

Radiology Journal

Journal Title: Radiology **Publisher:** Radiological Society of North America (RSNA) **Impact Factor (2023):** ~30 **Focus:** Diagnostic and interventional radiology, imaging science, AI, imaging biomarkers **Audience:** Radiologists, imaging scientists, medical physicists, clinicians, health policy experts

□ Scientific Rigor and Editorial Quality

- □ **Strengths:**
 - Exceptional editorial standards, robust peer review, and statistical oversight.
 - Methodological transparency with frequent use of reporting guidelines (CONSORT, STARD, PRISMA).
 - External statistical reviews, especially for AI/quantitative studies.
 - □ **Weaknesses:**
 - Tendency toward “impact factor inflation” and multicenter glamour over practical applicability.
 - Prioritization of high-tech imaging over clinically grounded investigations.
-

□ Clinical and Scientific Relevance

- □ **Highlights:**
 - Influential studies on imaging guidelines, disease stratification, and emerging technologies.
 - Solid coverage of COVID-19, oncology, and stroke imaging.
 - □ **Limitations:**
 - Many studies are retrospective, industry-funded, or from elite centers—limiting real-world translation.
 - Sparse analysis of cost-effectiveness, radiation burden, or long-term outcomes.
-

□ Artificial Intelligence and Methodological Integrity

- □ **Positive Aspects:**
 - Leadership in AI publication and validation.
 - Promotes reproducibility via data/code sharing.
 - □ **Concerns:**
 - Lack of true external validation in many AI articles.
 - Dataset bias, overfitting, and clinical integration gaps often underreported.
-

▢ Diversity and Global Accessibility

- ▢ **Progress:**
 - Hybrid open access model available.
 - Some global consortia represented.
- ▢ **Issues:**
 - High publication fees restrict accessibility.
 - Editorial board and authorship remain Western-dominated.
 - Underrepresentation of patient-centered and equity-driven research.

▢ Innovation vs. Hype

- ▢ **Advances:**
 - Cutting-edge work in radiogenomics, hybrid modalities, perfusion imaging.
- ▢ **Pitfalls:**
 - Risk of technophilia: shiny methods with minimal discussion of healthcare integration.

▢ Ethics and Conflicts of Interest

- ▢ **Practices:**
 - Transparent COI disclosures.
- ▢ **Problems:**
 - Industry sponsorship frequent.
 - Blurred lines between scientific content and promotional interest in some editorials.

▢ Summary Verdict

Category	Score (out of 5)	Comment
Editorial and Statistical Rigor	★★★★	Top-tier scientific control
Clinical Utility	★★	Needs better real-world translation
AI and Quantitative Imaging	★★★★	Leading field with some gaps
Global Representation	★★	Still US/Europe-centric
Innovation vs. Practicality	★★	Tech-focused but often impractical
Conflict of Interest Handling	★★	Transparent but vulnerable to industry

□ Bottom Line

Radiology remains **the flagship journal** of imaging science—essential for scientific leadership. However, its **focus on prestige and high-tech trends** may eclipse critical issues in **clinical utility, health equity, and cost-conscious care**.

From:

<https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/> - Neurosurgery Wiki

Permanent link:

https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/doku.php?id=radiology_journal

Last update: **2025/06/25 06:58**

