Front Matter: Volume 9787
Contents

vii Authors
xi Conference Committee
xiii 2016 Medical Imaging Award Recipients

SESSION 1 TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT IN BREAST IMAGING

9787 02 Quantra reproduces BI-RADS assessment on a two-point scale [9787-21]
9787 03 Validated novel software to measure the conspicuity index of lesions in DICOM images [9787-22]
9787 04 Impact of two types of image processing on cancer detection in mammography [9787-23]
9787 05 Potential workflow advantages with single 8MP versus dual 5MP displays [9787-25]
9787 06 Discriminatory power of common genetic variants in personalized breast cancer diagnosis [9787-24]

SESSION 2 MODEL OBSERVERS I

9787 07 Can model observers be developed to reproduce radiologists’ diagnostic performances? Our study says not so fast! [9787-4]
9787 08 Applying the J-optimal channelized quadratic observer to SPECT myocardial perfusion defect detection [9787-5]
9787 09 Identification of error making patterns in lesion detection on digital breast tomosynthesis using computer-extracted image features [9787-6]
9787 0A Location- and lesion-dependent estimation of background tissue complexity for anthropomorphic model observer [9787-7]
9787 0B Task-based optimization of flip angle for texture analysis in MRI [9787-8]
9787 0C Task-based detectability comparison of exponential transformation of free-response operating characteristic (EFROC) curve and channelized Hotelling observer (CHO) [9787-9]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION 3</th>
<th>PERCEPTION METROLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9787 0D</td>
<td>Semi-parametric estimation of the area under the precision-recall curve [9787-10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 0E</td>
<td>Proper bibeta ROC model: algorithm, software, and performance evaluation [9787-11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 0F</td>
<td>MRMC analysis of agreement studies [9787-12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 0G</td>
<td>Quality metrics can help the expert during neurological clinical trials [9787-13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 0H</td>
<td>Performance comparison of quantitative semantic features and lung-RADS in the National Lung Screening Trial [9787-14]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION 4</th>
<th>PERCEPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9787 0I</td>
<td>The classification of normal screening mammograms [9787-15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 0J</td>
<td>The potential of pigeons as surrogate observers in medical image perception studies [9787-16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 0K</td>
<td>The impact of radiology expertise upon the localization of subtle pulmonary lesions [9787-17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 0L</td>
<td>Quantitative imaging features to predict cancer status in lung nodules [9787-18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 0M</td>
<td>Shapelet analysis of pupil dilation for modeling visuo-cognitive behavior in screening mammography [9787-19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 0N</td>
<td>Image similarity ranking of focal computed tomography liver lesions using a 2AFC technique [9787-20]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION 5</th>
<th>KEYNOTE AND ROC ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9787 0P</td>
<td>Detection of pulmonary nodule growth with dose reduced chest tomosynthesis: a human observer study using simulated nodules [9787-2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 0Q</td>
<td>Assessing nodule detection on lung cancer screening CT: the effects of tube current modulation and model observer selection on detectability maps [9787-3]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION 6</th>
<th>MODEL OBSERVERS II: SEARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9787 0R</td>
<td>Ranking inconsistencies in the assessment of digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT) reconstruction algorithms using a location-known task and a search task: a falsifiable image quality assessment method [9787-26]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 0S</td>
<td>Model observer design for detecting multiple abnormalities in anatomical background images [9787-27]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visual-search observers for SPECT simulations with clinical backgrounds [9787-28]

Three scenarios of ranking inconsistencies involving search tasks [9787-29]

Investigation on location-dependent detectability of a small mass for digital breast tomosynthesis evaluation [9787-30]

Machine-learning model observer for detection and localization tasks in clinical SPECT-MPI [9787-31]

SESSION 7 BREAST IMAGING II

Varying performance in mammographic interpretation across two countries: Do results indicate reader or population variances? [9787-32]

Luminance level of a monitor: influence on detectability and detection rate of breast cancer in 2D mammography [9787-33]

The effectiveness of the cranio-caudal mammogram projection among radiologists [9787-34]

Investigating the link between the radiological experience and the allocation of an 'equivocal finding' [9787-35]

The interplay of attention economics and computer-aided detection marks in screening mammography [9787-36]

SESSION 8 TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

Importance of the grayscale in early assessment of image quality gains with iterative CT reconstruction [9787-37]

Validation of no-reference image quality index for the assessment of digital mammographic images [9787-38]

Impact of large x-ray beam collimation on image quality [9787-39]

Predicting radiologists’ true and false positive decisions in reading mammograms by using gaze parameters and image-based features [9787-40]

Quantitative image quality evaluation for cardiac CT reconstructions [9787-41]

