

QIBA Process Committee
Wednesday, November 16, 2016 at 3 PM CT
Call Summary

Attendees:

Kevin O'Donnell, MASC (Chair)
Daniel Sullivan, MD (Co-Chair)

Edward Jackson, PhD
Nancy Obuchowski, PhD

Eric Perlman, MD
Nicholas Petrick, PhD

RSNA Staff:

Joe Koudelik
Susan Weinmann

Approval Process for Profile Release / Profile Stages

- The Profile Review Process was discussed and can be found on QIBA wiki at:
http://qibawiki.rsna.org/index.php/Review_Process
 - Public Comment criteria were reviewed; criteria related to each Profile stage to be refined
 - The same review and approval process occurs for each publishing stage: Public Comment Profile, a Consensus Profile, a Technically Confirmed Profile, Claim Confirmed Profile or a Clinically Confirmed Profile; just the criteria change
 - Criteria to include statistical requirements; Dr. Obuchowski to draft language for each stage

Performance Requirements vs. Conformance Requirement

- Section 3 (performance) and Section 4 (conformance) details need to be made more obvious to new users

Imaging Site Conformance (Section 4.6)

- The use/need for imaging site assessment procedures was discussed
- Currently, the imaging site is not listed as an "Actor" under Section 4 (conformance)
- Whether or not individual "Actor" conformance equates to imaging site conformance is not known
- Mr. O'Donnell recommended adding imaging site performance procedures to demonstrate claim conformance
- Assessment details, including metric(s), needed if Profile scope includes "claim confirmed" language
- BCs need to decide whether a dedicated imaging site conformance assessment procedure is necessary beyond individual Actor conformance (i.e. beyond the individual components) due to subtle differences
- Comparisons were made between the FDG-PET and CT Vol Profiles regarding reproducibility
 - FDG Profile is using Dr. Kinahan's DRO as a surrogate regarding assessment, whereas the CT Vol Profile is using Dr. Samei's simulated CT lung lesions to test against ACR accreditation images
 - The FDG DRO was elevated to "Actor" level to evaluate SUVmax within the FDG Profile
 - Dr. Obuchowski to follow up with Dr Kinahan re a lack of reproducibility in the current FDG-PET Profile
- Whether imaging sites need to prove conformance beyond individual components (Actors) was debated
- Dr. Obuchowski noted that Mr. Avila may be drafting a site assessment procedure based on his recent crowd-sourcing phantom project

- Section 4.6 only applies to the claim confirmed and clinically confirmed stages of Profile development; if the imaging site is not included as an Actor, then section 4.6 text may be removed
- Although under discussion, Mr. O'Donnell suggested adding the imaging site as Actor to the Profile template and all related performance criteria to meet the growing dependence on an overarching site assessment

Next Calls: Wednesday, December 14, 2017 at 3 PM CT