

1 Effect of continuous medical education and clinical imaging guidelines on reducing
2 inappropriate computerized tomography utilization among children and young patients
3 in a resource -limited settings: A before-and-after study
4
5

6 Harriet Nalubega Kisembo^{1,2*}, Richard Malumba³, Ezra Kato Nsereko³, Deborah Babirye⁴, Victoria Nakalanzi³, Francis Xavier
7 Kasujja⁵, Elsie-Kiguli Malwadde⁶, Elizeus Rutebemberwa⁷, Simon Kasasa⁸, Dina Husseiny Salama⁹, Michael Grace Kawooya³
8

9 ¹Department of Radiology, School of Medicine, College of Health Sciences, Kampala, Uganda

10 ²Department of Radiology, Mulago National Referral and Teaching Hospital, Kampala, Uganda

11 ³Department of Radiology, Ernest cook Ultrasound Research and Education Institute, Kampala, Uganda

12 ⁴Department of Radiology, Entebbe Regional Referral Hospital, Entebbe, Uganda

13 ⁵The Medical Research Council/Uganda Virus Research Institute, Entebbe, Uganda

14 ⁶African Centre for Global Health and Social Transformation (ACHEST), Kampala, Uganda

15 ⁷Department of Health Policy & Management, School of Public Health, College of Health Sciences Makerere University, Kampala,
16 Uganda

17 ⁸Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, School of Public Health, College of Health Sciences, Makerere University, Kampala,
18 Uganda

19 ⁹The National Center for Radiation Research and Technology (NCRRT), Egyptian Atomic Energy Authority (EAAEA), Cairo, Egypt

20

21 *Corresponding Author

22 Email: kisemboharriet@yahoo.co.uk

23 ORCIDs: 0000-0001-6542-8743

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 **Abstract**

34 **Background**

35 Multi-Detector Computed Tomography (MDCT) has revolutionized healthcare delivery, significantly improving diagnostic accuracy
36 and patient outcomes in various clinical settings. However, the overuse of CT examinations (CTEs), especially in resource-limited
37 settings (RLS), poses a substantial public health challenge. Inappropriately performed CTEs, particularly among children and young
38 adults, expose these vulnerable populations to unnecessary radiation risks, with 20%-50% of CTEs deemed inappropriate, and 10%-
39 20% involving children. Despite the existence of evidence-based interventions like clinical imaging guidelines (CIGs) to curb this
40 overuse, their availability and effectiveness in RLS are not well established.

41 **Objective**

42 This study aimed to determine the impact of continuous medical education (CME) and the introduction of clinical imaging guidelines
43 (CIGs) on the appropriateness of CT utilization among children and young adults in selected hospitals in Uganda.

44 **Materials and Methods**

45 A before-and-after study design was employed to assess the effect of an intervention comprising CME and CIGs on appropriate CTE
46 utilization. The intervention targeted healthcare providers (HCPs) across six public and private tertiary hospitals with available CT
47 services over a 12-month period. Baseline data indicated a high prevalence of inappropriate CTEs among the target population. The
48 proportion of CTEs performed for various body regions (head, paranasal sinuses, chest, abdomen, spine, trauma) and their

49 appropriateness were retrospectively analyzed before and after the intervention, using the European Society of Radiology's iGuide and
50 pre-intervention study results as benchmarks.

51 **Results**

52 Post-intervention, the total number of CTEs performed increased by 33% (909 vs. 1210), with a 30% increase in public hospitals (300
53 vs. 608, $p < 0.001$) and a 41% increase in private-for-profit hospitals (91 vs. 238, $p = 0.037$). Specific increases were observed in head
54 CTs (19%, 746 vs. 890, $p < 0.0001$) and contrasted studies (252%, 113 vs. 410, $p < 0.0001$). Conversely, CTEs for trauma decreased
55 by 8% (499 vs. 458, $p < 0.0001$). Despite these changes, the overall proportion of inappropriate CTEs increased by 15% (38% vs.
56 44%, $p < 0.001$), with a 28% increase in inappropriate contrasted examinations (25% vs. 53%, $p < 0.001$) and a 13% increase in non-
57 trauma cases (66% vs. 79%, $p < 0.001$). Notably, inappropriate CTEs for non-contrasted and trauma-related cases reduced by 28%
58 (75% vs. 47%, $p < 0.001$) and 31% (34% vs. 14%, $p = 0.0001$), respectively.

59 **Conclusion**

60 The findings underscore the potential of CME and the adaptation of CIGs from high-resource settings to enhance the appropriateness
61 of CT utilization in RLS. While the intervention notably reduced inappropriate trauma-related and non-contrasted CTEs, it also
62 highlighted the complexity of achieving consistent improvements across all examination types. Further research is recommended to
63 explore the determinants of successfully implementing CIGs in RLS, aiming to optimize CT utilization and improve patient outcomes.

64

65

66 **Introduction**

67

68 Over the past two decades, advances in medical imaging technologies, particularly Multi-Detector Computed Tomography
69 (MDCT), have significantly enhanced healthcare delivery and improved patient outcomes, especially in emergency situations,
70 uncooperative patients, and complex clinical cases (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7). Despite these benefits, the widespread and growing utilization
71 of CT imaging has raised concerns about its appropriateness, especially given its significant contribution to the global collective dose
72 from medical radiation exposure(5, 8, 9, 10). According to the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic
73 Radiation (UNSCEAR) 2020/2021 report, CT scans (CTs) have become the largest contributor to this collective dose(11). Alarminglly,
74 studies indicate that 20%-50% of CT examinations (CTEs) performed globally are inappropriate(9, 10, 12, 13), with 10%-20% of
75 these occurring among children (4, 14, 15).

