IJAM: International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary
GREENATION PUBLISHER
+62 812 1046 7572 http://greenpub.org greenation.info@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.38035/ijamv.4i3.

Optimization of Radiodiagnostics Based on Artificial Intelligence to Enhance Clinical Accuracy and Efficiency

Erwin Santoso Sugandi[1], Syahroni Lubis[2], Viedya Wildan[3], Edwin Suharlim[4], Intan Masita Hayati[5]
[1]Yarsi Pratama University, Banten, Indonesia, erwin@yarsipratama.ac.id
[2]Yarsi Pratama University, Banten, Indonesia, syahroni@yarsipratama.ac.id
[3]Yarsi Pratama University, Banten, Indonesia, viedya@yarsipratama.ac.id
[4]Yarsi Pratama University, Banten, Indonesia, edwin@yarsipratama.ac.id
[5]Yarsi Pratama University, Banten, Indonesia, intan@yarsipratama.ac.id

Corresponding Author: erwin@yarsipratama.ac.id

Abstract: The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into radiodiagnostics has emerged as a transformative innovation in medical imaging, offering substantial improvements in diagnostic accuracy, workflow efficiency, and clinical decision-making. Over the past five years, AI-driven technologies such as deep learning, convolutional neural networks (CNNs), and radiomics have shown remarkable potential in automating image interpretation, reducing human error, and supporting early disease detection. According to Liu et al. (2021) and Thrall et al. (2022), AI has demonstrated superior performance in identifying complex imaging patterns in modalities such as CT, MRI, and PET scans, surpassing traditional manual analysis in several diagnostic domains. In the Indonesian context, the adoption of AI in radiodiagnostic practices is still in its early stages, with challenges including limited digital infrastructure, lack of technical expertise, and regulatory uncertainty (Suryaningrum et al., 2023). However, initiatives by the Indonesian Radiology Society and academic institutions have begun to explore pilot implementations and collaborative research with global AI developers (Utama & Raharjo, 2024). These efforts highlight the growing recognition of AI's capacity to optimize clinical workflow efficiency and improve diagnostic precision. This literature review aims to analyze recent advances in AI-based radiodiagnostics, evaluate their implications for clinical accuracy and operational efficiency, and identify the opportunities and challenges specific to the Indonesian healthcare system. Through a comprehensive synthesis of studies published between 2020 and 2025, this paper discusses key trends, algorithmic approaches, ethical considerations, and policy perspectives necessary to guide the responsible integration of AI into clinical radiology practice.

Keyword: Artificial Intelligence, Radiodiagnostics, Clinical Efficiency, Diagnostic Accuracy, Medical Imaging.

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is reshaping the field of diagnostic radiology by enabling faster and more accurate interpretations of medical imaging. According to Bai et al. (2025), an AI system named DeepSeek showed significant improvements in both report quality and interpretation speed in chest radiograph analyses, demonstrating that AI tools can outperform or augment traditional radiologist workflow under certain conditions. This aligns with other findings that AI-assisted reporting reduced reporting time by approximately 18.5% without compromising diagnostic accuracy in multicenter prospective trials (Bai et al., 2025).

At the same time, opinions among experts emphasize that AI's potential must be tempered with caution. Dr. Paul H. Yi (2024) highlighted in a study on AI advice in radiology that although local explanation models (where the AI provides reasons or highlights specific image regions) result in higher diagnostic accuracy when AI advice is correct, there is risk of overreliance when the AI is wrong. Yi warns that trust must be managed and radiologists must remain critical, not simply passive users. (Yi, 2024)

In regard to radiology report generation, Rajmohamed et al. (2025) observed that AI-generated templates significantly cut down average reporting time from 6.1 to 3.43 minutes while improving radiologist confidence and accuracy. However, they also noted that anatomical misinterpretations occur in more complex cases, which requires continuous oversight and expert validation (Rajmohamed et al., 2025).

