

QIBA Process Committee
Wednesday, October 19, 2016 at 3 PM CDT
Call Summary

Attendees:

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

Edward Jackson, PhD
Nancy Obuchowski, PhD

Eric Perlman, MD

RSNA Staff:

Joe Koudelik
Susan Weinmann

Approval Process for Profile Release / Profile Stages

- The Profile process can be found on QIBA wiki at: <http://qibawiki.rsna.org/index.php/Process>
- The Profile Review Process was discussed and can be found on QIBA wiki at: http://qibawiki.rsna.org/index.php/Review_Process
 - 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
 - Authors/Editor of the Profile request internal committee review for approval once they feel work on the current stage has been completed
 - Assigned/volunteer reviewers to focus on specific Profile sections to help “share the review load”
 - Ideally, each section should be covered by more than one reviewer
 - Reviewing assignments can be divided up any way that is convenient
 - Some reviewers may read through the Profile in its entirety to find inconsistencies/gaps
 - Reviewers verify that the Profile meets the [criteria for the current stage](#) and ensure general clarity/quality
 - Two weeks for expert review is recommended
 - At the BC meeting subsequent to the close of this review period, reviewers to report back on their sections to the rest of the BC membership
 - Any questions/comments/clarifications raised by the reviewers to be resolved
- Discussion on revising the current voting process
 - The balloting process can be found on the QIBA wiki at: http://qibawiki.rsna.org/index.php/Balloting_Process
 - Voting privileges can be found on the QIBA wiki at: http://qibawiki.rsna.org/index.php/Voting_Privileges
 - Committee procedures can be found on the QIBA wiki at: http://qibawiki.rsna.org/index.php/Committee_Procedures
 - Suggested was a release vote to first go to the BC, whose members are most familiar with the Profile and its detailed content
 - The goal is group consensus and imaging community input and endorsement on major decisions; suggestions made to tentatively hold release if any negative vote was cast
 - A single negative vote or multiple abstentions can prevent Profile release
 - If there is no consensus, and issue is unable to be resolved at the BC level, it will go to the CC for review, otherwise, CC can be bypassed for a release vote

- Dr. Obuchowski requested that “statistical oversight” be part of the Profile approval process to maintain consistency of claim formats across all modalities
 - CC to vote electronically and, if needed, have a call to discuss the issue
 - The CC’s role is to provide high-level quality control of Profiles
 - Once a Profile is approved, the vote outcome will be recorded in the notes
- Mr. O’Donnell to write up a strawman regarding revisions to the Standard Approval Practices for Process Committee discussion on the November 2nd call
 - Changes to voting process to be presented to the SC
 - Once committee approved, Mr. O’Donnell to update the Wiki for general reference

Approval Process for Naming of BC Chairs and Appointment of CC Chairs

- Item to be added to “current work” list on QIBA wiki at:
http://qibawiki.rsna.org/index.php/Process_Coordinating_Committee

Discriminatory Claim Discussion for SPECT BC Profile

- SPECT BC members wish to release the Profile containing a discriminatory Claim for Public Comment stage
 - Claim 1C (#3) of the SPECT Profile includes only the coefficient of variation where true value cannot be determined
 - If bias is known, a cross-sectional Claim is used; if linearity exists, a longitudinal Claim is used
 - Dr. Mozley emphasized that two of the SPECT Profile claims (one longitudinal and one cross-sectional) conform to QIBA claim guidance standards and that substantial research data are available to support these claims
 - For many QIBA groups, finding test-retest data to support cross-sectional claims is proving difficult, whereas there is abundant data (statistically supportive) regarding the proposed discriminatory claim around a clinical decision-making cut-point
 - There was a perception that the proposed discriminatory claim is not a quantitative measurement of performance, but may be considered a correlation of an observation
 - Since some bias characteristics (e.g. measurement precision and between subject variability) are unknown, concern was expressed about drawing conclusions related to clinical utility which has routinely considered beyond the scope of QIBA efforts
- One of the goals in QIBA is to balance practical with ideal
 - While the ideal is to have a statistically robust Profile, there is concern of slowing SPECT BC Profile progress
 - Dr. Obuchowski reminded the committee that any Profile claim, statistically valid or not, must be clinically useful, or the Profile is irrelevant
 - Discussion paragraph may be added, stating that no Claim has been made about bias or linearity, which imposes some limitations

Next Steps

- The NM CC will vote on whether to release the SPECT Profile for Public Comment
 - RSNA staff to prepare list of QIBA NM CC members with voting privileges for upcoming vote to consider release of the SPECT Profile for Public Comment

Next Calls: Wednesday, November 2, 2016 at 3 PM CT