76

77 Inappropriate CT examinations are those that do not align with established medical guidelines, are not medically justified, or
78 could be replaced with safer, less costly, or more effective diagnostic methods . In resource-limited settings (RLS), inappropriate
79 utilization of CT imaging is particularly concerning, manifesting as overuse, misuse, or underuse of the technology. Overutilization
80 often occurs when clinicians order CT scans excessively or inappropriately, even when simpler, more cost-effective diagnostic
81 modalities might suffice(5, 9, 16, 17, 18) . Conversely, underutilization may result from logistical challenges, such as limited access to
82 CT scanners, insufficient expertise in image interpretation, or financial constraints (15, 19).

83

84 While the health risk from a single CT scan is relatively low, the cumulative effect of increasing CT utilization is a significant
85 public health concern, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. Here, the population is notably young, with a median age as low as 15.1
86 years in some countries, yet MDCT scanners are rapidly being acquired(14, 16, 20). The decision to order a CT examination in an
87 RLS is influenced by several factors, including healthcare infrastructure, resource availability, clinical guidelines, patient
88 characteristics, and healthcare provider behaviors(19, 21). another key contributor to unnecessary imaging is the low level of
89 knowledge and awareness among healthcare providers regarding radiation doses, risks associated with medical imaging, and
90 adherence to referral criteria(20, 22, 23, 24, 25) .

91

92 The potential risks of radiation-induced cancers, particularly among children and young adults, underscore the critical need for
93 radiation dose optimization and informed decision-making in medical imaging. Young patients are more vulnerable to radiation risks
94 due to their longer life expectancy, which provides a greater window for the development of radiation-induced cancers, the possibility
95 of repeated examinations, and the higher sensitivity of their rapidly dividing tissues(26, 27, 28, 29) . Overutilization of CT scans not
96 only increases these risks but also strains healthcare resources, leading to overcrowded imaging departments, longer wait times, delays
97 in patient care, and increased healthcare costs(12, 16, 30) .

98

99 To address these challenges, evidence-based interventions have been developed and implemented, targeting different stages of
100 the imaging process. These include initiatives such as patient and provider education, clinical decision support tools, and routine
101 auditing and feedback, which have proven effective in reducing inappropriate imaging(1, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35). International
102 organizations and professional bodies, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)(36, 37) and the International
103 Commission for Radiation Protection (ICRP)(38), have recommended and supported the training of healthcare providers,
104 implementation of clinical imaging guidelines (CIGs), and routine audits to enhance the appropriateness of medical exposures .
105

106 CIGs, developed by organizations like the American College of Radiology (ACR)(39), the Royal College of Radiology
107 (RCR)(40), and the World Health Organization (WHO)(36), provide evidence-based recommendations to guide healthcare providers
108 in ordering the most appropriate imaging tests. These guidelines have been shown to reduce inappropriate CTEs by 25% to 50% .
109 However, while these guidelines offer valuable insights for high-income countries (HICs), their direct applicability in RLS may be
110 limited due to differences in healthcare infrastructure, workforce capacity, financial resources, cultural considerations, and disease
111 epidemiology.
112

113 In response to these challenges, a group of African experts convened in several workshops to discuss the adaptation of existing
114 guidelines to suit the needs of RLS. The consensus was to adopt and adapt guidelines from the Royal College of Radiologists for
115 English-speaking countries and from the French Society for French-speaking countries, given the limited resources . This study set out

116 to evaluate the effect of continuous medical education (CME) and the implementation of adapted CIGs on the proportion of
117 inappropriate CTEs performed among children and young patients in six hospitals in Uganda.

118

119 **Materials and Methods**

120 **Ethical approval**

121 Ethical approval was obtained from the Makerere University, School of Medicine Research and Ethics Committee (SOMREC),
122 REF: #REC REF 2017-118, and the National Council for Science and Technology, REF: HS1313ES. Administrative clearance was
123 also obtained from all the participating health facilities before the start of the study. All study procedures were in accordance with the
124 ethical standards of the 1964 Helsinki Declaration. A waiver of consent was obtained from REC to access all patient records. To
125 protect patient confidentiality, all identifying information was replaced with unique identification numbers.

126 **Study Design**

127

128 This study employed a before-and-after design to evaluate the impact of continuous medical education (CME) and clinical imaging
129 guidelines (CIGs) on the proportion of inappropriate CT examinations (CTEs) performed among children and young patients.

130 **Study Setting**

131 The study was conducted in six tertiary public and private hospitals in Uganda. These hospitals were purposively selected based on
132 the following criteria: national and regional referral status, university teaching hospital affiliation, and regional representation,

133 availability of functional CT services during the study period, the ability to identify eligible cases retrospectively, and geographical
134 representation of CT services across the country. The hospitals were categorized into three groups according to Ministry of Health
135 service standards: two public (PH), two private-for-profit (PFP), and two private not-for-profit (PNFP) hospitals.

136 **Intervention**

137 Following a baseline study that revealed high levels of inappropriate CT examinations among children and young patients(41), an
138 intervention was introduced. This intervention comprised continuous medical education (CME) and the implementation of clinical
139 imaging guidelines from the European Society of Radiology (ESR)-iGuide. The intervention targeted healthcare providers (HCPs),
140 including interns, medical officers, residents, specialists, nurses, radiographers, radiologists, information technologists, and
141 administrative staff at the participating hospitals.

142

143 The CME sessions were delivered by two radiologists (a senior consultant and a professor), a senior imaging technologist, and a
144 clinical epidemiologist. Each session included a one-hour lecture on the basic principles of radiation protection, justification and
145 optimization of medical exposures, radiation doses from common imaging procedures, equivalent to number of chest x-rays and risks
146 of radiations as in Table 1 below:

147

148 Table 1: effective radiation doses for common diagnostic imaging modalities and equivalent number of chest x-rays doses

Diagnostic imaging modality	Effective dose (mSv) ^a	Equivalent number of chest X-rays resulting in the same effective dose	Following ranges are accepted (based on equivalent number of chest X-rays)
Chest X-ray	0.02	1	1
Cranial X-ray	0.07	3.5	0–10
Pelvic X-ray	0.7	35	10–50
Abdominal X-ray	0.7	35	10–50
Cranial CT	2.4	120	50–200
Chest CT	7.8	390	200–500
Abdominal CT	12	600	>500
Pelvic CT	10.5	525	>500
Abdominal US	0	0	0
Abdominal MRI	0	0	0

^a Effective dose, health care level II countries, United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR) report 2008 (10)

149

150

151 Alternative imaging modalities that use less or no ionizing radiation were also highlighted. Following the lecture, a practical
152 interactive session was conducted, during which participants accessed the online ESR-iGuide, registered, and downloaded the app on
153 their devices. Participants were also provided with various educational materials, including handout summaries, overheads, IAEA
154 posters on radiation protection during CT scans, and justification of CT examinations, which were displayed in workstations.
155 The CME sessions were repeated 6 to 12 months after the initial training in all hospitals. A pre- and post-intervention test using a
156 structured questionnaire was administered to participants to assess their knowledge and awareness of radiation safety and justification

157 of medical exposures. The results have been published elsewhere. Attendance was voluntary, though the sessions also counted towards
158 routine continuous professional development, a mandatory requirement for the renewal of HCPs' annual practice licenses.

159 **Data Management and Analysis**

160 Hypothesis

161 The null hypothesis (Ho) posited that there would be no difference in the proportion of inappropriate CT requisitions for patients aged
162 35 years and below before and after the intervention. The alternative hypothesis (Ha) proposed that the use of CIGs by CT prescribers
163 would reduce inappropriate CT requisitions for common examinations in this age group by 10-15% across the six selected hospitals.

164 **Data Source**

165 A decline in the use of CT scans was anticipated following the intervention, though expected to be lower than in the implementation
166 studies (18, 42). For a hypothesized absolute decrease of 15% in CT utilization, with 90% power and a one-tailed α of 0.05, from a
167 baseline level of 80% for patients aged 35 years and below who had CT scans performed during the study period, a minimum sample
168 size of 148 CT request forms (CTRFs) per phase (before and after the intervention) was required to achieve a power of 0.90 and a one-
169 tailed α of 0.05.

170 Retrospective retrieval from hospital archives included all consecutive eligible CTRFs for head, paranasal sinuses (PNS), chest,
171 abdomen, spine, or trauma CTs performed from July 1 to December 31, 2020. The upper age limit of 35 years was selected as the
172 radiation-induced lifetime attributable risk of cancer mortality from low-dose radiation plateaus beyond this age.

173

174 The principal author (HNK) screened all retrieved CTRFs, excluding unreadable records, duplicates, canceled examinations,
175 electronic medical requests, and requests from external referrers. The analysis methods mirrored those used in the baseline study by
176 Kisembo et al(41).

177 **Clinical imaging guidelines**

178

179 Permission and virtual training on the use of the web-based guideline were provided by the ESR-ACR iGuide Project of the European
180 Board of Radiology. Each requisition was independently reviewed by at least two researchers (HNK and RM) to assess the match
181 between the clinical information provided and the clinical condition options reported by the "Consult Appropriate Use Criteria
182 (AUC)" online computer program(43). The AUC is based on the Appropriateness Criteria developed by the American College of
183 Radiology and embedded into the ESR-ACR iGuide, a computerized decision support (CDS) platform. All researchers had adequate
184 experience in analyzing the appropriateness of medical tests. Disagreements were resolved through discussion and consensus. If
185 necessary, a third reviewer (MGK) served as the tie-breaker.

186 **Rating of Appropriateness of CT Request Forms (CTRFs)**

187

188 The clinical information on the majority of CTRFs was converted into a coding system to derive ratings of appropriateness. Each
189 eligible requisition was manually coded into the software by entering patient demographics (age and sex) and relevant clinical
190 indications, symptoms, diagnoses, or differential diagnoses that could justify the CTE. The computer system scored each requisition
191 using a 1 to 9 ordinal-point rating scale, with 1 being the least appropriate and 9 being the most appropriate. Scores were categorized

192 as follows: 7-9 indicated the most appropriate imaging study to be performed first (usually appropriate), 4-6 indicated a specialized
193 investigation not initially indicated (may be appropriate), and 1-3 indicated that ordering should be avoided, with consideration of
194 specialist referral or radiology consultation (not appropriate).

195

196 For this study, the 9-point rating scale was simplified into a two-grade scale, as used by Vilar-Palop et al. . A score of 7–9 was
197 classified as appropriate, while a score of 1-6 was classified as inappropriate. If the CTRF lacked sufficient clinical information to
198 understand the patient’s condition and evaluate the appropriateness of the examination according to the guideline, it was categorized
199 as not justified and included in the inappropriate group. Requests that could not be categorized based on the guideline were excluded
200 from the study. CTRFs requesting scans for multiple body parts (e.g., CT chest and abdomen) were treated as separate requests, and
201 criteria/guidelines were applied individually to each.

202

203 **Statistical Methods**

204 Frequency distributions and cross-tabulations were used to describe the data. The primary outcome measures were the difference in
205 the total number of CTEs and the proportion of inappropriate CTEs before and after the intervention. These were calculated separately
206 and compared using Pearson’s chi-square test or Fisher’s exact test, with a significance level of $P < 0.05$. Data was analyzed in
207 relation to hospital category, patient age, sex, anatomical region, indication, and use of contrast media.

208

209 **Results**

210 A total of 2,119 computed tomography examinations (CTEs) were performed on patients aged ≤ 35 years across the six participating
211 hospitals during the two study periods. Of these, 38% (799/2,119) were females, and 23% (539/2,119) were children (aged < 18
212 years). The majority of the CTEs were head scans, constituting 77% (1,638/2,119) of the total. Non-contrast CTEs accounted for 69%
213 (1,463/2,119), and trauma-related CTEs represented 45% (957/2,119).

214

215 Following the intervention, the overall number of CTEs performed increased by 33%, from 909 before the intervention to 1,210 after
216 the intervention. This increase was particularly significant in public hospitals (PHs) and private-for-profit hospitals (PFPs), where the
217 number of CTEs rose by 30% (300 vs. 608, $p < 0.001$) and 41% (91 vs. 238, $p = 0.037$), respectively. In contrast, private not-for-profit
218 hospitals (PNFPs) experienced a 27% decrease in inappropriate CTEs after the intervention (518 vs. 364, $p < 0.001$).

219

220 Specifically, head CTEs increased by 19% (746 vs. 890, $p < 0.0001$), and contrasted CTEs surged by 252% (113 vs. 410, $p < 0.0001$)
221 following the intervention. Conversely, CTEs performed for trauma decreased by 8% (499 vs. 458, $p < 0.0001$). These changes in the
222 number of CT examinations performed for patients aged ≤ 35 years before and after the intervention are detailed in Table 2.

223

224 Table 2: The total number (n) and changes in the numbers of different CT examinations performed on patients aged ≤ 35 years before
225 and after the intervention at the six participating hospitals

226

		after-intervention N (%)	% Change before and after intervene	P-values	95% Confidence Intervals
n	909 (43)	1,210 (57)	14.2	<0.001	(0.0994, 0.1846)
Hospital					
A	58 (6)	197 (16)	9.9	0.056	(0.0177, 0.1803)
B	193 (21)	231 (19)	-2.14	0.584	(-0.0982, 0.0554)
C	33 (4)	41 (3)	-0.24	0.830	(-0.2429, 0.1949)
D	107 (12)	377 (31)	19.39	<0.001	(0.1170, 0.2708)
E	103 (11)	100 (8)	-3.07	0.462	(-0.1123, 0.0509)
F	415 (46)	264 (22)	-23.83	<0.001	(-0.3074, -0.1692)
Hospital Category					
Public Hospital	300 (33)	608 (50)	17.25	<0.001	(0.1061, 0.2389)
Private for Hospital	91 (10)	238 (20)	9.66	0.037	(0.0169, 0.1763)
Private not for profit	518 (57)	364 (30)	-26.91	<0.001	(-0.3326, - 0.2056)
Sex					
Male	572 (63)	741(61)	1.69	0.532	(-0.0698, 0.0360)
Female	331 (37))	468 (39)	2.19	0.529	(-0.0462, 0.900)
Missing	6 (10)	1 (0)	-0.58		
Age categories					
< 1	36 (4)	61(5)	1.08	0.807	(-0.0733, 0.0949)
1 <= 5	63 (7)	80 (7)	0.32	0.940	(-0.0862, 0.0798)
6 <= 10	48 (5)	66 (6)	0.17	0.968	(-0.0820, 0.0854)
11 <= 15	52 (6)	55 (5)	-1.17	0.784	(-0.0955, 0.0721)

16 <= 20	115(13)	161(13)	0.66	0.872	(-0.0737, 0.0869)
Above 20	595(66)	786 (65)	-0.5	0.847	(-0.0557, 0.6928)
Missing	0	1 (0)	0.08		
Age categories					
<18	232 (26)	307 (25)	-0.15	0.968	(-0.0758, 0.0728)
≥18	677 (75)	902 (75)	0.07	0.975	(-0.0427, 0.0441)
Missing	0 (0)	1 (0)	0		
Anatomic Region					
None	34 (4)	2 (0)	-3.57	0.791	(-0.1213, 0.0499)
Head	746 (82)	890 (74)	-8.52	<0.001	(-0.1252, -0.0452)
spine	16(2)	61 (5)	3.28	0.567	(-0.0518, 0.1174)
Abdomen	48 (5)	101 (8)	3.07	0.502	(-0.0552, 0.1138)
Chest	34 (4)	134 (11)	7.33	0.195	(-0.0097, 0.1563)
PNS	20 (2)	12 (1)	-1.21	0.800	(-0.0974, 0.0732)
Others	11 (1)	10 (1)	-0.38	0.931	(-0.0895, 0.0819)
Contrast					
Not contrasted	796 (88)	800 (66)	-21.45	0.931	(-0.0895, 0.0819)
Contrasted	113 (12)	410(34)	21.45	<0.001	(0.1383, 0.2907)
Trauma					
Non-trauma	412 (45)	702 (58)	12.7	<0.001	(0.0666, 0.1874)
Trauma	497 (55)	458 (38)	-16.83	<0.001	(-0.2307, -0.1059)
Missing	0 (0)	50 (4)	4.13		

227

228 The overall proportion of inappropriate CTEs significantly increased by 15%, from 38% before the intervention to 53% after the

229 intervention ($p < 0.001$). Notably, inappropriate contrasted and non-traumatic CTEs increased by 28% (25% vs. 53%, $p < 0.001$) and

230 13% (66% vs. 79%, $p < 0.001$), respectively. However, there was a reduction in the proportion of inappropriate non-contrasted and
 231 trauma-related CTEs by 28% (75% vs. 47%, $p < 0.001$) and 21% (34% vs. 14%, $p < 0.001$), respectively.

