### Quality Improvement Assessment Questions
**Pediatric Echocardiography: Pediatric Transesophageal**

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.

#### I. Test appropriateness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With the clinical information provided, was the test ordered for an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate indication?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Appropriate/usually appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ May be appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Rarely appropriate/usually not appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

#### II. Technical quality review

1. Does this study include short and long axis views of the aortic valve?  | ○ Yes ○ No  
   Part B, 2.8.7B

2. Does this study include multiple imaging planes of the mitral valve with appropriate Doppler?  | ○ Yes ○ No  
   Part B, 2.8.7B

3. Does this study include multiple imaging planes of the tricuspid valve with appropriate Doppler?  | ○ Yes ○ No  
   Part B, 2.8.7B

4. Does this study include multiple imaging planes of the atrial septum and foramen ovale with appropriate Doppler?  | ○ Yes ○ No  
   Part B, 2.8.7B

5. Does the study include images and Doppler of pathology for which the study was performed?  | ○ Yes ○ No  
   Part B, 2.8.7B

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

**Comments:**

#### III. Interpretive quality review

1. Is the final report text consistent with quantitative and Doppler data? | ○ Yes ○ No  
   Part A, 3.3A

2. Is all clinically significant pathology reported?  | ○ Yes ○ No  
   Part A, 3.3A

**Could the interpretive quality of this case have been improved?** | ○ Yes ○ No  

**Comments:**
IV. Report completeness and timeliness

1. Is there a summary of pertinent findings? Part A, 3.3.1.3A  ○ Yes  ○ No
2. Is the indication included in the report demographics? Part A, 3.3.1.2A  ○ Yes  ○ No
3. Is the identity of the interpreting physician present on the report? Part A, 3.3.1.3A  ○ Yes  ○ No
4. Was the study interpreted within the required time? Part A, 3.4.1.3A  ○ Yes  ○ No
5. Was the final report generated within the required time? Part A, 3.4.1.3A  ○ Yes  ○ No

Could the report completeness and timeliness of this case have been improved?  ○ Yes  ○ No

Comments:

V. Correlation

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

Comments: