## **NHSBSP EQUIPMENT EVALUATION (FORM 6)**

## Radiographers' Observations and Findings

A copy of this form should be completed near the start and again towards the end of the evaluation

Unit:		Evaluating centre:						
Ger	neral		Poor	Satis- factory	Good	Excellent	Comments	
1.	How	good was the operator's manual?						
2.		good was the user training provided e supplier?						
3.	3.1	How do you rate the unit's ease of use?  How do you rate the unit's help in minimising fatigue?						
4.	acce	e the x-ray exposure times ptable? (If not, explain, eg hit backup r frequently.)						
5.	Settir 5.1 5.2	ng for radiographic views:  How do you rate the rotation of the support arm?  How do you rate the visibility of the set angle?						
6.	Settir 6.1	ng position of breast support table:  How do you rate the facility for positioning the height of the breast support table?						
7.	Rang 7.1	e of movements:  How do you rate the adequacy of the range of movements offered by the unit?						
8.	Comp 8.1 8.2	How effective was the compression system?  How good was the visibility of compression force from breast support table?						

October 2002 Page 1 of 4

Gen	eral	Poor	Satis- factory	Good	Excellent	Comments
9.	AEC detector positioning:	. 551	.actory			- Commonto
	9.1 Ease of setting?					
	9.2 Adequacy of detector position					
	options?					
10.	Visibility of AEC detector marking					
11.	Ease of insertion and removal of cassettes					
10	Devicements of augustical radiographic view					
12.	Performance of supplied radiographic view markers					
13.	Effectiveness of brakes:					
	13.1 How well did the brakes work? (eg was there any backlash or					
	movement?)					
14.	Comfort of women:					
	14.1 Did the women experience excessive discomfort or pain?					
	14.2 Were there any sharp corners, etc?					
15.	Range of controls and indicators:					
	15.1 Were all the expected controls present?					
	15.2 Were they easy to find and use?					
	10.2 Were they easy to find and use:					
16.	How do you rate the choice of collimators					
	supplied for spot compression?					
17.	Confidence of good results:					
	17.1 What was your level of confidence					
	in the machine?					
18.	Hazards:					
	18.1 Were there any potentially					
	hazardous areas (eg hot spots) accessible to either you or the					
	woman?					

October 2002 Page 2 of 4

General	Poor	Satis- factory	Good	Excellent	Comments
19. Equipment cleaning:		,			Yes/no
19.1 Ease of cleaning the machine?					
19.2 Were there instructions in the					
manual?					
20. Patient and exposure data and					
postexposure printout facility (if availa	ble)				
21. Did the performance of the x-ray set li					Yes/no
patient throughput? (If so, say why, eg allow for cooling.)	to				
anow for econing.					
22. Overall film quality:					
22.1 How would you rate the image	:+0				
quality of films taken on this un	11.7				
23. Relative image quality:	Worse	Same	Better		
23.1 Was the image quality attained					
this unit better, worse or the sal					
as that by other units?					
Any additional comments on general perfor	mance:				I

October 2002 Page 3 of 4

Magnification		Poor	Satis- factory	Good	Excellent	Comments
1.	Rate the ease with which the magnification equipment may be assembled and dismantled					
2.	Rate the ease of use of the magnification breast support table					
3.	Grade how the magnification support table performs					
4.	Visibility of indication of focal spot size selected?					
5.	Removal and insertion of collimator plates: 5.1 Range of collimators 5.2 Operation of automatic diaphragms					

			Satis-			
Stereo		Poor	factory	Good	Excellent	Comments
1.	Rate the ease with which stereotactic equipment may be assembled and dismantled					
2.	How easy is the stereo to clean?					
3.	Ease of rotation of support arm with stereo assembly fitted?					
4.	Overall, how easy to use was the stereo assembly?					
5.	Comment on the accuracy of the stereo in needle positioning					

October 2002 Page 4 of 4