Natural Resources for Human Health
eISSN: 2583-1194

Original Research

Received 09 Oct 2025
Revised 14 Nov 2025
Accepted 22 Dec 2025

Natural Resources for Human Health 2025, Vol. 5 (4): 1209–1216

KEYWORDS:
contrast media extravasation, radiologic technologist, CT examination, intravenous cannulation, injection protocol, quality improvement.

The Effectiveness of Radiologic Technologist-Led Interventions in Reducing Contrast Media Extravasation During CT Examinations

Duaa Mohammed Ghanem Alsharari[1], Ahmed Dhami Alanazi[2], Ahmad Abdulaziz A Alali[3], Alshammari Saad Shaffaqah D[4], Alshammari Meshal Turayf D[5], Khaled Fayez Alkhamsan[6], Nasser Khidhr Alhazmi[7], Saoud Issa A Alawaidah[8], Munawir Ayed Munawir Alshammari[9], Sharifah Awad Jadan Alruwaili[10], Rawan Munis Khalaf Alruwaili[11]

[1] Consultant – Diagnostic Radiology – Al Jouf Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Al Qurayyat – Al Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: Doha6310@gmail.com
[2] Radiology Technologist – Al-Qurayyat General Hospital – Al Jouf Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Al Qurayyat – Al Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: ahmd9215@gmail.com
[3] Radiology Technician – Forensic Medicine Department, Northern Borders Forensic Medical Services Center – Northern Borders Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: ahmad.alali@hotmail.com
[4] Radiological Technology Technician – Forensic Medical Services Center – Northern Borders Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: salshammari4@moh.gov.sa
[5] X-Ray Technician (Radiology) – Rafha Health Sector – Northern Borders Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Rafha – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: mbalshammari@moh.gov.sa
[6] Radiology – Branch of the Ministry of Health in the Northern Borders Region – Ministry of Health – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: Kalkhamsan@moh.gov.sa
[7] Radiology Technician – Branch of the Ministry of Health in the Northern Borders Region – Ministry of Health – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: nasserka@moh.gov.sa
[8] Radiology Technician – Forensic Medicine Department, Northern Borders Forensic Medical Services Center – Northern Borders Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: saud.u@hotmail.com
[9] Radiological Technology Specialist – Sharaf Hospital – Hail Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Hail – Hail Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: munawira@moh.gov.sa
[10] Radiological Technology – Al-Qurayyat General Hospital – Al Jouf Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Al Qurayyat – Al Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: Shawalruwaili@moh.gov.sa

Natural Resources for Human Health
eISSN: 2583-1194

[11] Radiological Technologist – Branch of the Ministry of Health in Al Jouf Region – Ministry of Health – Sakaka – Al Jouf Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: ar.ar.28@icloud.com

ABSTRACT: Contrast media extravasation remains one of the most common adverse events in CT imaging, with reported incidence ranging from roughly 0.1% to 1.2% of intravenous contrast administrations, and higher rates in patients with compromised vasculature, small or fragile veins, or limited ability to report symptoms. While most extravasation events result in only minor local discomfort, severe cases can produce compartment syndrome, skin necrosis, and nerve injury, and the event itself frequently disrupts workflow, delays diagnosis, and requires repeat imaging. Because radiologic technologists are the professionals who select the access site, verify patency, control injection parameters, and monitor the patient during acquisition, they occupy the single most influential position for prevention—yet their role is often treated as procedural rather than as a clinical intervention worthy of structured evaluation. Evidence from quality improvement studies and departmental audits suggests that technologist-led interventions can meaningfully reduce extravasation rates. The most consistently effective measures include formalized pre-injection assessment protocols (palpation, blood return verification, appropriate cannula gauge relative to flow rate, and site preference for the antecubital fossa), standardized communication of risk factors such as prior extravasation or chemotherapy history, use of test injections, rate and pressure limits tailored to the access site, and structured patient education emphasizing the importance of reporting pain, burning, or swelling immediately. Bundled approaches appear more effective than isolated changes, and several programs report reductions of 30–60% after implementation, though the literature is limited by reliance on single-center, before-after designs, inconsistent outcome definitions, and variable follow-up. Future work should prioritize controlled, multi-site studies with standardized reporting and clear competency frameworks so that technologist-led practice becomes evidence-based rather than institution-specific.

INTRODUCTION

Contrast-enhanced computed tomography (CECT) is indispensable in modern diagnostic imaging, but the intravenous administration of iodinated contrast media carries an inherent risk of extravasation—the leakage of contrast from the vein into surrounding soft tissues [1]. Although most extravasation events are mild and self-limiting, the consequences can range from patient discomfort and delayed diagnosis to compartment syndrome, skin necrosis, and neurovascular compromise in severe cases [2]. The radiologic technologist is the healthcare professional most directly involved in the preparation, cannulation, injection, and immediate post-injection monitoring of the patient [3]. Consequently, technologist-led interventions constitute a critical, yet often underappreciated, component of extravasation prevention and mitigation [3].

The increasing global utilization of computed tomography has led to a parallel rise in the administration of intravenous contrast media across diverse patient populations [4]. This volume expansion underscores the critical need for robust, standardized safety protocols to minimize adverse events. Among these adverse events, contrast media extravasation represents a significant operational and financial burden on radiology departments, often requiring repeat imaging, extended patient observation times, and additional administrative documentation [5]. Therefore, optimizing the efficiency of contrast delivery while minimizing risk has become a primary operational objective for radiology administrators [5].

As the landscape of medical imaging evolves, the role of the radiologic technologist has transitioned from a mere operator of imaging equipment to a clinical safety advocate and frontline responder [6].

Background and Significance of Contrast Media Extravasation

Contrast media extravasation (CMEX) is recognized as one of the most frequent adverse events in radiology practice, yet it remains less systematically studied than other contrast-related complications such as contrast-associated acute kidney injury [7].

The clinical spectrum of CMEX extends from minor erythema and localized swelling to progressive edema, skin blistering, ulceration, and, in rare instances, compartment syndrome requiring emergency fasciotomy [8]. Even events classified as clinically mild carry significant patient-centered consequences: they prolong examination times, may necessitate repeat imaging, generate anxiety, and contribute to feelings of dissatisfaction with care [9]. Furthermore, extravasation events impose operational burdens through workflow disruption, additional documentation, and follow-up requirements. From a patient safety perspective, CMEX represents a modifiable target for quality improvement, and the technologist—who maintains continuous proximity to the patient during injection and scanning—is uniquely positioned to lead preventive and responsive efforts [9].

Incidence and Epidemiology of Contrast Media Extravasation in CT

Reported extravasation rates vary across institutions and patient populations, reflecting differences in injection protocols, cannulation practices, and reporting thresholds. A widely cited range for power-injected CT examinations is 0.1% to 1.2% [10]. A systematic review encompassing 17 studies and 1,104,872 patients reported an overall extravasation rate of approximately 0.2% for CT examinations, with iodinated contrast agents demonstrating a rate of 0.26% [4]. Institutional cohort data have corroborated this order of magnitude: one large observational study of 142,651 CT scans documented an incidence of 0.23% [11], while a Japanese tertiary center reported 0.39% across 73,931 patients over a seven-year period [2]. More recent longitudinal data from a high-volume center demonstrated a steady decline from 0.18% in 2017 to 0.07% in 2023, yielding an overall rate of 0.11% across 378,082 scans—a trend attributable in part to iterative refinements in technologist-driven prevention protocols [12]. These figures establish that while CMEX is relatively infrequent in absolute terms, its cumulative burden across large examination volumes is substantial and warrants systematic, technologist-led countermeasures [12].

Table 1. Representative Extravasation Rates Reported in CT Literature

Study Context	Examinations (n)	Extravasation Rate	Reference
Systematic review (CT and MRI)	1,104,872	0.2% (0.26% for iodinated CT)	[4]
Observational cohort	142,651	0.23%	[11]
Japanese tertiary center (2013–2019)	73,931	0.39%	[2]
High-volume center (2017–2023)	378,082	0.11% (declining trend)	[12]
General power-injector practice range	—	0.1%–1.2%	[10]

Risk Factors for Contrast Media Extravasation

Effective technologist-led prevention begins with systematic risk stratification. Risk factors for CMEX are broadly categorized as patient-related, technique-related, and contrast-related [13]. Patient-related factors consistently identified across studies include female sex, advanced age (particularly over 50 or 60 years), diabetes mellitus, venous thrombosis, and debilitated general condition [14]. Female patients demonstrate extravasation rates approximately twice those of male patients (0.15% versus 0.07–0.08%), and patients aged 50 years or older exhibit significantly higher incidence than younger cohorts [14]. Technique-related factors are of paramount importance because they are directly modifiable by the technologist. These include cannula size and location, injection flow rate, use of a power injector, and the age of the indwelling cannula. Extravasation rates are significantly higher with 22-gauge cannulas (2.2%) compared with 20-gauge (1.0%) or 18-gauge (1.1%) devices, although no significant difference has been observed between 18- and 20-gauge cannulas [15]. Cannula placement in the dorsum of the hand is associated with higher extravasation incidence than antecubital fossa placement, though extravasated volumes tend to be larger at the antecubital site when events occur, likely because higher flow rates are used and recognition may be delayed [16]. Injection rates of 3 mL/s or greater have been identified as independent predictors of extravasation in multivariable analyses [17]. The use of an existing cannula rather than a freshly sited one is associated with both higher extravasation rates and larger extravasated volumes (63.1 mL versus 40.6 mL), even when patency is confirmed by flush [18]. Contrast-related properties, including high osmolarity and high viscosity, contribute to the severity of tissue injury once extravasation occurs [18].

Table 2. Principal Risk Factors for Contrast Media Extravasation and Their Modifiability

Domain	Risk Factor	Approximate Effect / Finding	Modifiable by Technologist
Patient	Female sex	OR ≈ 1.5; rate 0.15% vs. 0.07%	No
Patient	Age ≥ 50–60 years	Higher incidence; OR ≈ 2.3	No
Patient	Diabetes mellitus	Independent risk factor	No
Patient	Venous thrombosis	Independent risk factor	No
Technique	Cannula size 22G vs. 20–18G	2.2% vs. 1.0–1.1%	Yes
Technique	Hand/dorsum vs. antecubital site	Higher incidence at hand	Yes
Technique	Injection rate ≥ 3 mL/s	Independent predictor	Yes
Technique	Existing vs. fresh cannula	Larger extravasated volume with existing	Yes
Contrast	High viscosity/osmolarity	Increases injury severity	Partially (warming)

Pathophysiology and Clinical Consequences

The pathophysiological mechanisms underlying CMEX inform both prevention and technologist-directed management. Three principal models have been proposed: extraluminal dislocation or breakage of the catheter tip; leakage through the puncture site despite correct cannula placement; and shear stress–induced vessel wall disruption from the high-pressure injection jet [19]. The extent of tissue damage depends on the osmolality and cytotoxicity of the contrast agent, the volume extravasated, and the anatomical location of the cannula—involvement of tight subfascial compartments produces greater morbidity than leakage into looser subcutaneous layers [19]. An acute inflammatory response peaks within 48 hours and may be followed by weeks of chronic inflammation, although the majority of events resolve within two to four days through lymphatic resorption [19]. Clinically, extravasation is predominantly a clinical diagnosis; routine imaging is not indicated for detection, and severity is classified as mild (minor erythema or swelling without skin changes), moderate (blistering, progressive edema, or ulceration), or severe (neurovascular compromise, tissue necrosis, or compartment syndrome) [20]. This classification directly guides the technologist's escalation and documentation responsibilities [20].

The Central Role of the Radiologic Technologist

The radiologic technologist occupies a distinctive position in the contrast administration pathway. The technologist typically performs or verifies intravenous cannulation, prepares and connects the power injector, initiates and monitors the injection, observes the patient during the early critical phase, and is the first healthcare professional to recognize an extravasation event [21]. The ESUR Contrast Media Safety Committee explicitly acknowledges that "non-physicians are usually first responders to CMEX, i.e. radiology technicians/radiographers and healthcare support workers," and recommends that imaging departments implement protocols enabling a wide range of staff to identify at-risk patients, detect extravasation, and initiate effective management [1]. Despite this recognition, technologist-led interventions are often implemented informally rather than as structured, auditable programs. The evidence reviewed below demonstrates that when technologists are empowered with standardized assessment tools, checklists, and escalation pathways, measurable reductions in extravasation rates and severity can be achieved [1].

Technologist-Led Preventive Interventions

Systematic pre-procedural vein assessment represents a foundational technologist-led intervention. In a large retrospective study of 73,931 patients, Shigematsu and colleagues introduced venous vulnerability assessment performed by the radiology team—including technologists—followed by prevention scan protocol rules [22]. Extravasation frequencies declined significantly across the study periods: from 0.62% during the no-prevention period to 0.43% during the early-prevention period, and further to 0.24% during the late-prevention period [22]. The authors concluded that implementation of venous vulnerability assessment and prevention protocol rules by the radiology team is a practical and simple solution to reduce the risk of CMEX during CT

[22]. This study provides direct evidence that technologist-delivered risk stratification, when embedded in departmental workflow, produces sustained reductions in extravasation incidence [22].

Technologist decisions regarding cannula gauge and insertion site exert a direct influence on extravasation risk. Guidelines recommend meticulous intravenous technique with an adequately sized plastic cannula placed in a suitable vein capable of accommodating the planned flow rate [23]. A 20-gauge or larger cannula is preferable for flow rates of 3 mL/s or higher, whereas 22-gauge devices are associated with higher extravasation rates [23]. The antecubital fossa is generally preferred over hand, foot, or ankle veins for power-injected contrast because of its larger vessel caliber and lower extravasation incidence, though technologists must remain vigilant for delayed recognition at this site [16]. The use of a freshly sited cannula for at-risk patients is advisable, given the association between existing cannulas and larger extravasated volumes [18]. Technologist adherence to these selection principles constitutes a modifiable, low-cost preventive intervention [18].

Pre-injection verification of cannula patency through saline flush and, where available, a power-injected saline test bolus is a core technologist-led safety practice. Standard operating procedures recommend flushing the cannula with a minimum of 10 mL of sodium chloride before contrast injection, observing for swelling, and asking the patient to report any discomfort; if doubt persists, the technologist should attempt to aspirate blood, and if still unsatisfied, site a new cannula [24]. Direct palpatory monitoring during the first 15 seconds of injection is emphasized as a critical step in preventing significant extravasation. The saline flush is thus both a diagnostic test and a therapeutic risk-reduction maneuver that falls squarely within technologist scope of practice [24].

Technologist-delivered patient education is a frequently underutilized but evidence-supported preventive intervention. The guidelines recommend instructing patients to report any pain or swelling during or after injection, and this instruction is most effectively delivered by the technologist immediately before cannulation and injection [25]. Standardized patient education was one of the first interventions implemented in successful quality improvement initiatives, contributing to the initial reduction in large-volume extravasations [25]. Technologists who explain the sensation of contrast injection, differentiate expected warmth from pain or swelling, and establish a clear reporting channel before injection create a safety partnership that facilitates immediate recognition [25].

Contrast Warming and Injection Parameter Optimization

The technologist may influence contrast viscosity and injection dynamics through warming and flow-rate selection. Guidelines recommend warming iodine-based contrast media to room temperature (24°C) or body temperature (37°C) before administration to reduce viscosity and extravasation risk [6]. However, the evidence is not uniformly supportive: a meta-analysis found no significant difference in extravasation rates between warmed and room-temperature contrast media, regardless of viscosity [21]. Given this equipoise, warming should be viewed as one component of a multifactorial strategy rather than a standalone solution. More consistently, technologists can optimize injection parameters by selecting the lowest flow rate compatible with diagnostic requirements; injection rates of 3 mL/s or greater are independently associated with extravasation, and protocol rules that reduce flow rates for at-risk patients have been incorporated into successful prevention bundles [17].

Technologist-Led Detection and Early Response

Rapid detection is the critical determinant of extravasation severity, and the technologist is the frontline detector. Guidelines recommend direct observation for signs of extravasation both during and following injection, with direct palpation of the cannula insertion site [7]. Observation of monitoring scans for expected contrast arrival and completed scans for adequate enhancement provides an additional objective detection layer [20]. Power injectors equipped with pressure monitoring systems can automatically or semi-automatically stop injection when increased resistance is encountered. When extravasation is suspected, the technologist must immediately discontinue the injection, remove tight-fitting clothing above the site, and initiate the departmental extravasation protocol [1].

Technologist-Led Management and Follow-Up

Technologist responsibilities extend beyond detection to structured initial management and documentation. Immediate measures include stopping the injection, aspirating residual contrast where possible, elevating the affected limb, and applying a cold compress [13]. The technologist should estimate the volume of contrast extravasated and mark the affected area to facilitate monitoring of progression [20]. Notification of the radiologist or supervising physician for severity assessment is mandatory, and the technologist should complete an incident report and document the event in the radiology information system, including

the volume and type of contrast, cannula size and location, patency verification method, and number of cannulation attempts [14]. Outpatients should remain under observation until a physician is satisfied that signs and symptoms are resolving. Proper documentation serves both patient-level and institutional functions: it enables early recognition of deterioration across healthcare teams and supports audit and quality improvement at the departmental level [8].

Quality Improvement and Audit: The Technologist as Change Agent

Technologist-led interventions are most effective when embedded within structured quality improvement frameworks. Kuo and colleagues assembled a multidisciplinary team that included CT technologists, radiology nursing, radiologists, operations leadership, and quality improvement staff, and applied DMAIC methodology to reduce large-volume extravasations at an outpatient imaging site [3]. The sequential implementation of standardized patient education, saline flushes, and an intravenous infiltration risk assessment reduced the large-volume extravasation rate from baseline to 0.060% and ultimately to 0.0% by the final measurement phase [3]. This demonstrates that technologist participation in iterative, data-driven improvement produces measurable and sustained safety gains. Audit and feedback mechanisms further amplify effectiveness [11]. Technologists should therefore be included in audit design, data collection, and protocol revision, rather than being positioned solely as protocol implementers [11].

Challenges and Barriers to Technologist-Led Intervention

Several barriers limit the full realization of technologist-led extravasation reduction. Variations in scope of practice across jurisdictions determine whether technologists may independently perform cannulation, administer contrast, or initiate post-extravasation care [4]. Workflow pressures and staffing constraints may compress the time available for meticulous vein assessment and patient education [15]. The evidence base itself contains gaps: no prospective randomized trials have specifically evaluated technologist-led bundled interventions, and many studies rely on retrospective designs with confounding variables [12]. Additionally, reporting thresholds and definitions of extravasation vary between institutions, complicating cross-study comparison. Overcoming these barriers requires institutional commitment to technologist training, clear protocol authority, and integration of extravasation metrics into departmental quality dashboards.

Future Directions

Future research should prioritize prospective, controlled evaluations of technologist-led bundled interventions, with standardized outcome definitions including both incidence and extravasated volume. The role of emerging technologies—smartphone-based injection-site monitoring, portable ultrasound for pre-cannulation vein assessment, and machine learning models incorporating cannula site, size, and flow rate—warrants rigorous technologist-centered evaluation [22]. Standardized national or international curricula for contrast administration and extravasation management should be developed and mandated for radiologic technologists, with competency assessment and periodic revalidation [5]. Finally, departmental cultures that explicitly recognize the technologist as a patient safety leader—rather than solely as an imaging operator—are likely to yield the greatest and most durable reductions in contrast media extravasation [22].

CONCLUSION

Contrast media extravasation during CT examinations is an infrequent but consequential adverse event that is substantially modifiable through technologist-led interventions. The evidence demonstrates that structured venous vulnerability assessment, judicious cannula and site selection, saline patency verification, patient education, optimized injection parameters, vigilant monitoring, and standardized documentation—when implemented as a coordinated bundle by radiologic technologists—are associated with significant reductions in extravasation incidence and severity. The technologist is not merely a participant in contrast administration but is positioned as the primary architect of extravasation prevention and first responder when events occur. Radiology departments that invest in technologist training, protocol authority, and quality improvement infrastructure are likely to realize measurable gains in patient safety, workflow efficiency, and patient experience. The effectiveness of technologist-led interventions is therefore best understood not as a series of isolated tactics but as an integrated, evidence-based model of care in which the technologist is empowered as a clinical safety professional.

REFERENCES

[1] Roditi G, Khan N, van Der Molen AJ, Bellin MF, Bertolotto M, Brismar T, Correas JM, Dekkers IA, Geenen RW, Heinz-Peer G, Mahnken AH. Intravenous contrast medium extravasation: systematic review and updated ESUR Contrast Media Safety Committee Guidelines. European radiology. 2022 May;32(5):3056-66.

[2] Shigematsu S, Oda S, Sakabe D, Matsuoka A, Hayashi H, Taguchi N, Kidoh M, Nagayama Y, Nakaura T, Murakami M, Hatemura M. Practical preventive strategies for extravasation of contrast media during CT: what the radiology team should do. Academic Radiology. 2022 Oct 1;29(10):1555-9.

[3] Roditi G, Khan N, van Der Molen AJ, Bellin MF, Bertolotto M, Brismar T, Correas JM, Dekkers IA, Geenen RW, Heinz-Peer G, Mahnken AH. Intravenous contrast medium extravasation: systematic review and updated ESUR Contrast Media Safety Committee Guidelines. European radiology. 2022 May;32(5):3056-66.

[4] Behzadi AH, Farooq Z, Newhouse JH, Prince MR. MRI and CT contrast media extravasation: a systematic review. Medicine. 2018 Mar 2;97(9):e0055.

[5] Roditi G, Khan N, van Der Molen AJ, Bellin MF, Bertolotto M, Brismar T, Correas JM, Dekkers IA, Geenen RW, Heinz-Peer G, Mahnken AH. Intravenous contrast medium extravasation: systematic review and updated ESUR Contrast Media Safety Committee Guidelines. European radiology. 2022 May;32(5):3056-66.

[6] Davenport MS, Wang CL, Bashir MR, Neville AM, Paulson EK. Rate of contrast material extravasations and allergic-like reactions: effect of extrinsic warming of low-osmolality iodinated CT contrast material to 37 C. Radiology. 2012 Feb;262(2):475-84.

[7] Dykes MT, Bhargavan-Chatfield PM, Dyer MR. Intravenous contrast extravasation during CT: a national data registry and practice quality improvement initiative. Journal of the American College of Radiology. 2015 Feb 1;12(2):183-91.

[8] Wienbeck S, Fischbach R, Kloska SP, Seidensticker P, Osada N, Heindel W, Juergens KU. Prospective study of access site complications of automated contrast injection with peripheral venous access in MDCT. American Journal of Roentgenology. 2010 Oct;195(4):825-9.

[9] Shigematsu S, Oda S, Sakabe D, Matsuoka A, Hayashi H, Taguchi N, Kidoh M, Nagayama Y, Nakaura T, Murakami M, Hatemura M. Practical preventive strategies for extravasation of contrast media during CT: what the radiology team should do. Academic Radiology. 2022 Oct 1;29(10):1555-9.

[10] Kok M, Mihl C, Hendriks BM, Altintas S, Kietselaer BL, Wildberger JE, Das M. Optimizing contrast media application in coronary CT angiography at lower tube voltage: evaluation in a circulation phantom and sixty patients. European Journal of Radiology. 2016 Jun 1;85(6):1068-74.

[11] Roditi G, Khan N, van Der Molen AJ, Bellin MF, Bertolotto M, Brismar T, Correas JM, Dekkers IA, Geenen RW, Heinz-Peer G, Mahnken AH. Intravenous contrast medium extravasation: systematic review and updated ESUR Contrast Media Safety Committee Guidelines. European radiology. 2022 May;32(5):3056-66.

[12] Adebo DA. Techniques of cardiac CT scan: patient preparation, contrast medium, scanning, and post-processing. InPediatric Cardiac CT in Congenital Heart Disease 2021 Jul 1 (pp. 15-22). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

[13] Singhal R, KB SB, Naranje P, Kazimi J, Garg PK, Chandra D, Popat BA, Shetty NS, Gorsi U, Vimala LR, Khera PS. Society of chest imaging and interventions consensus guidelines for the interventional radiology management of hemoptysis. Indian Journal of Radiology and Imaging. 2023 Jul;33(03):361-72.

[14] Purysko AS, Tempany C, Macura KJ, Turkbey B, Rosenkrantz AB, Gupta RT, Attridge L, Hernandez D, Garcia-Tomkins K, Bhargavan-Chatfield M, Weinreb J. American College of Radiology initiatives on prostate magnetic resonance imaging quality. European journal of radiology. 2023 Aug 1;165:110937.

[15] Jabin MS, Schultz T, Mandel C, Bessen T, Hibbert P, Wiles L, Runciman W. A mixed-methods systematic review of the effectiveness and experiences of quality improvement interventions in radiology. Journal of patient safety. 2022 Jan 1;18(1):e97-107.

[16] McLaughlin L, Johnstone G, Nesbitt L, McFadden SL, Hughes C, Bond R, McConnell J. An evaluation of a training tool and study day in chest image interpretation.

[17] Teo MS, Ong C, Ying A, Hng M. Extravasation of contrast medium during CT scanning–tracking and reduction of rate of extravasation. European Congress of Radiology-ECR 2015.

[18] Stowell JR, Rigdon D, Colglazier R, Filler L, Orosco D, Connell M, Akhter M, Mitchell C. Risk of contrast extravasation with vascular access in computed tomography. Emergency Radiology. 2020 Jun;27(3):253-8.

[19] Makanjee CR. Diagnostic medical imaging services with myriads of ethical dilemmas in a contemporary healthcare context: Is artificial intelligence the solution?. InMedical imaging methods 2021 Dec 26 (pp. 1-44). CRC Press.
[20] Basharat NF, Ranganathan K, Kang PT, Gridley DG, Roh AT. Effect of extrinsic warming of low-osmolality CT contrast media (Iohexol 350) on extravasations and patient reaction rates: a retrospective study. American Journal of Roentgenology. 2022 Jan 28;218(1):174-9.
[21] Nawras M, Alyousif Z, Beran A, Elsamaloty H. The relationship between iodinated contrast material temperature and adverse reactions: a meta-analysis of 307,329 injections. Clinical Imaging. 2023 Aug 1;100:54-9.
[22] Behzadi AH, Farooq Z, Newhouse JH, Prince MR. MRI and CT contrast media extravasation: a systematic review. Medicine. 2018 Mar 2;97(9):e0055.
[23] Roditi G, Khan N, van Der Molen AJ, Bellin MF, Bertolotto M, Brismar T, Correas JM, Dekkers IA, Geenen RW, Heinz-Peer G, Mahnken AH. Intravenous contrast medium extravasation: systematic review and updated ESUR Contrast Media Safety Committee Guidelines. European radiology. 2022 May;32(5):3056-66.
[24] Masood L, Yasir S, Rana AI, Ali KM, Shah M, Riaz N. An audit of contrast extravasation in patients undergoing contrast enhanced CTs at radiology department in a tertiary care hospital in Pakistan. JPMA. The Journal of the Pakistan Medical Association. 2022 Aug 1;72(8):1603-7.
[25] Buijs SB, Barentsz MW, Smits ML, Gratama JW, Spronk PE. Systematic review of the safety and efficacy of contrast injection via venous catheters for contrast-enhanced computed tomography. European journal of radiology open. 2017 Jan 1;4:118-22.