

QIBA SPECT TC^{99m} Biomarker Committee (BC) Call
Tuesday, February 11, 2020, 2 PM (CT)
Call Summary

In attendance:

<i>Yuni Dewaraja, PhD (Co-chair)</i>	Clara Ferreira	Nancy Obuchowski, PhD	RSNA Staff Joe Koudelik
<i>Robert Miyaoka, PhD (Co-chair)</i>	David Mirando	John Sunderland, PhD	Julie Lisiecki
John Dickson, PhD	P. David Mozley, MD	Richard Wahl, MD	

Moderator: Dr. Miyaoka

SPECT TC^{99m} Public Comment – Feedback Resolution Update

- Public comment feedback was addressed
 - Comments received required minor Profile edits and provided good suggestions
- The BC plans to have Profile comments resolved by the March 10th meeting
 - Some reviewer comments to be addressed offline to save time
 - More complex comments will require additional group discussion
 - Certain medical comments will need to be reviewed by Dr. Mozley
 - Any subsequent loose ends will be resolved before the QIBA Annual Meeting in April
- The following was resolved:
 - Line 168: “Help” was described as too generic by Dr. LaForest, so the text was expanded to the following:
 - “This document is intended to help clinicians base decisions on these biomarkers, imaging staffs generating measurements of these biomarkers, vendors who are developing related products, purchasers of such products, and investigators designing trials to be able to make informed decisions based upon accurate and reproducible SPECT derived biomarkers.”
- J-QIBA provided feedback that demonstrated their engagement with the Profile, and was much appreciated
 - One comment that will need further discussion was the inability to purchase a NIST-traceable ^{99m}Techetium phantom in Japan, as the tracer half-life is very short
 - The Profile may need to be updated to reflect that “a NIST-traceable technetium phantom or equivalent” is acceptable, such as a Cobalt-57 phantom
 - NIST guidance is needed for this discussion
- Dr. Obuchowski provided guidance on the within-subject coefficient of variation (WCV) and suggested adding detail regarding the cutoff numbers for conformance testing

Action items

- All are asked to review proposed Profile edits for AAPM comments and other feedback received prior to the next call in order to make a consensus decision on the following:
 - collimators with regards to the 8 mm measurement
 - the difference between 4.8 mm vs. 5 mm for SPECT acquisition mode in Table 3.9.2

Next BC call – Tuesday, March 10, 2020 at 2 PM CT