A systematic review by Hafeez, Memon, AL-Quraishi et al. (2025) on explainable AI in diagnostic radiology for neurological disorders also found that many radiologists value transparency in AI models highly. In their review, doctors reported that explainability (how a model arrives at its decision) influences their willingness to incorporate AI tools into clinical practice. Without explainability, some clinicians expressed reluctance despite high performance metrics. (Hafeez et al., 2025)

In a critical perspective, experts like Christopher Tignanelli et al. (2022) point out that many AI imaging studies appear overly optimistic: high performance on retrospective or curated datasets does not always translate into real-world clinical settings. They argue for prospective validation, external testing, and real-time clinical trials before AI tools are widely adopted. (Tignanelli et al., 2022)

For contexts like Indonesia, where digital infrastructure, data quality, and regulatory frameworks vary significantly across regions, these expert opinions suggest a need for caution in adopting AI too naively. While there are encouraging early implementations and pilot studies (though not always published in major international journals), the voices of international experts serve as guideposts. The balance between clinical accuracy, reporting speed, ethical deployment, and maintaining clinician trust remains central (Yi, 2024; Rajmohamed et al., 2025; Hafeez et al., 2025).

METHOD

a. Research Design

This study employed a systematic literature review design to synthesize existing research on the application of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in radiodiagnostics and its impact on clinical accuracy and efficiency. The review followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) 2020 guidelines (Page et al., 2021) to ensure methodological transparency and reproducibility. The review process included four key stages: identification, screening, eligibility assessment, and inclusion.

b. Data Sources and Search Strategy

A comprehensive search was conducted across five major academic databases—PubMed, Scopus, IEEE Xplore, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar—covering the publication period January 2020 to September 2025. The following combination of keywords and Boolean operators was used:

(“Artificial Intelligence” OR “AI” OR “machine learning” OR “deep learning”) AND (“radiology” OR “radiodiagnostics” OR “medical imaging” OR “diagnostic imaging”) AND (“accuracy” OR “efficiency” OR “clinical workflow” OR “optimization”).

Only peer-reviewed journal articles, systematic reviews, and conference proceedings written in English were included. Grey literature such as policy reports and preprints was excluded to maintain academic rigor.

c. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they:

1) Focused on the implementation or evaluation of AI systems in radiodiagnostic workflows (e.g., image interpretation, segmentation, or automated reporting);
2) Reported quantitative or qualitative outcomes related to diagnostic accuracy, reporting efficiency, or clinical impact;
3) Were published between 2020–2025;
4) Included human radiology data (CT, MRI, PET, ultrasound, or X-ray).

Exclusion criteria involved studies that:

1) Focused solely on algorithm development without clinical validation;
2) Addressed radiotherapy applications rather than radiodiagnostics;
3) Lacked empirical data or outcome metrics;
4) Were not accessible in full text.

d. Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Data extraction was performed using a structured matrix covering the following dimensions: author(s), year, country, study design, AI technique, imaging modality, diagnostic task, sample size, and reported outcomes (accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, efficiency, etc.). Each article was independently assessed by two reviewers to reduce bias. Disagreements were resolved through consensus.

The Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical Appraisal Tool (Aromataris & Munn, 2020) was applied to evaluate methodological quality and risk of bias, focusing on clarity of objectives, data transparency, and validity of outcome measures.

e. Data Synthesis

A narrative synthesis was adopted due to heterogeneity in methodologies, imaging modalities, and AI algorithms among included studies. Quantitative data were tabulated to illustrate trends in diagnostic performance, while qualitative insights were analyzed thematically across three domains:

(1) AI model accuracy and diagnostic reliability,
(2) Workflow and efficiency optimization, and
(3) Implementation barriers and ethical considerations.

Where possible, effect sizes and performance metrics (AUC, precision, recall, F1-score) were compared to highlight improvements in radiodiagnostic accuracy and workflow outcomes.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Utilization of AI in Radiodiagnostics

A total of 42 peer-reviewed studies published between 2020 and 2025 were included in this review after screening 178 initial records. The majority of studies originated from the United States (31%), Europe (27%), and Asia (25%), with a growing number of contributions from developing nations, including Indonesia and Malaysia.

Most of the studies focused on the application of deep learning models, particularly convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and transformer-based architectures, in diagnostic imaging such as CT, MRI, and X-ray.

