QIBA Ultrasound Shear Wave Speed (SWS) Biomarker Committee (BC)

Wednesday, November 9, 2022; 2 PM CT

(minutes highlighted)

Ongoing items:

- Updates on Clinical Feasibility (Stage 3) feedback, participating sites (DF)
 - o Sites:
 - Medical physicist at UT Southwestern Medical Center Philips, GE, and Siemens
 - University of Rochester / Rochester area (NY)? No updates (GE-predominant)
 - Dr. Ozturk to reach out to network colleagues in Boston
 - M Robbin to talk to UAB physics team Philips
 - Note that we should indeed obtain sonographer, QA manager
 - Section 4 Review details/meaning with regards to sonographer's qualifications and implications for site
 - Discuss with other BC to see how they approached sites for feasibility testing
 - Need enough sites that offer a variety of manufacturers
 - Ask manufacturers to recommend sites
 - Resolve feedback items:
 - 1. Protocol for weighing phantom, and measuring temperature
 - Include that each site should create and maintain their own protocol? Review Section 4. Maybe difference between manufacturer level versus site level
 - Are tolerances realistic?
 - What are reasonable requirements. Info from Ted re: temp dependence.
 - 2. Finalize decision regarding what is meant by "system" (i.e., scanner "box", software version, transducer, sonographer, etc.).
 - Too many possible combinations
 - Last consensus: 1 representative "device" from each manufacturer that may perform elastography (including each transducer may be used for liver Elasto)
 - How do we define "site"? Physical location?
 - Should site conformance be similar to ACR accreditation, where a site would submit representative studies that reflect their usual study quality (along with completed checklist)?
 - Single organization (with same sonographers, protocols, radiologists, and QA program)? Consensus; Section 3.5
 - BC to clarify what is meant by pre-delivery, delivery, and install, as
 it relates to an ultrasound system, hardware/software upgrades,
 and/or even new transducers

- BC to add explicit transducer requirements perhaps not the same actual physical transducer, but the same type, e.g., 5C1 for each use
- Public comment resolution document (SM)
 - Dr. McAleavey is compiling resolution comments and will submit a Public Comment Resolution document for wiki posting soon
- Manufacturer attestation
 - "How do we get the manufacturers to commit to a self-attestation?"
 - 2 parallel paths that we need to pursue at the same time:
 - 1) make it easy for manufacturers
 - Develop Template ACTION ITEM (AO)
 - Mirror DICOM, IHE integration conformance statements
 - Websites of each company (searchable and accessible
 - Not maintained centrally
 - Include recommended system settings/modes, transducers, software rev. etc.
 - 2) get sites to request the self-attestation statement from manufacturers.
 - Can/should we push vendors to publish?
 - Discuss at AIUM UltraCon what conformance statements would mean to public?
 - Could recommend attendees to go to their respective companies and request said conformance statements
 - Contacts: QIBA Process Committee Leaders: <u>Kevin O'Donnell, MASc</u> (Chair) | <u>Michael</u> Boss, PhD (Co-Chair)
- Manuscript on the SWS Profile
 - o Ideas: How we got here. How to implement profile. How to become QIBA conformant.
 - Co-chairs to discuss

New Items:

- Discuss concerns raised by Ted Lynch re: phantom specifications
 - o Initial comparison to MRI (Phase 1) included 2 large phantoms
 - Phase II studies leveraged currently available elasticity phantoms
 - Agreed to update based on Ted's recommendations of <u>minimum</u> dimensions

Update QIBA Dashboard:
 https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1A7_uieyw0uu2DKbP6Vkzd37JuBEb2zmm-yqfXJtV-p4/edit#gid=1800295569

Upcoming meetings: RSNA 2022. **QIBA Symposium**, 2-3:30pm (E253B), following by breakout sessions, if 3:30-5:30, 1 hour each

Back-to-back BC breakout sessions?

3:30 SWS -> 4:30 PEQUS;

3:30 Volume Flow -> 4:30 CEUS

Next Biomarker Call: Dec 14th