

QIBA Process Committee Call

Tuesday, March 5, 2019 at 3 PM CT

Call Summary

Attendees:

Kevin O'Donnell, MAsc (Co-Chair) Michael Boss, PhD Brian Zimmerman, PhD
Cathy Elsinger, PhD

RSNA Staff:

Joe Koudelik
Susan Stanfa

Discussions on Current Process Cmte Work

*The items below can be found on the [Process Cmte page of the QIBA Wiki](#)

Onboarding Process

- Due to some key guidance documents being difficult to locate on the QIBA Wiki, Mr. O'Donnell is exploring an alias feature to reduce the number of clicks required to access nested documents or Wiki pages

Assessment Procedure Guidance

- Past versions of the Assessment Procedure Guidance document are located on the QIBA Wiki at: http://qibawiki.rsna.org/index.php/Assessment_Procedure_Guidance
- A more recent draft requiring a few edits to be posted soon
- Statistical clarification needed re: developing an uncertainty metric based on a single composite (site) measurement vs. multiple/individual components (Actors); a comparison of approaches was suggested
- Recommended that Profile input be sought directly from the various Actor groups, e.g. technologists; this is a cohort that has been mostly absent from the DWI BC discussions
 - Site assessments often require the involvement and input of technologists
 - Suggestion to list various stakeholder areas on dashboard and ask BCs to appoint a person for each category, with CC Co-Chairs highlighting possible gaps in coverage
- Discussion re: site assessment data sets
 - Variability will differ among biomarkers regarding whether patient, phantom or DRO data is used
 - It was noted that there are different levels of assessment and ideally a Profile provides a physical phantom recommendation or a DRO as ground truth
 - Patient data deemed highly desirable, but discussion needed on whether any Profiles will require it
 - Examples from biomarker groups are still needed in Assessment Procedures sections
 - Drs. Jackson, Obuchowski, and Reeder to be contacted to discuss considerations/rationale for diverging from phantom-testing (the ultimate decision is a judgment call for each biomarker committee)
 - A table listing advantages and disadvantages of bias testing with human subjects vs. phantoms to be included
- Sections 3.1: Bottom-Up Threshold approach and 3.2: Top (site performance)-Down (individual actors) approaches to measurement
 - Rationale behind choosing each approach was included in the guidance document
 - Discussion to be continued with Dr. Obuchowski during an upcoming Process Cmte call
- Mr. O'Donnell to circulate this document to Process Cmte members for review prior to the March 19 Process Cmte call

Public Comment Resolution Procedure

- A QIBA Wiki page for posting public [comment resolution](#) documents has been created
 - Comment submitters will be able to access details on how their feedback was addressed, i.e., incorporated into the subsequent draft (Consensus Profile)
 - Each BC may decide what tool to use to track process to address public comments (e.g., Excel, Google Sheet, Word, etc.)
- A Google-based public [comment resolution spreadsheet template](#) was created and was linked to the [public comment process](#) QIBA Wiki page
- Staff to draft universal, boilerplate language thanking submitters and informing them of next steps, e.g., to be included in the customizable auto-notification feature in the electronic public comment submission form
- It was noted that the DWI BC, whose Profile is about to enter a second round of public comment, is finalizing its comment resolution spreadsheet containing the 1st round of comments for posting
- Discussion re: line numbering in Profile documents
 - Recommendation that comment submitter use the PDF document of the posted Profile when submitting a comment pertaining to a specific location
 - Issue with alignment of line numbers when converting a .pdf to an edited Word document was noted (deemed more difficult with Google Docs)
 - QIBA groups use Google Docs line numbers for verbal navigation/reference during t-cons
 - It is important to keep track of the location of text in the original public comment document, as text shifts considerably during editing
 - Suggestion to keep track of both the proposed resolution and the final one
 - Recommendation to use Word (despite versioning issues during collaboration), due to its ability to create a static .pdf with matching line numbers
 - It was noted that while Google Docs does not natively provide line numbers, extensions that may work are available (Mr. O'Donnell to report back with name of an extension)
 - The DWI BC tried extensions, but they were deemed inconsistent with Word or Acrobat
 - At the end of the DWI collaborative resolution period, the cmte returned to using a Word document
 - Having a small, unofficial DWI TF focused on comment resolution facilitated the sharing of Word documents
- The Public Comment Process page on the QIBA Wiki, located at: http://qibawiki.rsn.org/index.php/Public_Comment_Process provides instructions to BC members re: classifying comments:
 - “Accepted” = proposed text was accepted as is
 - “Rejected” = committee does not agree with issue (cmte to document reason, e.g. out of scope)
 - “Resolved” = issue accepted but resolved differently than proposed by comment submitter
 - Suggestion to add, “under discussion” for purposes of internal collaboration (status to be used for only an in-progress, unposted resolution spreadsheet)
 - A comment resolution document to be posted on the QIBA Wiki during only the terminal stage
 - Other statuses to be used (color code and key noted in [comment resolution template](#)):
 - “TBD” = to be used for intermediate states
 - “Ok” = No action requested
 - “Discuss” = Resolution needs to be decided by cmte members
 - “TODO” = resolution decided and Profile update to be made

- “Done” = Profile update has been made
 - Comment resolution template contains an “owner” column to indicate who is working on each issue
 - The DWI BC to use the public comment resolution template for its 2nd round of public comments
- This item deemed completed for the time being; it will be revisited if feedback is received

BC and TF Sunsetting Procedure

- Due to limited RSNA resources, it was suggested that new BCs not be approved until resources can be reallocated from an existing group
 - Modalities (CCs) to be responsible for managing growth – some modalities may need fewer resources and could cede them to another modality if necessary
- Mr. O’Donnell to draft a QIBA Wiki page for review during the March 19 Process Cmte meeting
 - Who proposes, who considers, and who decides the status of each QIBA group, to be outlined
 - How to most effectively/efficiently leverage/allocate limited resources for support of QIBA groups to be explored
- A standing agenda item for future Process calls was proposed
 - Time to be allocated for discussion of issues related to Profile development; identifying common problems and exploring possible solutions will facilitate Profile progress

Next Call: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 at 3 PM CT *(1st & 3rd Tuesdays)*