232 The number, proportion, and difference in proportions of inappropriate CTEs out of the total number of cases analyzed in 2018 and
 233 2020 for patients are summarized in Table 3.

234

235 Table 3. The number (n), proportion (%) and the difference in proportions of inappropriate CT examinations out of the total number of
 236 the cases analyzed before and after intervention for patients aged ≤ 35 years

237

	Baseline	Post-intervention	% change	p-value	95% CI
Inappropriateness	347 (38)	645 (53)	+15.14	<0.001	(0.2382, 0.3626)
Sex					
Male	139 (40)	287 (44)	4.44	0.386	(-0.5530, 0.1441)
Female	207 (60)	358 (56)	-4.15	0.337	(10.1259, 0.4286)
Age categories					
< 1	13 (4)	56(9)	4.93	0.549	(-0.0776, 0.1762)
1 \leq 5	27 (8)	45 (7)	-0.8	0.899	(-0.1335, 0.1175)
6 \leq 10	24 (7)	37 (6)	-1.18	0.852	(-0.1380, 0.1144)
11 \leq 15	26 (8)	37 (6)	-1.75	0.781	(-0.1434, 0.1084)
16 \leq 20	52 (15)	92 (14)	14.26	0.905	(-0.1278, 0.1132)
Above 20	205 (59)	377 (59)	-0.63	0.883	(-0.0900, 0.0774)
Age categories 2					
<18	105 (30)	200 (31)	0.75	0.893	(-0.1013, 0.1163)
\geq 18	242 (70)	444 (69)	-0.9	0.807	(-0.0816, 0.0632)

Anatomic Region					
None	34 (10)	2 (0.3)	-9.49	0.653	(-0.2211, 0.0313)
Head	239 (69)	412 (64)	-5	0.195	(-0.1248, 0.2481)
spine	7 (2)	38 (6)	3.87	0.674	(-0.0896, 0.1670)
Abdomen	27 (8)	92 (14)	6.48	0.375	(-0.0589, 0.1887)
Chest	25 (7)	87 (14)	6.29	0.395	(-0.0613, 0.1871)
PNS	8 (2)	7 (1)	-1.22	0.852	(-0.1416, 0.1172)
Others	7 (2)	7 (1)	-0.93	0.888	(-0.1388, 0.1202)
Contrast			0		
Not contrasted	259 (75)	302 (47)	-27.82	<0.001	(0.3555, -0.2009)
Contrasted	88 (25)	343 (53)	27.82	<0.001	(-0.1731, 0.3833)
Trauma			0		
Non-trauma	228 (66)	507 (79)	12.89	<0.001	(0.0569, 0.2001)
Trauma	119 (34)	88 (14)	-20.65	0.001	(-0.3179, -0.0951)

238 NB; *p-value <0.05. NA = Assumptions for the normal approximation to the binomial were not met. The percentages shown above
 239 are for inappropriateness

240

241 **Discussion**

242 This study aimed to evaluate the impact of continuous medical education (CME) and clinical imaging guidelines (CIGs) on reducing
 243 inappropriate computed tomography examinations (CTEs) in a resource-limited setting (RLS). CME is well recognized for its role in
 244 enhancing the quality of medical practice. Integrating radiation protection and the application of CIGs into these sessions was intended
 245 to improve the appropriateness of CTE requisitions(35, 44, 45, 46).

246

247 Our findings reveal a 33% overall increase in the number of CT examinations performed, accompanied by a 15% rise in
248 inappropriate CTEs. This suggests that the intervention did not optimally change clinical practice behavior regarding the use of CT
249 examinations.

250 There are could be several explanations for these findings. First, the increase in CTEs might reflect a broader global trend of
251 heightened use of cross-sectional imaging, particularly among young patients. Factors contributing to this trend include advancements
252 in CT technology, greater availability of CT scanners, increased public awareness and demand for advanced diagnostic imaging, and
253 changes in disease epidemiology, such as the rising burden of non-communicable diseases (3, 4, 6, 15, 16, 21, 28, 29, 47, 48, 49).

254 Second is the ineffectiveness of CIGs, which were originally developed for high-income countries (HICs), in altering CT
255 utilization behaviors in an RLS, aligns with the existing literature on guideline implementation (19, 21, 42, 50). For these guidelines to
256 be effective in an RLS, they must be adapted to local contexts, with consideration for constraints, resources, and collaboration among
257 stakeholders.

258 Third, since a previous study from the same setting reported low utilization of advanced imaging modalities like CTs, the
259 intervention might have inadvertently raised awareness among healthcare workers about the availability and utility of CT scans,
260 leading to an overall increase in their requisition, even when inappropriate(51).

261

262 The intervention's effects varied across hospital types. While public and PFP hospitals saw significant increases in CTEs by
263 30% and 41%, respectively, PNFP hospitals experienced 27 % decrease in CTEs. This decline in PNFPs might be attributed to prior

264 similar interventions that reinforced compliance and increased awareness among imaging referrers . This aligns with findings from
265 Forsetlund et al., (44)who noted that multi-session educational meetings are more effective than single sessions for knowledge
266 retention and behavior change .

267

268 Trauma related CT utilization, which accounted for 45% of all CTEs, significantly decreased by 20% after the intervention.
269 The reduction in inappropriate trauma-related CTEs by 16% may be partly due to the national lockdown and travel restrictions during
270 the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020(52). While the overall number of accidents may have decreased, the severity of injuries might have
271 increased, justifying the need for CT examinations for high-energy injuries. The intervention likely provided evidence-based criteria
272 that supported more judicious decision-making by imaging referrers when ordering CTEs.

273 Traumatic brain injuries, a significant contributor to inappropriate CTEs, remain a priority area for interventions aimed at reducing
274 unnecessary scans. A study by Babirye et al. demonstrated that a significant proportion of head CTEs for mild traumatic brain injuries
275 could have been avoided by applying clinical decision rules like the Canadian CT Head Rule (CCHR) (53).

276

277 The 28% increase in inappropriate contrasted CTEs could be due to the lack of alternative imaging modalities like ultrasound
278 or MRI, which do not use ionizing radiation but are often unavailable in RLS (18, 19, 21, 48, 50, 54).

279 We however also observed a lack of radiologist consultation by IRs before ordering CT examinations, contributing to the escalation of
280 inappropriate CT utilization(38, 55, 56). Radiologists play a crucial role as gatekeepers, ensuring that patient exposures are clinically

281 justified by approving appropriate requisitions and rejecting those that are not . Studies have shown that IRs are more cautious in their
282 ordering practices when they know their requests will be scrutinized and possibly rejected(57, 58) .

283

284 **Limitations**

285

286 Several potential biases could affect the estimated impact of the intervention, including secular trends, seasonal effects, the
287 duration of the intervention, and random fluctuations. This underscores the need for robust experimental or quasi-experimental designs
288 to evaluate strategies for reducing inappropriate imaging utilization in RLS. Additionally, the limited number of CME sessions may
289 have constrained the intervention's impact, although this was enhanced by an interactive learning model incorporating lectures, case
290 discussions, and hands-on practice. The study's short follow-up period raises uncertainty about whether similar effects would be
291 observed over more extended periods. Moreover, the impact of various intervention components was not measured separately, making
292 it likely that certain interventions had a more significant influence on referral practices than others. However, the multi-center
293 representation of CT services in this study increases the generalizability of the results to hospitals with CT services across Uganda.
294 Other limitations noted in the baseline study also apply to this analysis .

295 **Acknowledgments**

296

297 We acknowledge the administrative officers, CT in-charges, CT imaging technologists, research assistants, and radiologists
298 from the participating hospitals for their invaluable support throughout this study. We extend our gratitude to all healthcare workers
299 who actively participated in the CME sessions. Special appreciation goes to the ESR-ACR iGuide Project secretariat of the European
300 Board of Radiology for their unwavering support in terms of training and for allowing free access to their guidelines. We also thank
301 the IAEA Radiation Protection of Patients unit for providing free educational and training resources.

302

303 Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

304 Financial Support: This study received no financial support.

305

306 **Conclusion and Implications**

307

308 One of the most significant findings to emerge from this study is that CME for HCPs and the adoption of CIGs from HICs
309 have the potential to improve the appropriateness of CT utilization in RLS, particularly by reducing inappropriate trauma-related and
310 non-contrasted CTEs among children and young patients.

311 However, further research is needed to focus on the determinants of implementing CIGs from HICs into RLS, with the goal of
312 improving evidence based clinical practice behaviors. In these environments, a phased approach is recommended, focusing on

313 creating awareness, encouraging dialogue, and adapting existing CIGs to local resources. This can lay the groundwork for more
314 comprehensive, locally tailored quality improvement processes in the future.

315

316 **References**

- 317 1. Hendee WR, Becker GJ, Borgstede JP, Bosma J, Casarella WJ, Erickson BA, et al. Addressing overutilization in medical imaging. *Radiology*.
318 2010;257(1):240-5.
- 319 2. Hricak H, Brenner DJ, Adelstein SJ, Frush DP, Hall EJ, Howell RW, et al. Managing radiation use in medical imaging: a multifaceted
320 challenge. *Radiology*. 2011;258(3):889-905.
- 321 3. Larson DB, Johnson LW, Schnell BM, Goske MJ, Salisbury SR, Forman HP. Rising use of CT in child visits to the emergency department in
322 the United States, 1995-2008. *Radiology*. 2011;259(3):793-801.
- 323 4. Shahi V, Brinjikji W, Cloft HJ, Thomas KB, Kallmes DF. Trends in CT Utilization for Pediatric Fall Patients in US Emergency Departments.
324 *Acad Radiol*. 2015;22(7):898-903.
- 325 5. Smith-Bindman R, Lipson J, Marcus R, Kim KP, Mahesh M, Gould R, et al. Radiation dose associated with common computed tomography
326 examinations and the associated lifetime attributable risk of cancer. *Arch Intern Med*. 2009;169(22):2078-86.
- 327 6. Agrawal JP, Erickson BJ, Kahn CE, Jr. Imaging Informatics: 25 Years of Progress. *Yearb Med Inform*. 2016;Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S23-31.
- 328 7. Ginat D, Gupta R. Advances in Computed Tomography Imaging Technology. *Annual review of biomedical engineering*. 2014;16:431-53.
- 329 8. Pozzessere C, von Garnier C, Beigelman-Aubry C. Radiation Exposure to Low-Dose Computed Tomography for Lung Cancer Screening:
330 Should We Be Concerned? *Tomography*. 2023;9(1):166-77.
- 331 9. Runde D, Shah K, Naraghi L, Godbout B, Kirschner J, Newman D, et al. Computed tomography utilization rates after the placement of a
332 scanner in an emergency department: a single-center experience. *Emerg Radiol*. 2014;21(5):473-8.
- 333 10. Zondervan RL, Hahn PF, Sadow CA, Liu B, Lee SI. Body CT scanning in young adults: examination indications, patient outcomes, and risk of
334 radiation-induced cancer. *Radiology*. 2013;267(2):460-9.
- 335 11. (UNSCEAR) TUNSCotEoAR. UNSCEAR 2020/2021 report. New York; 2022.
- 336 12. Malone J, Guleria R, Craven C, Horton P, Järvinen H, Mayo J, et al. Justification of diagnostic medical exposures: some practical issues.
337 Report of an International Atomic Energy Agency Consultation. *Br J Radiol*. 2012;85(1013):523-38.
- 338 13. Oikarinen H, Meriläinen S, Pääkkö E, Karttunen A, Nieminen MT, Tervonen O. Unjustified CT examinations in young patients. *European*
339 *Radiology*. 2009;19(5):1161-5.
- 340 14. Pearce MS, Salotti JA, Little MP, McHugh K, Lee C, Kim KP, et al. Radiation exposure from CT scans in childhood and subsequent risk of
341 eukaemia and brain tumours: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet*. 2012;380(9840):499-505.

