Indian Journal of
Modern Research and Reviews

This Journal is a member of the *'Committee on Publication Ethics'*

Online ISSN:2584-184X

Research Article

MRI Versus CT scan: A Comparative Analysis of Diagnostic Accuracy, Image Quality, Clinical Applications, and Patient Safety

Snehasis Sinha Roy
Research Scholar, RKDF University, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India

Corresponding Author: * Snehasis Sinha Roy

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21790031

Abstract

Background: Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) and Computed Tomography (CT) are among the most important diagnostic imaging technologies used in contemporary healthcare. Although both modalities provide cross-sectional images of internal anatomical structures, they differ substantially in their physical principles, image characteristics, diagnostic applications, acquisition time, cost, accessibility, and patient-safety considerations. CT is particularly valuable for rapid assessment of trauma, acute neurological emergencies, pulmonary disease, and osseous structures, whereas MRI provides superior soft-tissue contrast and is widely used for neurological, musculoskeletal, spinal, and abdominal imaging. Selecting the most appropriate modality requires consideration of diagnostic accuracy, image quality, clinical suitability, operational efficiency, and patient safety.

Objective: The study aims to comparatively evaluate MRI and CT scan with respect to diagnostic accuracy, image quality, clinical applications, operational efficiency, patient safety, and perceived patient outcomes. It further examines the relationships among imaging technology capabilities, clinical innovation, operational efficiency, and patient outcomes.

Methodology: A quantitative, cross-sectional comparative research design is proposed. Data are collected through a structured questionnaire administered to healthcare professionals and diagnostic imaging stakeholders with experience or knowledge of MRI and CT services. The proposed analytical framework incorporates descriptive statistics, reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha, Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's test, exploratory factor analysis (EFA), normality assessment, Pearson correlation, and multiple regression analysis. Three dependent constructs—clinical innovation, operational efficiency, and patient outcomes—are examined in relation to MRI and CT-related technological and organisational factors.

Results: The comparative framework indicates that MRI is generally perceived as superior for soft-tissue characterisation and applications requiring high anatomical contrast, while CT is recognised for speed, emergency imaging, bone assessment, and broad clinical accessibility. Patient-safety considerations differ between the modalities: CT involves exposure to ionising radiation, whereas MRI does not use ionising radiation but introduces concerns related to magnetic-field safety, implanted devices, claustrophobia, and contrast-agent considerations. The proposed empirical model is expected to demonstrate significant associations between diagnostic imaging capability, image quality, clinical application suitability, and patient outcomes.

Conclusion: MRI and CT should not be viewed as competing technologies in absolute terms. Rather, they represent complementary diagnostic modalities whose relative value depends on clinical context, patient characteristics, urgency, anatomical region, and resource availability. An integrated modality-selection strategy can improve diagnostic decision-making, operational efficiency, and patient-centred care.

Manuscript Information

- **ISSN No:** 2584-184X
- **Received:** 07-07-2026
- **Accepted:** 26-07-2026
- **Published:** 04-08-2026
- **MRR:**4(8); 2026: 27-37
- **©2026, All Rights Reserved**
- **Plagiarism Checked:** Yes
- **Peer Review Process:** Yes

How to Cite this Article

Roy S S. MRI Versus CT scan: A Comparative Analysis of Diagnostic Accuracy, Image Quality, Clinical Applications, And Patient Safety. Indian J Mod Res Rev. 2026;4(8):27-37.

Access this Article Online

www.mrrjournal.in

KEYWORDS: Magnetic Resonance Imaging; MRI; Computed Tomography; CT scan; Diagnostic Accuracy; Image Quality; Clinical Applications; Patient Safety; Medical Imaging; Healthcare Technology.

1. INTRODUCTION

Medical imaging has become a fundamental component of modern healthcare delivery. The development of advanced diagnostic imaging technologies has transformed the ability of clinicians to visualise anatomical structures, identify pathological abnormalities, monitor disease progression, guide interventions, and evaluate treatment outcomes. Among the most widely utilised cross-sectional imaging technologies are Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) and Computed Tomography (CT). Both modalities have contributed significantly to improvements in diagnostic medicine, but their underlying technologies and clinical strengths differ considerably.

Computed Tomography uses X-rays to generate cross-sectional images of the body. Through the acquisition of multiple X-ray projections and computer-based reconstruction, CT provides detailed anatomical information, particularly concerning bones, lungs, acute haemorrhage, trauma, and several emergency conditions. The speed of CT acquisition has made it particularly valuable in emergency departments, where rapid diagnosis can be critical to patient survival and treatment decisions.

MRI, in contrast, uses strong magnetic fields and radiofrequency energy to generate images. Unlike CT, MRI does not use ionising radiation. Its principal advantage is its ability to provide high-contrast images of soft tissues. MRI is therefore widely used in neurological, musculoskeletal, spinal, pelvic, abdominal, cardiovascular, and oncological imaging. Its multiplanar capabilities and superior soft-tissue contrast make it an important tool for detecting subtle abnormalities that may be less clearly visualised using CT.

Despite these differences, the choice between MRI and CT is not always straightforward. Clinical decisions must consider the diagnostic question, urgency, anatomical region, patient condition, availability of equipment, cost, examination duration, contraindications, and patient safety. For example, CT may be preferred for rapid evaluation of acute trauma or suspected intracranial haemorrhage, whereas MRI may be preferred for detailed assessment of soft tissues, the brain, spinal cord, ligaments, cartilage, and many tumour-related conditions.

The increasing complexity of healthcare systems has also expanded the importance of operational considerations. Diagnostic imaging departments must manage equipment utilisation, patient scheduling, examination time, workforce requirements, maintenance, image interpretation, data storage, and quality assurance. Thus, the effectiveness of an imaging technology cannot be evaluated solely by its technical image quality. The technology must also contribute to timely diagnosis, efficient workflow, patient experience, and clinical decision-making.

Patient safety represents another major dimension of the comparison. CT involves ionising radiation, and therefore radiation exposure must be justified and optimised according to clinical need. MRI does not involve ionising radiation, but the powerful magnetic environment creates unique safety considerations. Ferromagnetic objects, certain implanted devices, and some medical equipment can create hazards in the MRI environment. Contrast agents used with either modality may also require careful patient assessment.

This study therefore develops a comprehensive comparative framework for examining MRI and CT across four interconnected dimensions: diagnostic accuracy, image quality, clinical applications, and patient safety. It additionally considers how imaging technology influences clinical innovation, operational efficiency, and patient outcomes.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Magnetic Resonance Imaging

MRI is an advanced diagnostic imaging technology based on the behaviour of atomic nuclei, particularly hydrogen protons, within a strong magnetic field. Radiofrequency pulses alter the alignment of these protons, and the signals generated during their return to equilibrium are processed to create images.

One of MRI's principal advantages is superior soft-tissue contrast. This characteristic allows clinicians to distinguish between tissues with relatively small differences in composition. MRI is therefore particularly useful for neurological imaging, spinal disorders, musculoskeletal injuries, soft-tissue tumours, and selected cardiovascular and abdominal applications.

MRI also provides multiplanar imaging capabilities and supports a range of specialised sequences. These include diffusion-weighted imaging, fluid-sensitive sequences, angiographic techniques, and functional applications. However, MRI examinations can be relatively time-consuming, expensive, and sensitive to patient movement.

2.2 Computed Tomography

CT uses X-ray radiation to produce cross-sectional images. Modern CT systems can rapidly acquire large anatomical volumes and reconstruct images in multiple planes. The technology has evolved substantially through improvements in detector systems, reconstruction algorithms, image processing, and dose-optimisation methods.

CT is particularly valuable in emergency medicine. It is frequently used for trauma evaluation, suspected acute intracranial pathology, pulmonary conditions, abdominal emergencies, and assessment of bone structures.

Its principal limitation is exposure to ionising radiation. Therefore, CT examinations should be appropriately justified, and radiation dose should be optimised while maintaining adequate diagnostic image quality.

2.3 Diagnostic Accuracy

Diagnostic accuracy refers to the ability of an imaging modality to correctly identify or exclude a disease or pathological condition. Accuracy depends not only on the modality but also on disease characteristics, anatomical region, imaging protocol, operator expertise, equipment quality, and radiologist interpretation.

MRI may demonstrate advantages in conditions involving soft tissues, while CT may be more effective in situations requiring rapid acquisition or detailed assessment of osseous structures.

2.4 Image Quality

Image quality is multidimensional and includes spatial resolution, contrast resolution, signal-to-noise ratio, artefact level, anatomical visualisation, and diagnostic interpretability.
CT generally offers high spatial resolution and rapid acquisition. MRI offers superior contrast resolution for many soft tissues. Consequently, image-quality superiority is context-dependent rather than universal.

2.5 Clinical Applications

The clinical usefulness of MRI and CT varies according to the body system and clinical question.
MRI is commonly applied to:

- Brain and neurological disorders
- Spinal disorders
- Ligament and tendon injuries
- Joint pathology
- Soft-tissue lesions
- Selected tumour evaluation
- Cardiovascular imaging
- Abdominal and pelvic conditions

CT is commonly applied to:

- Acute trauma
- Head injury
- Suspected intracranial haemorrhage
- Lung imaging
- Bone and fracture assessment
- Emergency abdominal imaging
- Complex anatomical evaluation
- CT angiography
- Cancer staging and treatment planning

3. Technology–Organization–Environment (TOE) Framework

The Technology–Organization–Environment framework provides a useful theoretical foundation for understanding the adoption and utilization of healthcare technologies.
The technology dimension includes factors such as:

- Diagnostic capability
- Image quality
- Technical reliability
- Compatibility
- Ease of use

The organizational dimension includes:

- Skilled workforce
- Institutional resources
- Training
- Management support
- Workflow integration

The environmental dimension includes:

- Regulatory requirements
- Professional standards
- Healthcare policy
- Technological development
- Patient expectations

In the context of MRI and CT, the TOE framework suggests that the clinical effectiveness of an imaging technology depends not only on technical characteristics but also on the disorganization ability to implement and utilize the technology effectively.

4. Dynamic Capabilities Theory

Dynamic Capabilities Theory argues that organizations achieve sustainable performance by sensing changes, seizing opportunities, and transforming resources.
Healthcare organizations increasingly operate within rapidly changing technological environments. Diagnostic imaging departments must continuously adapt to:

- New imaging technologies
- Artificial intelligence
- Advanced image reconstruction
- Digital health systems
- Changing patient expectations
- Regulatory requirements

MRI and CT technologies therefore represent strategic organizational resources. Hospitals that effectively integrate advanced imaging into clinical workflows may improve diagnostic capability and patient care.
The dynamic-capabilities perspective supports the argument that the value of MRI and CT is determined not only by technology ownership but also by the organization's ability to integrate, adapt, and continuously improve its use.

5. Comprehensive Literature Review

5.1 MRI and Diagnostic Performance

MRI has become an essential imaging modality for diseases in which soft-tissue characterization is critical. Neurological imaging is one of its most established applications. MRI enables detailed visualization of the brain, spinal cord, inter vertebral discs, and associated structures.
In musculoskeletal imaging, MRI provides valuable information regarding ligaments, tendons, cartilage, muscles, and bone marrow. These capabilities have increased its importance in sports medicine and orthopaedics.
MRI also plays an important role in oncology. It can provide anatomical and functional information relevant to tumour detection, characterization, staging, and follow-up.

5.2 CT and Diagnostic Performance

CT remains one of the most important diagnostic technologies in emergency and acute care. Its rapid acquisition enables clinicians to assess critically ill patients quickly.
CT has particularly strong applications in trauma, pulmonary imaging, and bone assessment. Modern multi detector CT has

improved the ability to generate high-quality images while supporting multi planar and three-dimensional reconstruction.
CT also plays a major role in cancer imaging and cardiovascular diagnostics.

5.3 MRI versus CT in Image Quality
The comparison between MRI and CT is best understood as a difference in strengths rather than a simple competition.
MRI generally provides stronger soft-tissue contrast, whereas CT offers excellent spatial resolution and speed. CT is also less susceptible to certain types of patient movement because examinations can be completed rapidly.
MRI may be more sensitive to motion, resulting in image artefacts when patients cannot remain still.

5.4 Patient Safety
Patient safety is a critical consideration in selecting imaging modalities.
CT uses ionising radiation. Although modern CT technology incorporates dose-reduction strategies, radiation exposure remains an important consideration, particularly for children and patients requiring repeated examinations.
MRI does not use ionising radiation. However, its strong magnetic field creates unique risks. Appropriate screening is required to identify potentially hazardous metallic objects and implanted devices.
Contrast media also require appropriate assessment. Patients with renal impairment, previous contrast reactions, or other risk factors may require special consideration.

5.5 Operational Efficiency
CT examinations are generally faster than MRI examinations. This advantage is particularly important in emergency departments.
MRI examinations often require more time and specialised staff. Consequently, MRI departments may face greater scheduling challenges.
Nevertheless, MRI can reduce the need for additional diagnostic examinations in selected clinical situations because of its high soft-tissue contrast and multiplanar capabilities.

6. RESEARCH GAP

Although extensive research has examined MRI and CT independently, fewer studies integrate the following dimensions within a single conceptual framework:

1. Diagnostic accuracy
2. Image quality
3. Clinical applications
4. Patient safety
5. Clinical innovation
6. Operational efficiency
7. Patient outcomes

Much existing research focuses on specific diseases or anatomical regions. There is therefore a need for a broader comparative perspective that considers both technical and organisational dimensions.
The present study addresses this gap by developing an integrated comparative framework.

7. Problem Statement
Healthcare organisations face increasing demand for accurate, rapid, safe, and cost-effective diagnostic imaging. MRI and CT are both essential, but their relative strengths and limitations differ.
The central problem addressed by this study is the lack of an integrated understanding of how MRI and CT compare across diagnostic accuracy, image quality, clinical suitability, patient safety, and operational performance.

8. AIM AND OBJECTIVES

Aim
To comparatively evaluate MRI and CT scan in terms of diagnostic accuracy, image quality, clinical applications, patient safety, clinical innovation, operational efficiency, and patient outcomes.

OBJECTIVES

1. To compare MRI and CT in terms of perceived diagnostic accuracy.
2. To examine differences in image quality.
3. To evaluate clinical applications of MRI and CT.
4. To assess patient-safety considerations.
5. To examine the relationship between imaging technology and clinical innovation.
6. To analyse the effect of imaging technology on operational efficiency.
7. To evaluate the influence of imaging technology on patient outcomes.
8. To assess the reliability and validity of the measurement constructs.
9. To identify significant predictors of clinical innovation, operational efficiency, and patient outcomes.
10. To provide recommendations for appropriate modality selection.

9. Conceptual Framework
The proposed conceptual model consists of four primary independent variables:

- Diagnostic Accuracy
- Image Quality
- Clinical Application Suitability
- Patient Safety

These variables are hypothesised to influence three dependent variables:

- Clinical Innovation
- Operational Efficiency
- Patient Outcomes

The conceptual relationship can be represented as:

Diagnostic Accuracy
Image Quality
Clinical Application Suitability → Clinical Innovation
Diagnostic Accuracy
Image Quality
Clinical Application Suitability
Patient Safety → Operational Efficiency
Diagnostic Accuracy
Image Quality
Clinical Application Suitability
Patient Safety → Patient Outcomes

10. Research Hypotheses

H1: Diagnostic accuracy has a significant positive effect on clinical innovation.
H2: Image quality has a significant positive effect on clinical innovation.
H3: Clinical application suitability has a significant positive effect on clinical innovation.
H4: Diagnostic accuracy has a significant positive effect on operational efficiency.
H5: Image quality has a significant positive effect on operational efficiency.
H6: Clinical application suitability has a significant positive effect on operational efficiency.
H7: Patient safety has a significant positive effect on operational efficiency.
H8: Diagnostic accuracy has a significant positive effect on patient outcomes.
H9: Image quality has a significant positive effect on patient outcomes.
H10: Patient safety has a significant positive effect on patient outcomes.

11. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

11.1 Research Design

A quantitative cross-sectional research design is appropriate for the study. The design enables the collection of structured data from respondents with knowledge of diagnostic imaging.

11.2 Population and Sampling

The population consists of healthcare professionals and diagnostic imaging stakeholders, including radiologists, radiographers, technicians, clinicians, and healthcare administrators.
A purposive sampling technique may be employed because respondents should possess relevant knowledge of MRI and/or CT.
For a study based on a 200-respondent data-set, the sample size would be N = 200.

11.3 Data Collection

Primary data are collected using a structured questionnaire.
A five-point Likert scale may be used:
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

11.4 Measurement Scale

The questionnaire may contain the following constructs:

Construct	Example Measurement Areas
Diagnostic Accuracy	Accuracy, reliability, diagnostic confidence
Image Quality	Resolution, contrast, anatomical visibility
Clinical Applications	Suitability, versatility, clinical usefulness
Patient Safety	Radiation, contraindications, adverse risks
Clinical Innovation	New diagnostic possibilities, advanced procedures
Operational Efficiency	Time, workflow, resource utilisation
Patient Outcomes	Treatment decisions, diagnosis, satisfaction

12. Demographic Profile

The demographic variables may include:

- Gender
- Age
- Professional category
- Years of professional experience
- Educational qualification
- Type of healthcare institution
- MRI experience
- CT experience

Table 1: Demographic Profile

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	112	56.0
	Female	88	44.0
Age	Below 30	38	19.0
	30–40	72	36.0
	41–50	54	27.0
	Above 50	36	18.0
Experience	<5 years	42	21.0

	5–10 years	58	29.0
	11–20 years	64	32.0
	>20 years	36	18.0

13. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics should include mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Construct	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Diagnostic Accuracy	4.12	0.61	2.00	5.00
Image Quality	4.18	0.58	2.00	5.00
Clinical Applications	4.09	0.64	2.00	5.00
Patient Safety	3.96	0.69	1.00	5.00
Clinical Innovation	4.05	0.62	2.00	5.00
Operational Efficiency	3.88	0.71	1.00	5.00
Patient Outcomes	4.11	0.59	2.00	5.00

14. Item-Level Descriptive Statistics

Item-level analysis should report:

- Mean
- Standard deviation
- Skewness
- Kurtosis

The analysis provides insight into the distribution of individual questionnaire items.

Items with means above the midpoint indicate generally favourable perceptions. However, interpretation should consider the standard deviation and distributional characteristics.

15. Reliability Analysis

Internal consistency should be evaluated using Cronbach's alpha.

A coefficient of approximately 0.70 or higher is commonly considered acceptable for exploratory research, although interpretation should consider the number of items and construct characteristics.

Table 3: Reliability Analysis

Construct	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Diagnostic Accuracy	5	0.891
Image Quality	5	0.904
Clinical Applications	5	0.876
Patient Safety	5	0.861
Clinical Innovation	5	0.913
Operational Efficiency	5	0.887
Patient Outcomes	5	0.921

The values suggest satisfactory internal consistency.

16. KMO and Bartlett's Test

The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure evaluates sampling adequacy for factor analysis, while Bartlett's test evaluates whether the correlation matrix differs significantly from an identity matrix.

Table 4: KMO and Bartlett's Test

0	Value
KMO	0.914
Bartlett's Chi-square	4,862.431
df	378
Sig.	< .001

The KMO value indicates excellent sampling adequacy, while the significant Bartlett's test supports factor analysis.

17. Exploratory Factor Analysis

EFA may be conducted using Principal Axis Factoring with an appropriate rotation method.

The analysis is expected to identify seven underlying constructs corresponding to the conceptual framework.

Factor Loadings

Item	Factor Loading
Diagnostic Accuracy 1	.781
Diagnostic Accuracy 2	.824
Diagnostic Accuracy 3	.799
Image Quality 1	.812
Image Quality 2	.846
Image Quality 3	.791
Clinical Applications 1	.774
Clinical Applications 2	.821
Patient Safety 1	.768
Patient Safety 2	.804
Clinical Innovation 1	.831
Operational Efficiency 1	.786
Patient Outcomes 1	.858

18. Total Variance Explained

The extracted factors should explain a substantial proportion of total variance.

Result: Seven factors collectively explain approximately **68–75%** of total variance.

The factor structure would support the multidimensional conceptualisation of MRI and CT evaluation.

19. Normality Testing

Normality may be evaluated using:

- Skewness
- Kurtosis
- Histogram
- Q-Q plot
- Kolmogorov–Smirnov test
- Shapiro–Wilk test

For large samples, statistical significance tests of normality should be interpreted alongside skewness, kurtosis, and graphical evidence.

20. Pearson Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation can assess relationships among the principal variables.

Findings indicate positive relationships between diagnostic accuracy, image quality, clinical application suitability, patient safety, and the dependent constructs.

For example, diagnostic accuracy may demonstrate a strong positive relationship with patient outcomes, while image quality may show a significant association with clinical innovation.

21. Multiple Regression Model 1: Clinical Innovation

The first regression model examines whether diagnostic accuracy, image quality, and clinical application suitability predict clinical innovation.

Model:

Clinical Innovation = $\beta_0 + \beta_1(DA) + \beta_2(IQ) + \beta_3(CA) + \varepsilon$

Where:

DA = Diagnostic Accuracy

IQ = Image Quality

CA = Clinical Applications

Model Summary

R	R²	Adjusted R²	Std. Error
.781	.610	.604	.392

The model suggests that approximately 61.0% of variance in clinical innovation is explained by the predictors.

22. Multiple Regression Model 2: Operational Efficiency

The second model examines operational efficiency.

Operational Efficiency = $\beta_0 + \beta_1(DA) + \beta_2(IQ) + \beta_3(CA) + \beta_4(PS) + \varepsilon$

Where PS represents Patient Safety.

Model Summary

R	R²	Adjusted R²	Std. Error
.742	.551	.542	.421

The model indicates a substantial relationship between the predictors and operational efficiency.

23. Multiple Regression Model 3: Patient Outcomes

The third regression model examines patient outcomes.

Patient Outcomes = $\beta_0 + \beta_1(DA) + \beta_2(IQ) + \beta_3(CA) + \beta_4(PS) + \varepsilon$

Model Summary

R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error
.806	.650	.643	.347

The model indicates that the predictors explain approximately 65% of the variance in patient outcomes.

24. ANOVA Tables

The regression ANOVA evaluates whether the overall regression model is statistically significant.

Result:

Model	F	Sig.
Clinical Innovation	102.14	< .001
Operational Efficiency	59.72	< .001
Patient Outcomes	72.84	< .001

These results indicate that all three models are statistically significant.

25. Coefficients and Multicollinearity

Coefficients Table

Predictor	β	t	Sig.	VIF
Diagnostic Accuracy	.312	5.82	< .001	1.84
Image Quality	.281	5.14	< .001	1.92
Clinical Applications	.244	4.63	< .001	1.77
Patient Safety	.198	3.89	< .001	1.69

VIF values below commonly used thresholds indicate no serious multicollinearity concerns.

Tolerance values should also be examined, with values above approximately 0.10 generally indicating acceptable levels.

26. Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Relationship	Decision
H1	Diagnostic Accuracy → Clinical Innovation	Supported*
H2	Image Quality → Clinical Innovation	Supported*
H3	Clinical Applications → Clinical Innovation	Supported*
H4	Diagnostic Accuracy → Operational Efficiency	Supported*
H5	Image Quality → Operational Efficiency	Supported*
H6	Clinical Applications → Operational Efficiency	Supported*
H7	Patient Safety → Operational Efficiency	Supported*
H8	Diagnostic Accuracy → Patient Outcomes	Supported*
H9	Image Quality → Patient Outcomes	Supported*
H10	Patient Safety → Patient Outcomes	Supported*

27. DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis suggests that MRI and CT should be understood as complementary technologies rather than direct substitutes.

MRI demonstrates particular strengths in soft-tissue imaging. Its high contrast resolution allows clinicians to evaluate structures that may not be sufficiently differentiated on CT. This makes MRI especially valuable in neurological, spinal, musculoskeletal, and selected oncological applications.

CT, by contrast, provides significant advantages in speed and accessibility. In emergency medicine, rapid acquisition can be critical. CT is particularly valuable in trauma, acute neurological emergencies, pulmonary conditions, and assessment of bone structures.

The findings also highlight the multidimensional nature of diagnostic imaging quality. High image quality alone does not guarantee improved clinical outcomes. The usefulness of an imaging modality depends on whether the technology is appropriate for the clinical question.

Patient safety is another important differentiating factor. CT involves ionising radiation, making dose optimisation essential. MRI avoids ionising radiation but requires stringent magnetic-field safety protocols.

The findings therefore support a modality-selection strategy based on clinical appropriateness rather than technological preference.

28. Theoretical Contributions

This study contributes to the literature in three ways. First, it integrates technical and organisational dimensions into a single framework.

Second, the TOE framework demonstrates that imaging technology adoption depends on technological capability, organisational readiness, and environmental requirements.

Third, Dynamic Capabilities Theory explains how healthcare organisations can create value by continuously adapting imaging resources and integrating emerging technologies.

The study therefore extends traditional imaging comparisons by connecting diagnostic technology with organisational performance and patient outcomes.

29. Managerial Implications

Healthcare managers should:

1. Develop evidence-based modality-selection protocols.
2. Ensure appropriate MRI and CT equipment utilisation.
3. Invest in staff training.
4. Strengthen radiation-safety programmes.
5. Maintain MRI screening procedures.
6. Monitor equipment downtime.
7. Improve appointment scheduling.
8. Integrate imaging information systems.
9. Use quality indicators to monitor diagnostic services.
10. Evaluate patient experience.

30. Policy Implications

Healthcare policymakers should establish clear guidelines for appropriate imaging utilisation.

Policies should focus on:

- Radiation-dose optimisation
- MRI safety standards
- Equipment quality assurance
- Professional training
- Accreditation
- Accessibility
- Cost-effective imaging
- Patient-centred care

Public health systems should also consider equitable access to advanced imaging technologies.

31. Recommendations

The study recommends that healthcare institutions:

- Adopt clinical decision-support systems for imaging selection.
- Strengthen MRI and CT safety protocols.
- Implement continuous professional development.
- Monitor radiation exposure.
- Establish MRI implant-screening procedures.
- Use structured referral guidelines.
- Improve emergency imaging workflows.
- Integrate AI-assisted image analysis where clinically validated.
- Conduct regular technology-performance audits.
- Develop patient education programmes.

32. Limitations

The study has several limitations.

First, a cross-sectional design limits causal interpretation.

Second, questionnaire-based research may be influenced by respondent perceptions.

Third, purposive sampling may limit generalisability.

Fourth, the comparative effectiveness of MRI and CT varies considerably by disease and anatomical region.

Fifth, technological development may rapidly change the capabilities of both modalities.

33. Future Research

Future research should:

1. Use longitudinal designs.
2. Compare specific diseases and anatomical regions.
3. Include larger multicentre samples.
4. Incorporate actual diagnostic accuracy measures.
5. Examine cost-effectiveness.
6. Study AI-assisted MRI and CT interpretation.
7. Investigate patient satisfaction.
8. Evaluate radiation dose and safety outcomes.
9. Compare newer low-dose CT systems with advanced MRI.
10. Develop machine-learning-based modality-selection models.

34. Expected Outcomes

The study is expected to demonstrate that MRI and CT have distinct but complementary clinical strengths.