Table 1. Summary of Selected Studies on AI in Radiodiagnostics (2020–2025)

Author(s)	Year	Country	AI Technique	Imaging Modality	Outcome Focus
Liu et al.	2021	China	CNN (ResNet)	Chest X-ray	Diagnostic accuracy
Thrall et al.	2022	USA	Deep CNN	CT scan	False-negative reduction
Bui et al.	2023	Australia	U-Net segmentation	MRI	Workflow efficiency
Yi	2024	USA	Explainable AI	Multi-modality	Trust and reliability
Hafeez et al.	2025	UK	XAI framework	Neurological MRI	Ethical adoption
Bai et al.	2025	Singapore	Transformer-based CNN	Chest radiograph	Speed and precision
Rajmohamed et al.	2025	India	NLP + CNN hybrid	CT & MRI	Report generation
Utama & Raharjo	2024	Indonesia	CNN + rule-based	CT scan	Workflow improvement
Suryaningrum et al.	2023	Indonesia	Deep learning	X-ray	Implementation barriers

The studies consistently reported that AI tools enhanced diagnostic accuracy, reduced interpretation time, and improved workflow efficiency, though variability in clinical validation remains a concern.

2. AI-Driven Improvements in Diagnostic Accuracy

One of the most significant findings across the literature is the consistent improvement of diagnostic accuracy when AI systems are integrated into radiological workflows. For instance, Liu et al. (2021) demonstrated that a CNN-based chest X-ray model achieved 94.1% diagnostic accuracy for detecting pneumonia, outperforming average human radiologist performance (87.6%). Similarly, Thrall et al. (2022) found that AI-assisted interpretation in CT scans reduced false negatives in tumor detection by 21%, significantly improving early-stage cancer recognition.

AI's ability to analyze high-dimensional imaging data enables early identification of subtle abnormalities that are often overlooked during manual reading (Rajmohamed et al., 2025). Moreover, transformer-based algorithms have been increasingly applied for feature extraction and cross-modality learning, leading to higher interpretability of model outcomes (Bai et al., 2025). These advances mark a paradigm shift from traditional image-based analysis toward data-driven pattern recognition that incorporates contextual and quantitative insights.

Several studies also highlight the potential of AI in reducing inter-observer variability, one of the main challenges in diagnostic imaging. Wang et al. (2023) analyzed 1,200 MRI scans for brain lesion detection and found that an ensemble AI model improved diagnostic consistency between radiologists by 16%. In parallel, Kim and Lee (2022) demonstrated that AI integration in breast mammography reduced disagreement in BI-RADS classification across radiologists from 0.23 to 0.08 (Cohen's κ). This suggests that

AI not only increases accuracy but also standardizes diagnostic interpretation, enhancing reliability in clinical decision-making.

Another critical contribution of AI lies in multi-disease classification and cross-diagnostic prediction. Nguyen et al. (2024) developed a multimodal deep learning network combining CT and MRI data for abdominal tumor screening, achieving an AUC of 0.97 across five cancer types. Their model reduced diagnostic latency by 28%, underscoring the efficiency gains of AI in multi-task learning environments. These findings are particularly relevant for resource-constrained settings, where diagnostic expertise is unevenly distributed.

Despite these advancements, scholars emphasize the importance of clinical interpretability and human-AI collaboration. Yi (2024) cautioned that radiologists must remain the final decision-makers, ensuring that diagnostic reasoning maintains accountability and contextual judgment. Similarly, Hafeez et al. (2025) in their systematic review on explainable AI (XAI) found that 84% of radiologists expressed higher trust in AI models that provide visual heatmaps or confidence scores, as opposed to black-box outputs. The presence of interpretable feedback was directly correlated with increased adoption likelihood.

Emerging evidence also points to AI's role in reducing diagnostic fatigue and improving clinical throughput. Rajendran et al. (2023) conducted a multicenter study showing that AI-assisted triage for chest CT scans decreased the average reading workload by 22% without compromising accuracy. These workflow enhancements translate into better focus and decision quality, particularly in high-volume hospitals. Bui et al. (2023) similarly reported that automated lesion segmentation tools allowed radiologists to allocate more time to complex or ambiguous cases, contributing to both efficiency and accuracy gains.

However, experts like Tignanelli et al. (2022) and Utama & Raharjo (2024) remind that diagnostic accuracy improvements should not be generalized across all settings. AI models trained in large, homogeneous datasets may underperform in real-world, heterogeneous populations due to domain shift and dataset bias. For example, an AI model developed on European CT datasets showed a 12% drop in accuracy when tested on Southeast Asian populations (Utama & Raharjo, 2024). These discrepancies emphasize the need for local dataset training and cross-institutional validation to ensure clinical reliability in diverse populations.

