QIBA Process Committee Call

Wednesday, September 6, 2017 at 3 PM CT Call Summary

Attendees:RSNA Staff:Kevin O'Donnell, MASc (Co-Chair)Nancy Obuchowski, PhDJoe KoudelikEdward Jackson, PhDEric Perlman, MDSusan Weinmann

Profile Review Process

- Due to the lack of awareness, clarification is needed on the meaning of a Profile ballot at the BC level and the specific criteria for each stage of development:
 - Ballot choices
 - Yes = "I have read the Profile and agree that it meets the guidelines and criteria for <insert name of Stage>" (comments are optional)
 - No (to voting ballot) = "I do not agree that the Profile is ready yet for <insert name
 of Stage>; see comments" (comments are mandatory)
 - Abstain = I abstain from voting Yes of No (but is still recorded and counts toward quorum) comments are optional
 - Suggestion to include links to criteria and guidelines in the eBallot and in the announcement
- Discussion on reassessing/revisiting differences between BC and CC level reviews for Profile movement through stages:
 - Current roles in review process (one layer of review and two layers of approval) can be found on the QIBA Wiki at: http://qibawiki.rsna.org/index.php/Review_Process
 - BC members complete an in-depth review
 - BC members approve the profile content
 - CC members provide high-level oversight approval and verify that Claim is on target
 - Should better clarify the charge of what the CC members are evaluating for their approval.
 (The CC is not expected to complete a second in-depth review)
 - CCs Chairs may request additional soliciting of SME comments at the BC level to ensure robustness of stage review
- It was proposed that the Steering Cmte take up the issue of the proliferation of Task Forces. They should be reaffirmed as subgroups formed by their Biomarker Committee to perform work and bring it back to their BC, or be formally upgraded to Biomarker Committees themselves. Ambiguity makes it harder to know who's responsible for what.
- Concern was expressed in regard to the amount of tasks required of QIBA leaders
 - With the loss of federal funding for groundwork projects, QIBA relies more on volunteer effort
 - A heavy review/vote process could dilute enthusiasm causing participation of volunteers to wane

- Might consider adapting elements of the (more familiar?) journal peer review process into the standards development process if that would be smoother, more familiar
- Suggestion that QIBA leaders propose 1-3 process-related steps to be reevaluated and possibly streamlined or removed
- Mr. O'Donnell to update generic public comment announcement text and forward it to RSNA staff
- Reminder that deciding a profile is ready for approval ballot is formal piece of BC business, so there should be a motion/second/discussion recorded in the meeting minutes/call summary. This also helps track progress.
- NOTE: Dr. Jackson recommended that until the CC charge has been revised, Profile approval will be limited to only BC members with voting privileges

Review of the QIBA Assessment Procedure Guidance Document

- This document is located on the QIBA Wiki at: http://qibawiki.rsna.org/index.php/Assessment Procedure Guidance
- The original purpose of this document was for testing statistical assumptions underlying the Claim(s) and for testing the composite performance of a site to compare it against the Claim(s)
- Updates made by Mr. O'Donnell & Dr. Obuchowski were reviewed
- Section 2: Composite measurement and site level conformance were discussed
 - Verification that a dataset is publically available should occur before it is chosen
 - Ultrasound example (deliberately targeting ground truth using a phantom) of properties of a dataset to be requested from Dr. Garra
- ➤ If you plan to attend the 2017 RSNA Annual Meeting, the QIBA Working Meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 29, 2017, 2:30 6 PM

Next Call: Wednesday, September 20, 2017 at 3 PM CT