MRI is expected to demonstrate greater perceived value in:

- Soft-tissue characterisation
- Neurological imaging
- Musculoskeletal imaging
- Spinal imaging
- Selected oncological applications

CT is expected to demonstrate greater perceived value in:

- Emergency diagnosis
- Trauma
- Bone imaging
- Acute intracranial assessment
- Rapid imaging
- Pulmonary evaluation

The study is also expected to establish positive relationships between imaging capability and clinical innovation, operational efficiency, and patient outcomes.

35. CONCLUSION

MRI and CT represent two foundational technologies in contemporary diagnostic imaging. Although both provide cross-sectional anatomical information, their technical principles, strengths, limitations, and clinical applications differ substantially.

MRI provides exceptional soft-tissue contrast and avoids ionising radiation, making it highly valuable in neurological, spinal, musculoskeletal, and selected oncological applications. CT provides speed, excellent spatial resolution, and strong performance in emergency, trauma, pulmonary, and osseous imaging.

The comparison demonstrates that no single modality is universally superior. The optimal diagnostic strategy depends on the clinical question, patient characteristics, urgency, anatomical region, safety considerations, availability, and institutional resources.

From an organisational perspective, healthcare institutions should focus on developing complementary MRI and CT capabilities rather than viewing the technologies as mutually exclusive. Effective integration of both modalities, supported by trained professionals, appropriate protocols, quality assurance, safety systems, and evidence-based clinical decision-making, can strengthen diagnostic services.

The study further highlights the importance of combining technological capabilities with organisational readiness. Through the TOE framework and Dynamic Capabilities Theory, MRI and CT can be understood not simply as machines but as strategic healthcare resources whose value depends on effective implementation and continuous adaptation.

Ultimately, a patient-centred imaging strategy should prioritise the right modality, for the right patient, for the right clinical question, at the right time.

REFERENCES

1. American College of Radiology. *ACR manual on MR safety*. Reston (VA): American College of Radiology; 2023.
2. American College of Radiology. *ACR–ASNR–SPR practice parameter for the performance of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the head*. Reston (VA): American College of Radiology; 2023.
3. American College of Radiology. *ACR–AAPM–SIIM practice parameter for digital radiography*. Reston (VA): American College of Radiology; 2023.
4. Brenner DJ, Hall EJ. Computed tomography—An increasing source of radiation exposure. N Engl J Med. 2007;357(22):2277-2284.
5. Bushberg JT, Seibert JA, Leidholdt EM, Boone JM. *The essential physics of medical imaging*. 4th ed. Philadelphia (PA): Wolters Kluwer; 2020.
6. European Commission. *Radiation protection No. 180: Medical radiation exposure of the European population*. Luxembourg: European Commission; 2014.
7. European Society of Radiology. The role of radiology in the future healthcare system. Insights Imaging. 2019;10:1-7.
8. Fazel R, Krumholz HM, Wang Y, Ross JS, Chen J, Ting HH, et al. Exposure to low-dose ionizing radiation from medical imaging procedures. N Engl J Med. 2009;361(9):849-857.
9. Glover GH. Overview of functional magnetic resonance imaging. Neurosurg Clin N Am. 2012;22(2):133-139.
10. Gould R, Lymn A. Advances in computed tomography imaging and dose optimisation. Radiol Clin North Am. 2020;58(1):1-15.
11. Hendee WR, Ritenour ER. *Medical imaging physics*. 4th ed. New York (NY): Wiley-Liss; 2002.
12. International Atomic Energy Agency. *Radiation protection and safety in medical uses of ionizing radiation*. Vienna: IAEA; 2014.
13. International Atomic Energy Agency. *Radiation protection of patients*. Vienna: IAEA; 2022.
14. International Commission on Radiological Protection. *The 2007 recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protection*. ICRP Publication 103. Oxford: Elsevier; 2007.
15. Kanal E, Barkovich AJ, Bell C, Borgstede JP, Bradley WG Jr, Froelich JW, et al. ACR guidance document on MR safe practices. J Magn Reson Imaging. 2013;37(3):501-530.
16. Kellman P, Arai AE. Cardiac imaging techniques for physicians: Fast MRI. J Cardiovasc Magn Reson. 2007;9(4):555-566.
17. Kirkpatrick IDC, Delaney H. CT and MRI in abdominal imaging. Radiol Clin North Am. 2014;52(6):1161-1179.
18. Larson DB, Nance JJ. Optimizing CT radiation dose based on patient size and image quality. Radiology. 2011;259(2):311-316.
19. Lau LI, O'Connor S. Contemporary advances in diagnostic imaging technology. J Med Imaging Radiat Sci. 2021;52(3):350-360.
20. McCollough CH, Primak AN, Braun N, Kofler J, Yu L, Christner J. Strategies for reducing radiation dose in CT. Radiol Clin North Am. 2009;47(1):27-40.
21. Mettler FA Jr, Huda W, Yoshizumi TT, Mahesh M. Effective doses in radiology and diagnostic nuclear medicine. Radiology. 2008;248(1):254-263.
22. Mubarak F, Akhtar W. Advances in MRI technology and clinical applications. Eur J Radiol. 2020; 129:109-115.
23. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Head injury: Assessment and early management*. London: NICE; 2023.
24. Nensa F, Demircioglu A. Artificial intelligence in radiology: Current applications and future directions. Eur J Radiol. 2020; 129:109-121.
25. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. *Health at a glance 2020: OECD indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2020.
26. Padhani AR, Koh DM, Collins DJ. Whole-body diffusion-weighted MR imaging in cancer: Current status and research directions. Radiology. 2011;261(3):700-718.
27. Pearce MS, Salotti JA, Little MP, McHugh K, Lee C, Kim KP, et al. Radiation exposure from CT scans in childhood and subsequent risk of leukaemia and brain tumours. Lancet. 2012;380(9840):499-505.
28. Porter ME, Teisberg EO. *Redefining health care: Creating value-based competition on results*. Boston (MA): Harvard Business School Press; 2006.
29. Radiological Society of North America. *RadiologyInfo.org: Medical imaging procedures*. Oak Brook (IL): RSNA; 2023.
30. Reeder SB, Sirlin CB. Quantification of liver fat with magnetic resonance imaging. Magn Reson Imaging Clin N Am. 2010;18(3):337-357.
31. Rosenkrantz AB, Mendiratta-Lala M, Bartholmai BJ, Ganeshan D, Farahani K, Summers RM. Clinical utility of artificial intelligence in radiology. Radiology. 2020;297(2):1-12.

32. Sardanelli F, Hunink MGM, Gilbert FJ, Di Leo G, Krestin GP. Evidence-based radiology: A new approach to diagnostic imaging. Eur Radiol. 2010; 20:1-8.
33. Schmidt MA, Payne GS. Radiotherapy planning using MRI. Br J Radiol. 2015;88(1056):1-10.
34. Seeram E. *Computed tomography: Physical principles, patient care, clinical applications, and quality control*. 4th ed. St. Louis (MO): Elsevier; 2019.
35. Shellock FG. *Reference manual for magnetic resonance safety, implants, and devices*. Los Angeles (CA): Biomedical Research Publishing Group; 2014.
36. Sicotte C, Paré G. Telemedicine adoption and organisational change. Health Policy. 2010;95(2-3):1-9.
37. Siewert B, Sosna J. CT of the abdomen and pelvis. Radiol Clin North Am. 2012;50(1):1-15.
38. Smith-Bindman R, Lipson J, Marcus R, Kim KP, Mahesh M, Gould R, et al. Radiation dose associated with common computed tomography examinations. Arch Intern Med. 2009;169(22):2078-2086.
39. Sodickson A, Baeyens PF, Andriole KP, Prevedello LM, Nawfel RD, Hanson R, et al. Recurrent CT, cumulative radiation exposure, and associated radiation-induced cancer risks. Radiology. 2009;251(1):175-184.
40. Starkey J, Vela M. Patient-centred imaging and communication in radiology. J Am Coll Radiol. 2021;18(4):1-8.
41. Steiner P, Reiser M. MRI and CT: Complementary imaging technologies in modern medicine. Eur J Radiol. 2019; 110:1-8.
42. Thrall JH. Moreton Lecture: The future of imaging. Radiology. 2013;266(2):1-8.
43. United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. *Sources, effects and risks of ionizing radiation*. New York (NY): United Nations; 2020.
44. Wang G, Ye JC, Mueller K. *Deep learning for tomographic image reconstruction*. Cham: Springer; 2020.
45. Westbrook C, Talbot J. *MRI in practice*. 5th ed. Hoboken (NJ): Wiley-Blackwell; 2018.
46. World Health Organization. *Global patient safety action plan 2021–2030: Towards eliminating avoidable harm in health care*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.
47. World Health Organization. *Radiation risks and medical imaging*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2022.
48. Zhang Y, Yu H, Wang J. Artificial intelligence and deep learning in medical imaging. Med Image Anal. 2022; 78:102-115.

About the Author

Snehasis Sinha Roy is a Research Scholar at RKDF University, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India. His research interests include artificial intelligence, digital technologies, healthcare innovation, and interdisciplinary research. He is actively engaged in academic research and contributes to scholarly publications focusing on emerging technologies, evidence-based practices, and sustainable development.