- 342 15. Sacchetti A, Carraccio C, Giardino A, Harris RH. Sedation for pediatric CT scanning: is radiology becoming a drug-free zone? *Pediatr Emerg*
343 *Care*. 2005;21(5):295-7.
- 344 16. Rehani B. Imaging overutilisation: Is enough being done globally? *Biomed Imaging Interv J*. 2011;7(1):e6.
- 345 17. Stephen Waite JS, Daria Colombo. Narrowing the Gap: Imaging Disparities in Radiology. *Radiology*. 2021;299:299:27–35.
- 346 18. Tahvonen P, Oikarinen H, Pääkkö E, Karttunen A, Blanco Sequeiros R, Tervonen O. Justification of CT examinations in young adults and
347 children can be improved by education, guideline implementation and increased MRI capacity. *Br J Radiol*. 2013;86(1029):20130337.
- 348 19. Kawooya M, Kitembo H, Remedios D, Malumba R, Perez M, Ige T, et al. An Africa point of view on quality and safety in imaging. *Insights*
349 *into Imaging*. 2022;13.
- 350 20. Portelli JL MJ, Bezzina P, Rainford L Paediatric imaging radiation dose awareness and use of referral guidelines amongst radiology
351 practitioners and radiographers. *Insights Imaging*. 2016;7:145 –53.
- 352 21. Frija G, Blažić I, Frush DP, Hierath M, Kawooya M, Donoso-Bach L, et al. How to improve access to medical imaging in low- and middle-
353 income countries ? *EClinicalMedicine*. 2021;38:101034.
- 354 22. Merzenich H, Krille L, Hammer G, Kaiser M, Yamashita S, Zeeb H. Paediatric CT scan usage and referrals of children to computed
355 tomography in Germany--a cross-sectional survey of medical practice and awareness of radiation related health risks among physicians.
356 *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2012;12:47.
- 357 23. S K. Awareness and knowledge of radiation dose and associated risks among final year medical students in Norway. *Insights Imaging*
358 2017;8:599 – 605.
- 359 24. W Gecaga GMaTM. Knowledge on ionizing Radiation among non-radiologist clinicians at Kenyatta National Hospital-Kenya. *East African*
360 *Medical Journal* 2018; 95(1):1109-15.
- 361 25. Dauda AM, Ozoh JO, Towobola OA. Medical doctors' awareness of radiation exposure in diagnostic radiology investigations in a South
362 African academic institution. *SA J Radiol*. 2019;23(1):1707.
- 363 26. Brenner DJ. Estimating cancer risks from pediatric CT: going from the qualitative to the quantitative. *Pediatr Radiol*. 2002;32(4):228-1;
364 discussion 42-4.
- 365 27. Brenner DJ, Doll R, Goodhead DT, Hall EJ, Land CE, Little JB, et al. Cancer risks attributable to low doses of ionizing radiation: assessing
366 what we really know. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2003;100(24):13761-6.
- 367 28. Brenner DJ, Hall EJ. Computed tomography--an increasing source of radiation exposure. *N Engl J Med*. 2007;357(22):2277-84.
- 368 29. Cao CF, Ma KL, Shan H, Liu TF, Zhao SQ, Wan Y, et al. CT Scans and Cancer Risks: A Systematic Review and Dose-response Meta-analysis.
369 *BMC Cancer*. 2022;22(1):1238.
- 370 30. Weidman EK, Loftus ML. The Consequences of Inappropriate Use of Emergency Imaging. In: Kelly A, Cronin P, Puig S, Applegate KE,
371 editors. *Evidence-Based Emergency Imaging: Optimizing Diagnostic Imaging of Patients in the Emergency Care Setting*. Cham: Springer
372 International Publishing; 2018. p. 37-46.
- 373 31. Birstow PJ, Mendelson R, Dhillon R, Valton F. Diagnostic imaging pathways: development, dissemination, implementation, and
374 evaluation. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2006;18(1):51-7.

