionals increasingly operate under intense workload pressure, with workforce shortages reported across many healthcare systems. Safety frameworks that

emphasize structured workflows, clear escalation pathways, and psychological safety through just culture models reduce the cognitive burden placed on clinicians.

Organizations that invest in safety infrastructure consistently report improved staff morale, reduced burnout, and stronger workforce retention, an increasingly critical advantage in an environment of global radiology workforce shortages.

Regulatory alignment and accreditation readiness

Safety-driven radiology systems align closely with international accreditation frameworks such as NABH (India), JCI, and ACR(USA) quality standards. Hospitals with structured safety governance, documented communication protocols, and continuous audit systems are better positioned to meet regulatory requirements and demonstrate compliance during accreditation reviews.

Rather than treating compliance as a periodic administrative exercise, aviation-style safety systems embed regulatory readiness into daily operations.

Institutional trust and market positioning

Healthcare systems increasingly compete not only on clinical capability but also on demonstrable safety performance. Hospitals recognized for high reliability operations attract referrals, research collaborations, and partnerships with insurers and policymakers.

A radiology department that consistently delivers timely, accurate, and clearly communicated diagnostic information strengthens confidence among referring clinicians, improves patient satisfaction, and reinforces the institution's reputation as a trusted provider of safe, high-quality care.

Safety as Strategic Infrastructure

Historically, healthcare organizations have approached patient safety primarily as a compliance obligation or quality improvement initiative. Aviation demonstrates that safety, when engineered systematically, becomes a form of operational infrastructure that supports efficiency, reliability, and long-term financial sustainability.

Radiology is uniquely positioned to lead this transformation. Its digital workflows, structured data environments, and central role in clinical decision making make it the ideal platform for implementing high-reliability safety models across healthcare systems.

For hospital leaders and policymakers, the question is no longer whether healthcare systems can afford to invest in diagnostic safety. The more pressing question is whether they can afford not to.

Conclusion

Radiology now sits at the operational centre of modern healthcare, guiding nearly every major clinical decision from emergency diagnosis to long-term treatment planning. Yet the systems governing radiology safety remain far less mature than those that transformed aviation into one of the safest industries in the world. The evidence presented in this paper demonstrates that diagnostic errors, communication failures, and fragmented workflows are not isolated failures of individual clinicians but predictable consequences of overstretched systems operating without engineered safeguards. Aviation addressed similar challenges by embedding structured communication, standardized protocols, simulation training, real-time monitoring, and a culture of transparent learning into every layer of operations. Radiology possesses the same advantages that enabled aviation's safety revolution: digital workflows, structured data, and highly trained professionals working in coordinated teams. By adopting aviation-grade safety frameworks, healthcare systems can close diagnostic communication gaps, reduce preventable harm, lower litigation exposure, and improve operational efficiency. The transition from fragmented processes to high-reliability radiology systems will require leadership commitment, investment in interoperable infrastructure, and a shift toward system-level accountability. However, the opportunity is clear: by transforming the radiology department from a reactive reporting unit into a proactive safety command centre, healthcare organizations can not only prevent harm but also strengthen institutional resilience and public trust in the decades ahead.

References

[1] WHO Global Patient Safety Report 2024 Burden of unsafe care.
https://www.quasrapp.com/blog/burden-of-harm-to-the-patients/

[2] Diagnostic error and discrepancies in radiology. American Journal of Roentgenology.
https://ajronline.org/doi/10.2214/AJR.12.10375

[3] Diagnostic errors in radiology 3 to 5% daily error rate.
https://collectiveminds.health/articles/diagnostic-errors-in-radiology-statistics-types-causes-and-prevention-strategies

[4] IATA Annual Safety Report 2024 1 per 880,000 flights.
https://www.iata.org/en/publications/safety-report/executive-summary/

[5] IATA 2024 Safety Report Fatal accident rate data.
https://www.iata.org/en/pressroom/2025-releases/2025-02-26-01/

[6] National malpractice claims and payouts 2023.
https://www.millerandzois.com/medical-malpractice/medical-malpractice-statistics/

[7] Burden of serious harms from diagnostic error in the USA.
https://qualitysafety.bmj.com/content/33/2/109

[8] Medical malpractice costs and inflation impact.
https://www.captive.com/news/inflation-adds-4-billion-to-medical-malpractice-losses-study-finds

[9] Medical negligence litigation in India 110% rise.
https://upjo.org/index.php/upjo/article/download/555/475

[10] Healthcare Safety Investigation Branch Communication failures in radiology UK.
https://www.hssib.org.uk/patient-safety-investigations/failures-in-communication-or-follow-up-of-unexpected-significant-radiolog/

[11] UK Ombudsman report on medical imaging failures March 2025.
https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cdjykmlr2vwo

[12] UK NHS X ray volumes 22.9 million procedures.
https://www.hssib.org.uk/patient-safety-investigations/failures-in-communication-or-follow-up-of-unexpected-significant-radiolog/

[13] NHS clinical negligence claim costs 2024 to 25 £3.6 billion.
https://www.nao.org.uk/press-releases/cost-of-settling-clinical-negligence-claims-has-more-than-tripled-in-last-two-decades/

[14] NHS England patient safety incident statistics Q4 2024 to 25.
https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/patient-safety-data/2024-25/q4-revised/

[15] UK Emergency Department diagnostic errors 2,288 cases study.
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6894198/

[16] Crew Resource Management in ICU. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5033035/

[17] Technology enhanced simulation meta analysis.
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10150956/

[18] Critical result communication policy implementation.
https://pubs.rsna.org/doi/10.1148/radiol.11101396

[19] Economics of diagnostic safety OECD.
https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2024/09/the-economics-of-diagnostic-safety_2056205e/bb24ea76-en.pdf

[20] Royal College of Radiologists reporting standards audit 95 to 97% compliance.
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10089639/

[21] UK NHS radiology seven day working 54% non compliant.
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8320131/

[22] Systematic review of CRM training in healthcare. https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/9/2/e025247

[23] Impact of simulation based training. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10364267/

[24] NABH Accreditation Standards for Medical Imaging Services.
https://testing.nabh.co/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/5.-Standards-for-MIS-2nd-Edition_Edited.pdf

[25] NABH Hospital Accreditation Standards 6th Edition.
https://portal.nabh.co/images/Standards/NABH Hospital Accreditation Standard 6th Edition January 2025.pdf

[26] Guided reporting quality and reading time automatically generated radiology reports.
https://www.dirjournal.org/articles/evaluation-of-guided-reporting-quality-and-reading-time-of-automatically-generated-radiology-reports/

[27] Effect of interventions to improve safety culture on staff outcomes.
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11086522/

[28] Effect of accreditation on patient safety culture.
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12410063/

[29] RSNA Quality improvement resources.
https://www.rsna.org/practice-tools/quality-improvement/quality-improvement-resources