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**Welcome**

Dr. Kadom thanked the technical expert panel (TEP) for joining today's meeting. She requested that each member share disclosures relevant to the topic of the measure development project, DXA measure. Panelists acknowledged that they do not maintain conflicts of interest associated with this project or beyond those collected at the start of each panelist's term serving on an ACR-convened commission or committee.

**Measure Concept Review**

Sam Shugarman informed those on the call about the strawman measure. Sam shared a brief overview of the newly suggested measure, while Brendon pulled up the draft document for the committee’s review and input. Dr. Tyler Prout highlighted the importance of considering if there is good rationale for it to become a quality measure vs. a potential other method that is technically less challenging during this measure development project. There was ample discussion during a recent GSER Quality and Safety committee meeting on which measure to move forward. Out of that discussion, we leaned towards the LSC measure to the committee. If the committee disagrees, we could learn towards the submission of a proper use of a FRACS tool.

**Environmental Scan**

Sam provided a high-level overview of the measure development phases. Drs. Tyler Prout and Samuel Einstein, as the original measure concept submitters, provided an overview of the evidence he referenced to support the measure's concept. As part of the overview, Dr. Kadom informed the committee that the evidence table will need to be fully completed and accurate as possible for this measure submission.

Dr. Kadom expressed that the evidence in the scan should consist of the most current version of the information on best practices. Sam noted that she will include the related measures in the scan and emphasized that harmonizing with the related measures is a goal of the development project. Panelists agreed to participate in the literature search to see if they could identify additional articles in support of the measure. Dr. Bonna Rogers-Neufeld has provided one article to support best practices in relation to this measure.

**Measure Concept Review**

Facilitating the measure's refinement discussion, Dr. Kadom led the panelists through a straw man version of the quality measure, which contained the information collected as part of the concept's measure vetting submission process. This version served as the starting point to kick off the panel's discussion. The TEP provided input for revising the measure's purpose, level, denominator, numerator, guidance, and definition during today's meeting. The redlined version of the straw man is available so that the panel may revisit the edits in the future. Discussion about the measure's updates follow.

***Measure purpose discussion*** included deliberation of the measure's intention regarding true biologic changes vs. simple measurement variability.

***Measure level discussion*** surrounded around facility vs. the individual. Who generates the value? If the radiologist wants to report this properly, they will have to push the facilities to generate the values. If the facility generates the values, the radiologists may not use them properly in the report.

***Denominator discussion*** included addressing all DXA imaging exams with an eligible prior comparison. The panelists agreed to review the evidence to determine the denominator's specified age.

***Numerator discussion*** included describing the percentage of final reports that include an absolute value or percentage change in relation based on the facility generated LCS.

***Guidance discussion*** included the RAW absolute values should be reported and not percentage changes. Technologist LCS’ should be updated quarterly. [ISCD’s (International Society for Clinical Densitometry) best practices)](https://acradiology-my.sharepoint.com/personal/balves_acr_org/Documents/Desktop/Best-Practices-DXA-Article.pdf) is available for reference on page 132.

***Definition discussion*** included addressing precision values and verifying if numbers are valid. Goal is to focus on site specific level and site-specific value. Facility generated LSC’ is an average of all LCS’s technologists for a specific anatomical site that is updated continuously.

*Eligible prior comparison:* an exam performed on the same machine or an x-calibrated machine.

**Next Steps**

Samantha Shugarman will email Drs. Tyler Prout and Samuel Einstein the strawmen draft document to revise the language throughout, given the discussion today. After the 2nd draft is returned to Sam, she will discuss with Dr. Kadom and see if a second follow-up meeting is necessary, but likely will be. A doodle poll will be sent out and scheduled appropriately when the time comes. After-the-fact, it will likely want to be entered into our 30-day comment period.

**Meeting adjourned.**