Effect of anatomical backgrounds on detectability in volumetric cone beam CT images [9787-42]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9787 18</td>
<td>Breast ultrasound lesions classification: a performance evaluation between manual delineation and computer segmentation [9787-43]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 19</td>
<td>Impact of patient photos on visual search during radiograph interpretation [9787-45]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 1A</td>
<td>Changes in frequency of recall recommendations of examinations depicting cancer with the availability of either priors or digital breast tomosynthesis (Cum Laude Poster Award) [9787-46]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 1B</td>
<td>The study of surgical image quality evaluation system by subjective quality factor method [9787-47]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 1C</td>
<td>Inter-observer variability within BI-RADS and RANZCR mammographic density assessment schemes [9787-48]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 1D</td>
<td>Observer study to evaluate the simulation of mammographic calcification clusters [9787-49]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 1E</td>
<td>A four-alternative forced choice (4AFC) software for observer performance evaluation in radiology [9787-50]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 1F</td>
<td>The study on the color reproduction by illumination source for disposable endoscope [9787-51]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 1G</td>
<td>Cellular automata segmentation of the boundary between the compacta of vertebral bodies and surrounding structures [9787-52]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 1H</td>
<td>New conversion factors between human and automatic readouts of the CDMAM phantom for CR systems [9787-53]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 1I</td>
<td>Variability amongst radiographers in the categorization of clinical acceptability for digital trauma radiography [9787-54]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 1J</td>
<td>A utility/cost analysis of breast cancer risk prediction algorithms [9787-55]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 1K</td>
<td>Development and application of a channelized Hotelling observer for DBT optimization on structured background test images with mass simulating targets [9787-57]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 1L</td>
<td>Evaluation of image quality of MRI data for brain tumor surgery [9787-58]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9787 1M</td>
<td>Evaluation of the possibility to use thick slabs of reconstructed outer breast tomosynthesis slice images [9787-59]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Authors

Numbers in the index correspond to the last two digits of the six-digit citation identifier (CID) article numbering system used in Proceedings of SPIE. The first four digits reflect the volume number. Base 36 numbering is employed for the last two digits and indicates the order of articles within the volume. Numbers start with 00, 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 0A, 0B...0Z, followed by 10-1Z, 20-2Z, etc.

Abbey, Craig K., 06, 1J
Alam, Furam, 0M
Altmann, Maria L., 0B
Anam, Amrita, 0F
Antic, Sanja, 0L
Applegate, Kimberly, 19
Arti, Felix, 1L
Atwater, Thomas, 0L
Autrusseau, F., 0G
Avanaki, Ali R. N., 0A
Ba, Alexandre, 14
Bakic, Predrag R., 13, 1D
Balagurunathan, Yoganand, 0H, 0L
Balhorn, William, 16
Bandos, Andriy I., 1A
Bang, Hyeon Jin, 1F
Barufaldi, Bruno, 13
Bath, Magnus, 0P
Bemelmans, Frédéric, 0Y
Bhattacharyya, Achyut, 08
Bhattacharyya, Tulshi, 0B
Bilgin, Ali, 0B
Bochud, François O., 14
Boone, John M., 07, 1J
Borges, Lucas R., 13
Bomsans, Hilde, 0Y, 1E, 1K
Brand, Jonathan F., 0B
Brankov, Jovan G., 0W
Brennan, Patrick C., 02, 0I, 0K, 0X, 0Z, 10, 15
Burnside, Elizabeth S., 06, 1J
Butler, Marie-Louise, 11
Catullo, Victor J., 1A
Chen, Weijie, 0D, 0E, 0F
Chesterman, Frédéric, 0Y
Chough, Denise M., 1A
Chung, Alex, 19
Clarkson, Eric, 0B
Cockmartin, Lesley, 1E, 1K
Cooke, Julie, 04
Crafty, Dominic J., 0C
Danones, Christine N., 1C
Dance, David R., 04
Davila, S., 0G
de Oliveira, Heider C. R., 13
Decoster, Robin, 11
Der Sarkissian, H., 0G
Desal, H., 0G
DeSimone, Ariadne, 19
Dustler, Magnus, 1M
Egger, Jan, 1G
Ekpo, Ernest U., 02
Espig, Kathryn, 0A
Fan, Jiahua, 0C, 16
Fan, Jun, 06
Faruque, Jessica, 0N
Figl, Michael, 1H
Frey, Eric C., 08
Furenlid, Lars R., 0B
Gabarda, Salvador, 13
Gallas, Brandon D., 0F
Galons, Jean-Phillippe, 0B
Gandomikar, Ziba, 15
Ganolt, Marie A., 1A
Geisler, Benjamin, 1L
Ghaly, Michael, 08
Ghate, Sujata V., 09
Gifford, Howard C., 0T
Gilat Schmidt, Taly, 0C
Gilles, Robert J., 0H, 0L
Given-Wilson, Rosalind M., 04
Grimm, Lars J., 09
Guedon, J., 0G
Guo, Z., 12
Gur, David, 1A
Hahn, K., 12
Hakim, Christiane M., 1A
Halling-Brown, Mark D., 04
Hammond, Tracy, 0M
Han, Minah, 17
Haygood, Tamara Miner, 11
He, Xin, 0R, 0U
Heard, Robert, 0I
Heckel, Frank, 1L
Hillis, Stephen L., 0X
Hoffman, J. M., 0Q
Homolka, Peter, 1H
Hu, Nan, 0E
Hudson, Kathy, 0M
Hummel, Johann, 1H
Johnson, Karen S., 09
Johnson, Åse, 0P
Kaar, Marcus, 1H
Kelly, Amy E., 1A
Kobragade, P., 0C
Conference Committee