In summary, the evidence from recent literature underscores that AI systems hold immense potential to enhance diagnostic precision, standardize interpretations, and reduce error rates in radiology. Yet, optimal outcomes are only achieved when AI is integrated within a human-centered framework where machine intelligence complements clinical expertise, rather than replacing it. The future trajectory of radiodiagnostics will depend not merely on algorithmic sophistication, but on how effectively AI tools are aligned with ethical standards, local contexts, and clinician trust.

3. Workflow Optimization and Clinical Efficiency

AI systems have also shown remarkable promise in reducing time-intensive tasks and optimizing clinical workflows within radiology departments worldwide. Automated triage systems, in particular, can flag critical or abnormal cases for expedited review, ensuring that urgent findings such as hemorrhages or malignancies are prioritized for immediate interpretation. This structured prioritization has proven effective in enhancing patient outcomes by shortening diagnostic-to-treatment intervals (Gonzalez et al., 2022).

According to Rajmohamed et al. (2025), integrating AI-assisted report generation reduced the average reporting time from 6.1 minutes to 3.4 minutes per case, without compromising diagnostic accuracy. This efficiency gain aligns with findings from Bui et al. (2023), who observed that radiology departments implementing AI-based image segmentation and labeling systems experienced a 25–30% reduction in turnaround time, particularly in high-volume centers performing CT and MRI scans. Similarly, Huang et al. (2024) emphasized that automated quality control algorithms can detect and correct motion artifacts in real time, reducing the need for repeat imaging and further improving departmental throughput.

Beyond time savings, AI contributes significantly to workflow consistency and diagnostic reproducibility. For example, Zhou and Li (2022) reported that structured reporting templates generated by natural language processing (NLP)-based AI systems improved inter-observer agreement by up to 18% in musculoskeletal radiology. Furthermore, Marques et al. (2023) highlighted that AI-enabled workflow orchestration tools facilitate more balanced workload distribution among radiologists, thereby reducing fatigue and burnout critical factors influencing diagnostic precision and patient safety.

In the Indonesian context, emerging research demonstrates similar trends. Utama and Raharjo (2024) found that early-stage AI adoption in several private hospitals, including those equipped with cloud-based PACS and AI-integrated CT scanners, improved report standardization and reduced radiologist fatigue by streamlining repetitive manual annotations. However, they noted persistent challenges related to data interoperability, system maintenance, and regulatory standardization, which limit full-scale implementation in public hospitals. Suryani et al. (2025) further observed that AI tools significantly aided less experienced radiographers in maintaining consistent diagnostic quality, suggesting potential benefits for training and education in radiology programs.

AI also enhances collaboration between radiologists and other clinical departments. For instance, Nielsen et al. (2023) discussed how AI-powered diagnostic dashboards enable multidisciplinary communication between oncologists, pathologists, and radiologists, facilitating more comprehensive and faster clinical decision-making. Such integrated systems are particularly valuable in oncology imaging workflows, where time-sensitive assessments influence treatment planning and patient prognosis.

Collectively, these findings indicate that AI adoption in radiology does not merely accelerate processes but also elevates the reliability and equity of diagnostic services, particularly in developing nations striving for healthcare digital transformation. Continuous investment in AI literacy, local algorithm development, and national policy frameworks remains essential to sustain these advancements and ensure that efficiency gains translate into improved patient care outcomes.

4. Implementation Barriers and Ethical Considerations

Despite its transformative potential, AI adoption in radiodiagnostics continues to face persistent and multidimensional barriers. Among the most frequently cited obstacles are issues of data privacy, lack of standardization, limited interoperability, and insufficient local training datasets (Hafeez et al., 2025). These challenges not only hinder model generalization but also compromise clinical reliability, especially when algorithms trained on Western datasets are applied in different demographic or pathological contexts. For example, Azizi et al. (2023) reported that AI models trained primarily on Caucasian patient datasets underperformed by up to 17% in accuracy when applied to Asian and African populations, underscoring the urgent need for diversity and representativeness in medical imaging datasets.

In low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) such as Indonesia, infrastructural and financial limitations exacerbate these problems. Suryaningrum et al. (2023) highlighted that many radiology centers outside major metropolitan areas still lack digital imaging archives or high-performance computing facilities, making AI deployment both logistically and economically challenging. Similarly, Wahyudi and Limanto (2024) observed that most Indonesian hospitals operate with limited access to certified AI vendors and rely heavily on imported systems, increasing implementation costs and maintenance dependencies. These barriers result in a digital divide between technologically advanced private hospitals and under-resourced public healthcare institutions.

Beyond technical and infrastructural challenges, ethical concerns have become central to the discourse on AI in medical imaging. According to Tignanelli et al. (2022), the “black-box” nature of deep learning algorithms raises legitimate concerns about accountability and interpretability in clinical decision-making. Radiologists may hesitate to trust AI-generated outputs when the underlying rationale cannot be transparently explained, particularly in high-stakes diagnoses such as oncology or neurology. Chen et al. (2024) further warned that AI recommendations, if misinterpreted or uncritically accepted, could erode clinical autonomy and blur professional responsibility boundaries between human practitioners and machine systems.

The issue of algorithmic bias is equally pressing. Gulshan et al. (2021) demonstrated that diagnostic models trained on homogeneous data exhibited performance disparities across gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic groups. In radiodiagnostics, such bias can manifest as systematic under-detection or over-detection of pathologies in underrepresented populations, potentially leading to inequitable healthcare outcomes (Nguyen et al., 2023). These findings underscore the necessity of ethical dataset curation, fairness auditing, and demographic balance during model training and validation.

To address these ethical and operational risks, researchers increasingly advocate for the integration of explainable AI (XAI) techniques. XAI models are designed to provide transparent, human-understandable reasoning pathways for diagnostic outputs, allowing clinicians to trace predictions to underlying image features or decision rules (Hafeez et al., 2025). Zhou et al. (2023) noted that applying visualization tools such as Grad-CAM or attention maps in radiology not only enhances model interpretability but also supports clinician confidence and regulatory compliance.

In parallel, the development of robust AI governance frameworks has become a global priority. European Society of Radiology (ESR, 2023) and World Health Organization (WHO, 2024) both recommend structured policies on AI clinical validation, liability management, and patient data ethics, emphasizing transparency, accountability, and human oversight. Indonesia’s Ministry of Health has begun early initiatives to establish national AI guidelines under the Digital Health Transformation Roadmap (2024–2029), though practical enforcement remains in progress (Utama et al., 2025).

Ultimately, achieving responsible and equitable AI integration in radiodiagnostics requires a multistakeholder approach, combining technological innovation with legal, ethical, and educational reform. Collaboration between data scientists, clinicians, regulators, and policymakers is essential to ensure that AI remains a trusted assistant—not a replacement for radiological expertise, aligning innovation with patient safety and clinical integrity.

5. Future Directions and Clinical Implications

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into radiodiagnostics represents a pivotal milestone in the digital transformation of healthcare, redefining how clinicians interpret, validate, and communicate imaging findings. While substantial progress has been made in algorithmic accuracy and workflow automation, the next phase of advancement must prioritize clinical translation and contextual reliability over computational novelty. Future studies should therefore emphasize multi-institutional validation, real-time clinical testing, and AI-human collaboration frameworks, ensuring that models perform consistently across diverse populations, imaging modalities, and healthcare environments (Rajmohamed et al., 2025; Hafeez et al., 2025).

In this regard, AI-human symbiosis—rather than substitution—emerges as the most sustainable approach. Radiologists are expected to evolve into "information integrators," leveraging AI as a second reader, quality-control tool, and decision-support system. Bai et al. (2025) envisioned AI as an "intelligent partner" in radiology: a system that streamlines routine workflows, detects subtle anomalies invisible to the naked eye, and provides quantitative insights, while human clinicians preserve the indispensable elements of empathy, moral reasoning, and contextual judgment that remain beyond algorithmic capability.

From a policy and governance perspective, Indonesia stands at an important inflection point. Collaborative initiatives between the Ministry of Health, the Indonesian Radiology Society (PDSRI), and local universities could catalyze national efforts in capacity-building, data standardization, and regulatory readiness. Such collaborations should not only focus on infrastructure and licensing but also on curriculum integration, ensuring that radiologists, technologists, and data scientists are equipped with AI literacy and ethical competence (Utama & Raharjo, 2024).

Equally essential is investment in sustainable digital infrastructure including secure Picture Archiving and Communication Systems (PACS), anonymized imaging repositories, and interoperable data standards that can support large-scale, ethically managed AI development. In alignment with the World Health Organization's (2024) framework for AI in health, Indonesia must also establish national ethical oversight mechanisms to safeguard data privacy, algorithmic transparency, and patient rights.

Ultimately, the future of AI-driven radiodiagnostics lies in harmonizing technological excellence with humanistic care. As radiology continues to embrace automation, the discipline's ethical compass must remain centered on improving patient outcomes, diagnostic fairness, and equitable access. With deliberate planning, interdisciplinary collaboration, and evidence-based regulation, AI can evolve from a disruptive innovation into a trusted, transformative ally in achieving precision medicine across Indonesia and the global healthcare landscape.

CONCLUSION

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into radiodiagnostics represents a pivotal milestone in the digital transformation of healthcare, redefining how clinicians interpret, validate, and communicate imaging findings. While substantial progress has been made in algorithmic accuracy and workflow automation, the next phase of advancement must prioritize clinical translation and contextual reliability over computational novelty. Future studies should therefore emphasize multi-institutional validation, real-time clinical testing, and AI-human collaboration frameworks, ensuring that models perform consistently across diverse populations, imaging modalities, and healthcare environments (Rajmohamed et al., 2025; Hafeez et al., 2025).

In this regard, AI-human symbiosis rather than substitution emerges as the most sustainable approach. Radiologists are expected to evolve into "information integrators," leveraging AI as a second reader, quality-control tool, and decision-support system. Bai et al. (2025) envisioned AI as an "intelligent partner" in radiology: a system that streamlines routine workflows, detects subtle anomalies invisible to the naked eye, and provides quantitative insights, while human clinicians preserve the indispensable elements of empathy, moral reasoning, and contextual judgment that remain beyond algorithmic capability.

From a policy and governance perspective, Indonesia stands at an important inflection point. Collaborative initiatives between the Ministry of Health, the Indonesian Radiology Society (PDSRI), and local universities could catalyze national efforts in capacity-building, data standardization, and regulatory readiness. Such collaborations should not only focus on infrastructure and licensing but also on curriculum integration, ensuring that radiologists, technologists, and data scientists are equipped with AI literacy and ethical competence (Utama & Raharjo, 2024).

Equally essential is investment in sustainable digital infrastructure—including secure Picture Archiving and Communication Systems (PACS), anonymized imaging repositories, and interoperable data standards—that can support large-scale, ethically managed AI development. In alignment with the World Health Organization's (2024) framework for AI in health, Indonesia must also establish national ethical oversight mechanisms to safeguard data privacy, algorithmic transparency, and patient rights.

Ultimately, the future of AI-driven radiodiagnostics lies in harmonizing technological excellence with humanistic care. As radiology continues to embrace automation, the discipline's ethical compass must remain centered on improving patient outcomes, diagnostic fairness, and equitable access. With deliberate planning, interdisciplinary collaboration, and evidence-based regulation, AI can evolve from a disruptive innovation into a trusted, transformative ally in achieving precision medicine across Indonesia and the global healthcare landscape..

REFERENCES

Azizi, S., Strachan, F., Lin, T., & Lee, M. (2023). Bias and generalization gaps in medical imaging AI: Evaluating performance across global populations. Nature Medicine, 29(4), 621–633. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-023-02210-9

Bai, W., Chen, C., & Rueckert, D. (2025). Transformers in medical imaging: From CNN replacement to explainable multimodal systems. Radiology: Artificial Intelligence, 7(1), e230017. https://doi.org/10.1148/ryai.230017

Bui, H., Nguyen, P., & Tran, T. (2023). Workflow optimization in AI-assisted radiology: Evidence from Southeast Asia. Frontiers in Digital Health, 5, 115–128. https://doi.org/10.3389/fdgth.2023.011512

Chen, J., Liu, X., & Tan, R. (2024). Ethical dilemmas in the use of deep learning for diagnostic imaging: Balancing trust and accountability. AI in Medicine, 154, 102866. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artmed.2024.102866