- 375 32. Bairstow PJ, Persaud J, Mendelson R, Nguyen L. Reducing inappropriate diagnostic practice through education and decision support. *Int J*
376 *Qual Health Care*. 2010;22(3):194-200.
- 377 33. Dunne CL, Elzinga JL, Vorobeichik A, Sudershan S, Keto-Lambert D, Lang E, et al. A Systematic Review of Interventions to Reduce
378 Computed Tomography Usage in the Emergency Department. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2022;80(6):548-60.
- 379 34. Ebdon-Jackson S, Frija G, European Society of R. Improving justification of medical exposures using ionising radiation: considerations and
380 approaches from the European Society of Radiology. *Insights into Imaging*. 2021;12(1):2.
- 381 35. Harriet Nalubega Kisembo RM, Ritah Nassanga, Faith Ameda, Dina Hussein Salama, Michael Grace Kawooya. Effect of Continuous
382 Medical Education on Awareness of Clinical Imaging Guidelines Among Imaging Referrers in SUB-Saharan Africa. *International Journal of*
383 *Medical Imaging*. 2023;11(1):6-11.
- 384 36. World IAEA, (WHO) HO. Bonn call for action: 10 actions to improve radiation protection in medicine in the Next Decade. . *International*
385 *Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria*. 2016.
- 386 37. *Radiation Protection and Safety of Radiation Sources: International Basic Safety Standards.General Safety Requirements Part 3 No. GSR*
387 *Part 3, (2014)*.
- 388 38. ICRP. *Radiological Protection in Medicine. ICRP Publication 105. Ann. ICRP 37 2007*.
- 389 39. *Radiology ACo. ACR Appropriateness Criteria 2021* [
- 390 40. Remedios D, France B, Alexander M. Making the best value of clinical radiology: iRefer Guidelines, 8th edition. *Clin Radiol*.
391 2017;72(9):705-7.
- 392 41. Kisembo HN MR, Sematimba H, Kato EN, Kasujja FX, Elsie-Kiguli M. Inappropriate computed tomography examinations among children
393 and young adults in a limited resource setting: A cross-sectional retrospective study. *International Journal of Radiology and Diagnostic*
394 *Imaging*. 2024;7(2):35-42.
- 395 42. Kawooya MG, Kisembo HN, Malumba R, Nsereko E. Effectiveness of clinical imaging guidelines to reduce inappropriate head computed
396 tomography imaging: a case of Uganda. *Egyptian Journal of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine*. 2022;53(1):164.
- 397 43. *ESR iGuide, (2018)*.
- 398 44. Forsetlund L, Bjørndal A, Rashidian A, Jamtvedt G, O'Brien MA, Wolf F, et al. Continuing education meetings and workshops: effects on
399 professional practice and health care outcomes. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2009;2009(2):Cd003030.
- 400 45. Weigner MB, Dewar KM, Basham HF, Rupp VA, Greenberg MR. Impact of education on physician attitudes toward computed
401 tomography utilization and consent. *J Emerg Med*. 2012;43(5):e349-53.
- 402 46. Harriet Nalubega Kisembo RM, Ritah Nassanga, Faith Ameda, Dina Hussein Salama, et al. Effect of Continuous Medical Education on
403 Awareness of Clinical Imaging Guidelines Among Imaging Referrers in Sub-Saharan Africa. *International Journal of Medical Imaging*.
404 2023; 11(1): 6-11.
- 405 47. Lysdahl KB, Hofmann BM. What causes increasing and unnecessary use of radiological investigations? A survey of radiologists'
406 perceptions. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2009;9:155.

- 407 48. Kiguli-Malwadde E, Byanyima R, Kawooya MG, Mubuke AG, Basiimwa RC, Pitcher R. An audit of registered radiology equipment
408 resources in Uganda. *Pan Afr Med J.* 2020;37:295.
- 409 49. Fleming KA, Horton S, Wilson ML, Atun R, DeStigter K, Flanigan J, et al. The Lancet Commission on diagnostics: transforming access to
410 diagnostics. *Lancet.* 2021;398(10315):1997-2050.
- 411 50. Jenkins HJ, Hancock MJ, French SD, Maher CG, Engel RM, Magnussen JS. Effectiveness of interventions designed to reduce the use of
412 imaging for low-back pain: a systematic review. *Cmaj.* 2015;187(6):401-8.
- 413 51. Kawooya MG, Pariyo G, Malwadde EK, Byanyima R, Kitembo H. Assessing the Diagnostic Imaging needs for Five Selected Hospitals in
414 Uganda. *J Clin Imaging Sci.* 2011;1:53.
- 415 52. Inada H, Ashraf L, Campbell S. COVID-19 lockdown and fatal motor vehicle collisions due to speed-related traffic violations in Japan: a
416 time-series study. *Inj Prev.* 2021;27(1):98-100.
- 417 53. Deborah B. Appropriateness of head computed tomography scan in mild traumatic head injury among adult patients in Mulago National
418 Referral Hospital, Kampala: Makerere University 22.
- 419 54. McCollough CH, Primak AN, Braun N, Kofler J, Yu L, Christner J. Strategies for reducing radiation dose in CT. *Radiol Clin North Am.*
420 2009;47(1):27-40.
- 421 55. IR(ME)R: Implications for clinical practice in diagnostic imaging, interventional radiology and diagnostic nuclear medicine, (2020).
- 422 56. Jain SN. Are radiologists true medical imaging gatekeepers? *Indian J Radiol Imaging.* 2014;24(4):315-6.
- 423 57. Harrison R, Housden B, Hay C, Dixon A. Vetting requests for body computed tomography. *European radiology.* 2000;10:1015-8.
- 424 58. Vetting (Triaging) And Cancellation Of Inappropriate Radiology Requests (2021).

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.16.24312127>; this version posted August 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .