Quality Improvement Assessment Questions  
Echocardiography: Adult Transthoracic

Answer the questions below by reviewing the images and final report for a given case study. It is recommended that any discrepancies noted in the assessment be reviewed and shared with medical and technical staff members. The assessment is provided to assist the facility in furthering its ongoing Quality Improvement (QI) process.

For the purposes of Quality Improvement (QI), annual case study self-assessment must be sufficient to ensure the achievement of continuous actions that lead to measurable improvement in the imaging examinations performed in the facility. To attain maximum benefit to the facility, the minimum number of required case assessments is outlined in the IAC Echocardiography Standards, Part C, Section 2C.

Note: Although the case may be in compliance with the IAC Standards based on your assessment, there may be opportunity for improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Test appropriateness</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| With the clinical information provided, was the test ordered for an appropriate indication? | Part C, 2.1.1C | ○ Appropriate/usually appropriate
| | | ○ May be appropriate
| | | ○ Rarely appropriate/usually not appropriate

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Technical quality review</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are the 2D RV inflow views demonstrated (without color Doppler)? Part B, 1.6.2B</td>
<td>○ Yes ○ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are the 2D parasternal short axis views (at the level of the aortic valve, left ventricle at the basal, mid and apical levels) demonstrated? Part B, 1.6.2B</td>
<td>○ Yes ○ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are the apical views foreshortened? Part B, 1.5.3B and Part B, 1.5.4B</td>
<td>○ Yes ○ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the endocardium clearly defined in 14 of 16 segments? Part B, 1.5.3B and Part B, 1.5.4B</td>
<td>○ Yes ○ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the mitral valve evaluated with color Doppler in at least 2 views? Part B, 1.6.2.3B</td>
<td>○ Yes ○ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Could the technical quality of this case have been improved? ○ Yes ○ No

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Interpretive quality review</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was the LV global function correctly reported? Part A, 3.4.1.3A</td>
<td>○ Yes ○ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Was the LV regional function correctly reported? Part A, 3.4.1.3A</td>
<td>○ Yes ○ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the degree of regurgitation/stenosis correctly reported? Part A, 3.4.1.2A</td>
<td>○ Yes ○ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is all clinically significant pathology reported? Part A, 3.3.1.2A</td>
<td>○ Yes ○ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Could the interpretive quality of this case have been improved? ○ Yes ○ No
### IV. Report completeness and timeliness

1. Did the final report include an indication for the study? Part A, 3.3.1.1A  
   - Yes  
   - No

2. Did the final report include some measure of dimension or indexed LA volume? Part A, 3.4.1.1A  
   - Yes  
   - No

3. Did the final report include a comment on the pulmonic valve? Part A, 3.4.1.3A  
   - Yes  
   - No

4. Was the study interpreted within the required time? Part A, 3.2.4A  
   - Yes  
   - No

5. Was the final report generated within the required time? Part A, 3.2.4A  
   - Yes  
   - No

**Could the report completeness and timeliness of this case have been improved?**

---

### V. Correlation

Was this case correlated with any appropriate imaging modality, surgical findings, clinical outcome or other comparison?  
   - Yes  
   - No

---

Comments: