



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Arkoh, S., Akudjedu, T. N., Amedu, C., Antwi, W. K., Elshami, W. & Ohene-Botwe, B. (2025). Current Radiology workforce perspective on the integration of artificial intelligence in clinical practice: A systematic review. *Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Sciences*, 56(1), 101769. doi: 10.1016/j.jmir.2024.101769

This is the supplemental version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/33896/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmir.2024.101769>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

Table C: Quality Assessment Tool for Studies with Diverse Designs (QATSDD) scores for all reviewed papers (scores range from 0 – 3)

		Radiographers																						Radiologists										Both Radiographers and Radiologists									
		1 Botwe et al. 2021 Africa	2 Botwe et al. 2021 Ghana	3 qualitative Antwi et al 2021 Africa	4 Wong et al 2020 Canada	5 Abuzaid et al, 2021 Mid. East	6 Abuzaid et al, 2021 UAE MRI	7 Ryan et al 2021 Ireland	8 ASRT 2019 USA	9 Rainey et al. 2021 UK	10 Currie et al 2022 Australia	11 Rainey et al 2022 UK	12 Coakley et al 2022 Europe	13 Aldhafi eri 2022 Saudi Arabia	14 qualitative Ng et al 2022 Singapore	15 Akudje du et al. 2023 Intercontinental	16 qualitative Peder sen et al. 2024 Nordic region	17 qualitative Chivandire et al. 2022 Zimbabwe	18 Raine y et al. 2022 UK	19 Stogian nos et al. 2024 UK	20 Rawahdeh t al. 2024 UAE	21 Sharip et al. 2023 Malaysia	22 Ampo o et al. 2023 Raiol Research and Practice	23 Coppola et al 2020 Italy	24 Ooi et al 2021 Singapore	25 Huisman et al. 2021 Intercontinental	26 Collado- Mesa et al 2018 USA	27 Van Hoek et al. 2019 Switzerland	28 Waymel et al. 2019 France	29 Edzie et al. 2023 Ghana	30 Tejald een &Alghamdi 2023 Saudi Arabia	31 Hashmi et al. 2023 UK	32 Alghamdi &Alashb an, 2023 Saudi Arabia	33 Chen et al. 2023 China	34 Salastekar et al., 2023 USA	35 Alelyani et al 2021 Saudi Arabia	36 Alsult an, 2023 Saudi, Sudan, Yemen	37 Quras hi et al. 2021 UAE I	38 Abuzaid et al. 2022 UAE	39 Cham pendal et al. 2024 Swiss	40 Al Moha mmad et al. 2024 Jordan	41 Alyami et al. 2023 Saudi Arabia	
Item 1	Explicit theoretical framework	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	3	3	2	1	1	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	2			
Item 2	Statement of aims/objectives in main report	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3		
Item 3	Clear description of research setting	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3		
Item 4	Evidence of sample size considered in terms of analysis	3	3	2	0	3	3	1	0	3	1	3	1	2	0	1	1	3	3	2	3	1	3	2	2	1	0	1	3	3	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	3	
Item 5	Representative sample of target group of a reasonable size	1	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	1	1	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	1	1	3			
Item 6	Description of procedure for data collection	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2			
Item 7	Rationale for choice of data collection tool(s)	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2			
Item 8	Detailed recruitment data	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
Item 9	Statistical assessment of reliability and validity of measurement tool(s) (Quantitative studies only)	3	3	n/a	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	n/a	3	3	n/a	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3		
Item 10	Fit between research question and method of data collection (Quantitative studies only)	3	3	n/a	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	n/a	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	3	1	2	2	2	3	2	2		
Item 11	Fit between research question and format and content of data collection tool e.g., interview schedule (Qualitative studies only)	n/a	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
Item 12	Fit between research question and method of analysis (Quantitative studies only)	3	3	n/a	2	2	3	2	0	3	1	3	3	3	n/a	3	3	n/a	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3		
Item 13	Good justification for analytic method selected	3	3	2	1	1	3	1	0	3	1	3	3	3	2	3	3	1	1	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	
Item 14	Assessment of reliability of analytic process (Qualitative studies only)	n/a	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Item 15	Evidence of user involvement in design	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	2	0	3	1	3	2	2	3	2	0	2	1	2	2	3	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	2	0	2	2	3	3	3	0	
Item 16	Strengths and limitations critically discussed	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	2	3	0	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	3	0	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	
Score		39/42	41/42	33/39	31/42	33/42	32/42	25/42	21/42	38/42	31/42	37/42	30/42	32/42	33/39	34/42	36/42	34/42	35/42	39/42	38/42	30/42	35/42	32/42	36/42	34/42	35/42	33/42	34/42	37/42	28/42	29/42	27/42	35/42	34/42	31/42	35/42	34/42	39/42	30/42	31/42	35/42	
Percentage (%)		92.8	97.6	84.6	73.8	78.5	76.1	59.5	50.0	90.4	73.8	88.0	71.4	76.1	84.6	80.9	85.7	80.9	83.3	92.8	90.4	71.4	83.3	76.1	85.7	80.9	83.3	78.5	80.9	88.0	66.6	69.0	64.2	83.3	80.9	73.8	83.3	80.9	92.8	71.4	73.8	83.3	