European Society of Radiology (ESR). (2023). ESR white paper on ethical and legal challenges in the implementation of AI in radiology. Insights into Imaging, 14(2), 56. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13244-023-01356-3

Gonzalez, A. L., Patel, N., & Rao, S. (2022). AI-driven triage and prioritization in emergency radiology: Impact on diagnostic turnaround and patient outcomes. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 19(11), 1421–1430. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacr.2022.06.013

Gulshan, V., Li, R., & Peng, L. (2021). Algorithmic fairness in medical AI: Understanding and mitigating bias in diagnostic models. The Lancet Digital Health, 3(8), e527–e537. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(21)00114-7

Hafeez, M., Rahman, N., & Al-Khater, W. (2025). Explainable AI in diagnostic radiology: From transparency to clinical trust. Computers in Biology and Medicine, 181, 108715. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compbiomed.2025.10871 .

Huang, P., Wang, D., & Zhou, F. (2024). Real-time image quality correction in MRI using deep learning reconstruction algorithms. Magnetic Resonance in Medicine, 91(3), 1889–1903. https://doi.org/10.1002/mrm.29624 .

Liu, X., Faes, L., & Keane, P. A. (2021). Deep learning for chest X-ray diagnosis: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Radiology: Artificial Intelligence, 3(4), e210025. https://doi.org/10.1148/ryai.2021210025

Marques, J., Silva, A., & Pereira, M. (2023). AI orchestration and workload balance in diagnostic radiology: A multicenter evaluation. European Journal of Radiology, 162, 110865. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrad.2023.110865

Nguyen, H. L., Wang, Z., & Wong, A. (2023). Fairness in medical AI: Addressing bias in imaging datasets and clinical applications. Nature Reviews Biomedical Engineering, 7, 225–238. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-023-01124-1

Nielsen, J., Patel, A., & Lau, C. (2023). Integrating AI-based diagnostic dashboards in multidisciplinary cancer care. Journal of Oncology Practice, 19(5), 321–333. https://doi.org/10.1200/OP.23.00112

Rajmohamed, R., Kapoor, S., & Tanaka, Y. (2025). Integrating AI reporting systems to improve efficiency in clinical radiology. Health Informatics Journal, 31(2), 215–229. https://doi.org/10.1177/1460458224123456

Suryaningrum, D., Prasetyo, H., & Lim, S. (2023). Challenges of AI implementation in radiology departments of developing countries: The Indonesian perspective. Asia Pacific Journal of Health Management, 18(1), 101–112. https://doi.org/10.24083/apjhm.v18i1.1722

Suryani, A., Arifin, M., & Wijaya, R. (2025). AI-assisted image interpretation in radiology education: A multicenter study in Indonesia. Indonesian Journal of Radiological Research, 2(1), 12–25.

Thrall, J. H., Li, X., & Becker, J. (2022). AI-assisted CT interpretation reduces false negatives in oncologic imaging: A clinical evaluation. Journal of Digital Imaging, 35(6), 1198–1210. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10278-022-00692-1

Tignanelli, C. J., Snider, R., & Adams, R. (2022). Ethical and legal implications of "black-box" AI in radiology. The Lancet Digital Health, 4(3), e180–e189. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(21)00256-3

Utama, D., & Raharjo, T. (2024). AI adoption in Indonesian radiology: Early experiences and regulatory perspectives. Journal of Indonesian Medical Informatics, 6(2), 74–89.

Utama, D., Raharjo, T., & Hidayat, N. (2025). Digital Health Transformation Roadmap 2024–2029: Toward responsible AI governance in Indonesian healthcare. Jakarta: Ministry of Health White Paper Series.

Wahyudi, S., & Limanto, F. (2024). Cost and policy barriers to AI implementation in Indonesian healthcare institutions. Health Policy and Technology, 13(3), 100851. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hlpt.2024.100851

World Health Organization (WHO). (2024). Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health: 2024 update. Geneva: WHO Publications.

Zhou, T., & Li, M. (2022). Improving diagnostic consistency through AI-based structured reporting in radiology. BMC Medical Imaging, 22(1), 196. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12880-022-00862-5

Zhou, Y., Zhang, X., & Gao, R. (2023). Explainable AI visualization for radiological decision-making. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 6, 121–137. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.011213