

AI-RADS: A Framework for Case-Level Assessment of Radiology AI Output

Development and multireader evaluation of a structured system for AI reliability, clinical utility, and report communication

Maximilian F. Russe¹, Anna Fink¹, Carl P. Simon¹, Kai Kästingschäfer¹, Fabian Bamberg¹, Alexander Rau²

¹Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Radiology / ²Department of Neuroradiology, Medical Center - University of Freiburg, Faculty of Medicine, University of Freiburg, Germany

RCR Global AI Conference 2026

Why AI-RADS?

Radiology AI is entering routine workflows across detection, segmentation, quantification, classification, and generative tasks. However, most systems still lack a standardized case-level method to document whether an individual output was reliable, corrected, overridden, or suppressed. AI errors, image-quality limitations, workflow failures, and radiologist overrides may remain poorly traceable. AI-RADS addresses this need by linking each AI output to a structured reliability category and a corresponding clinical action.

Regulatory need
Real-world deployment of radiology AI requires traceable oversight beyond initial validation. AI-RADS creates auditable case-level documentation. This supports privacy- and regulation-conscious governance, including GDPR/HIPAA-aware documentation workflows, EU AI Act-aligned post-market monitoring, EU MDR surveillance concepts for medical-device software, and US trustworthy-AI / FDA-style real-world performance monitoring.

Objective
To develop and evaluate AI-RADS as a structured case-level framework for assessing radiology AI output reliability, clinical utility, and required reporting action. The study tested whether radiologists can reproducibly apply AI-RADS across representative image-based and generative AI tasks.

The AI-RADS framework

1

Excellent / optimal utility
Integrate into workflow or report

2

Highly accurate / high utility
Use with minor confirmation or edits

3

Acceptable / modification needed
Verify and modify before use

4

Unreliable / limited utility
Override critical sections

5

Unreliable / no clinical utility
Suppress from report or display

Task labels

[DET] Detection [CLS] Classification [SEG] Segmentation [QNT] Quantification [GEN] Generative AI

Context modifiers

[IL] Image limitation [SC] Superior confirmation [WL] Workflow limitation

Example: AI-RADS 4 [SEG, IL]

Study design

7 AI applications

350 total cases

5 radiologist readers

AI-RADS category + modifiers + correctness rating

Agreement and usability analysis

200 image-based AI outputs
150 generative AI outputs

Image-based tasks: fracture detection, chest radiograph pathology detection, lung nodule detection, and stroke MRI segmentation/classification

Generative tasks: CT protocol and contrast-phase selection, Spinal Instability Neoplastic Score assignment, and patient-friendly report generation

Assessment endpoints

- Interreader agreement
- Alignment with correctness
- Modifier use
- Usability and workload

Key results

0.89

Overall Krippendorff's alpha

0.87

Image-based tasks Krippendorff's alpha

0.93

Generative tasks Krippendorff's alpha

94.8%

Reader-rated correct AI outputs mapped to AI-RADS 1-2

88.3%

AI-RADS ratings unanimous or within one category

87.5 / 2

Median System Usability Scale / NASA-TLX

Conclusion and Clinical interpretation

AI-RADS showed high reproducibility across image-based and generative radiology AI tasks and standardizes documentation of radiologist oversight. Structured case-level ratings support safer workflow integration, quality assurance, audit trails, post-market monitoring, and regulation-conscious AI governance.

Take-home message

From AI output to accountable action: AI-RADS 1-5: integrate, edit, verify, override, or suppress.
Structured for evolving regulatory requirements.