Symposium Chairs

Steven C. Horii, The University of Pennsylvania Health System (United States)
Berkman Sahiner, U.S. Food and Drug Administration (United States)

Conference Chairs

Craig K. Abbey, University of California, Santa Barbara (United States)
Matthew A. Kupinski, College of Optical Sciences, The University of Arizona (United States)

Conference Program Committee

François O. Bochud, Center Hospitalier University Vaudois (Switzerland)
Jovan G. Brankov, Illinois Institute of Technology (United States)
Alastair G. Gale, Loughborough University (United Kingdom)
Howard C. Gifford, University of Houston (United States)
Stephen L. Hillis, The University of Iowa (United States)
Elizabeth A. Krupinski, Emory University (United States)
Maciej A. Mazurowski, Duke University (United States)
Anthony J. Maeder, The University of Western Australia (Australia)
Mark F. McEntee, The University of Sydney (Australia)
Claudia R. Mello-Thoms, The University of Sydney (Australia) and University of Pittsburgh (United States)
Robert M. Nishikawa, University of Pittsburgh (United States)
Subok Park, U.S. Food and Drug Administration (United States)
Ljiljana Platiša, University Gent (Belgium)
Frank W. Samuelson, U.S. Food and Drug Administration (United States)
Sian Taylor-Phillips, The University of Warwick (United Kingdom)
Pontus A. Timberg, Scanias University Hospital (Sweden)
David L. Wilson, Case Western Reserve University (United States)

Session Chairs

1 Technology Assessment in Breast Imaging
   Robert M. Nishikawa, University of Pittsburgh (United States)

2 Model Observers I
   Craig K. Abbey, University of California, Santa Barbara (United States)
3 Perception Metrology
   Frank W. Samuelson, U.S. Food and Drug Administration
   (United States)

4 Perception
   Claudia R. Mello-Thoms, The University of Sydney (Australia)

5 Keynote and ROC Analysis
   Craig K. Abbey, University of California, Santa Barbara (United States)
   Matthew A. Kupinski, College of Optical Sciences, The University of
   Arizona (United States)

6 Model Observers II: Search
   Howard C. Gifford, University of Houston (United States)
   Subok Park, U.S. Food and Drug Administration (United States)

7 Breast Imaging II
   Pontus A. Timberg, Scania University Hospital (Sweden)

8 Technology Assessment
   Maciej A. Mazurowski, Duke University (United States)

WORKSHOP: Validation of Medical Image-Perception Models
   Craig K. Abbey, University of California, Santa Barbara (United States)
   Matthew A. Kupinski, College of Optical Sciences, The University of
   Arizona (United States)
   Jovan G. Brankov, Illinois Institute of Technology (United States)
2016 Medical Imaging Award Recipients

Robert F. Wagner Best Student Paper Award

Robert F. Wagner was an active scientist in the SPIE Medical Imaging meeting, starting with the first meeting in 1972 and continuing throughout his career. He ensured that the BRH, and subsequently the CDRH, was a sponsor for the early and subsequent Medical Imaging meetings, helping to launch and ensure the historical success of the meeting. The Robert F. Wagner All-Conference Best Student Paper Award (established 2014) is acknowledgment of his many important contributions to the Medical Imaging meeting and his many important advances to the field of medical imaging.

This award is cosponsored by:

The Medical Image Perception Society

2016 Recipients:

First Place: MIND Demons for MR-to-CT deformable image registration in image-guided spine surgery (9786-16)
S. Reaungamornrat, T. De Silva, A. Uneri, Johns Hopkins Univ. (United States), J.-P. Wolinsky, Johns Hopkins Hospital (United States), A. J. Khanna, Johns Hopkins Health Care & Surgery Ctr. (United States), G. Kleinszig, S. Vogt, Siemens Healthcare (Germany), J. L. Prince, J. H. Siewerdsen, Johns Hopkins Univ. (United States)

Second Place: Design, fabrication, and implementation of voxel-based 3D printed textured phantoms for task-based image quality assessment in CT (9783-76)
Justin Solomon, Duke Univ. School of Medicine (United States), Alexandre Ba, Institut Univ. de Radiophysique Appliquée (Switzerland), Andrew Diao, Duke Univ. (United States), Joseph Lo, Elianna Bier, Duke Univ. School of Medicine (United States), François Bochud, Institut Univ. de Radiophysique Appliquée (Switzerland), Michael Gehm, Duke Univ. (United States), Ehsan Samei, Duke Univ. School of Medicine (United States)

Conference 9787 Awards

Cum Laude Poster Award

First Place: Changes in frequency of recall recommendations of examinations depicting cancer with the availability of either priors or digital breast tomosynthesis (9787-46)
C. M. Hakim, M. A. Ganott, V. J. Catullo, D. M. Chough, A. E. Kelly, D. D. Shinde, J. H. Sumkin, L. P. Wallace, Magee-Womens Hospital (United States); A. I. Bandos, R. M. Nishikawa, Univ. of Pittsburgh (United States); D. Gur, Univ. of Pittsburgh School of Medicine (United States)