

QIBA Process Committee Call

Tuesday, January 5, 2021 at 2 pm (CT)

Call Summary

Attendees:

Kevin O'Donnell, MASC (Chair)

Michael Boss, PhD (Vice Chair)

Alex Guimaraes, MD, PhD

Nancy Obuchowski, PhD

Nicholas Petrick, PhD

Daniel Sullivan, MD

Gudrun Zahlmann, PhD

RSNA Staff:

Joe Koudelik

Fiona Miller

Susan Stanfa

Profile Streamlining Efforts

- The main benefits of reducing the length of Profiles are greater likelihood of publication and implementation; there has been ongoing discussion among QIBA members on methods to accomplish this
- Dr. Boss noted that this topic was discussed during the Dec. 17 DWI BC meeting, where different views were shared
 - While some BC members agreed that Profile-shortening is paramount and feasible, others were adamant that all Profile text was truly necessary for scientific rigor, and nothing should be removed
 - It was suggested that when there is hesitancy re: removing text, a large portion could simply be moved out of the main body of the Profile and into appendices
- In the future, it will be important to set the tone early in the Profile-writing process that only crucial requirements for meeting Claims should be included in the body of the document
- A disconnect exists between the Profile creators and end-users
 - From the BC creator/editor perspective, the purpose of the Profile is to analyze and capture all sources of variance, outline methods to control them, and set strict requirements along with rationale for process; the outcome is a high-level of precision and insight
 - From the Profile user perspective, the goal is to complete the requirements as efficiently as possible to achieve site conformance
 - The current Profile template was designed from the perspective of a QIBA BC Profile creator/editor and it was recommended that the Process Cmte re-evaluate and redesign it from the end-user perspective
- Proposal to move checklists from the end of QIBA Profile documents to the beginning (Section 3), and move the existing Section 3 (which includes Discussion/clarifications and is organized by activity) to Appendix A
 - The checklist makes the Profile appear to be a more manageable undertaking for users (activity requirements with their associated background, explanations, examples, and troubleshooting can be daunting to new users)
 - Most BCs will likely still find the activity focus most productive for analyzing variability and reaching consensus on the requirements, but they can provide this detail in Appendix A, then generate the easy-to-follow checklist earlier in the Profile when ready to publish
 - All explanatory, supporting, or supplementary information should be included in appendices resulting in a shorter, more digestible Profile for end-users
- It was noted that the current scientific rigor of QIBA Profiles is exceptional and there was concern that quality degradation could result from removal of text
 - The Process Cmte does not support decrease in scientific rigor, however, adjusting the order of existing sections and elements might be beneficial to sites that seek to achieve conformance
 - BCs to be reminded to focus on a smaller set of requirements that have a significant impact on the claimed variability, i.e., try to provide most of the benefit at a lower conformance cost
 - The aim is that the text in the body of the Profile contain only the essential requirements for meeting the Claim, rather than elaborating on all conditions that could impact the claimed variability

- As current Profile lengths are deemed burdensome to Profile users, but some BCs may want to retain all of the text, it was proposed that a dedicated, succinct conformance document be drafted
 - This brief document would contain clear requirements for all Actors as well as a link to the entire Profile for further reference if needed
- The participation of Radiologic Technologists in the Profile-writing process is crucial; that input could help mitigate real-world user issues earlier in the process
- The Profile needs to be comprehensible for the majority of Profile users; to facilitate location of information relevant to the user, it was suggested that the Profile be separated into sections geared toward each type of actor
- A need for better Profile user instruction was mentioned; a main cause of Profile usability issues is lack of communication
- The recommended next step would include developing a plan for presenting Profile usability issues to BC members, sharing guidelines proposed by the Process Cmte, and inviting feedback

QIBA Conflicts of Interest

- Dr. Sullivan noted that this issue is being addressed in response to concerns raised during a past SC meeting and it has been discussed by the EC
- In the past, only SC members have been asked to complete a COI form, however, it was suggested that due to their voting member status and participation in Profile-writing decisions, BC Co-chairs should be included as well
- QIBA voting members are entrusted to acknowledge when there is a conflict and recuse themselves when appropriate
- Staff distributed Dr. Sullivan’s informational email regarding this decision and requested completion of the COI form on Oct. 14; a reminder was sent on Oct. 30
- Next steps:
 - A policy will be developed to outline QIBA expectations re: COIs (e.g., issues that may emerge and how they will be addressed) to be posted on the QIBA Wiki after approval
 - Dr. Sullivan to draft this policy text with 1-2 explanatory paragraphs, which will either appear on its own QIBA Wiki page, or be incorporated into a subsection of Committee Procedures page
 - It was suggested that Profile editors (even non-BC Co-chairs) be informed of COI submission requirements
 - It was noted that “Profile Editor,” is not currently an official, defined position and most who serve in this role are BC Co-chairs
- Dr. Sullivan reviewed reasons for COI concerns
 - When only 2 – 3 BC members are executing the majority of the Profile-writing, steering discussion re: specifications, or addressing public comments, there is greater risk of COI; this may be mitigated by larger group activity
 - Another example of a possible COI is when a BC voting member represents a manufacturer of a specific type of phantom required by the Profile, or would otherwise financially benefit from its publication/use as written
- Profiles should be reviewed to identify possible areas of COI; this process can occur during the Public Comment and Consensus processes; to demonstrate transparency, [public comment resolutions documentation](#) is published on the QIBA Wiki

Next Process Cmte Call: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 at 2 p.m. (CT)