

## ACR ACCREDITATION REQUIRED ULTRASOUND QC TESTS

Zaiyang Long, Ph.D. Department of Radiology, Mayo Clinic, MN

AAPM Annual Meeting July 13, 2022

#### MOTIVATION

Failures are being identified with fast/simple annual QC tests

- 10% for scanner components, 14% for transducers [1]
- Higher rates reported in the literature [2,3]
- Accreditation requirements
  - <u>ACR</u>, AIUM, etc.



1. Hangiandreou et al. 2011; 2. Martensson et al. 2010; 3. Dudley and Wooley 2016.

## **BEFORE GETTING STARTED WITH TESTING**

- ACR recommends acceptance testing, and requires documented annual survey
  - Performed by or under the supervision of a qualified medical physicist
- No specific manual or required pass/fail criteria Literature references such as Goodsitt et al. 1998
- Inventory establishment and verification

- Phantoms and testing methods
  - Material, acoustic properties, and care



#### **CIRS ATS 539**

## **ACR ACCREDITATION REQUIRED TESTS**

- Annual survey
  - Physical and mechanical inspection
  - Image uniformity and artifact survey
  - System sensitivity
  - Ultrasound scanner electronic image display performance
  - Geometric accuracy (optional) \*still required by AIUM accreditation
  - Contrast resolution (optional)
  - Spatial resolution (optional)
  - Primary interpretation display performance (optional)
  - Evaluation of QC program (if applicable)

## PHYSICAL AND MECHANICAL INSPECTION

 Scanner and monitor: console cracks, missing/damaged buttons/transducer holders, dysfunctional lights/switches/locks, dirty air filter, damaged power cords, contamination, etc.
~2-4 min

 Transducer: delamination, holes, air bubbles, separation, cable damage, exposed wiring, connector damage/bent pins, excessive dust, etc.

~1-2 min per transducer



### PHYSICAL AND MECHANICAL INSPECTION



















## **UNIFORMITY AND ARTIFACT SURVEY**

- Multi-purpose or uniformity phantom
  - Shallower imaging depth, lower dynamic range, turn off spatial compounding, max frame averaging
- Common findings during QC, can negatively impact grayscale and Doppler quality, as well as accuracy of velocity measurement [1-2]
- Factors to consider when artifact(s) identified
  - Location, number, and severity (could use computerized tool)
  - Check impact of cable and port
  - Clinical practice reality
- New vendor automatic probe check

1. Weigang et al. 2003; 2. Vachutka et al. 2013; 3. King et al. 2010.



<sup>©2022</sup> Mavo Foundation for Medical Education and Research | slide-7



### **UNIFORMITY AND ARTIFACT SURVEY**

	Capture % Failures found in QC	Scanner Physical and Mechanical	Uniformity and Artifact	
	2011 [1]	25%	66%	
	Current	60%	35%	



1. Hangiandreou et al. 2011; 2. Lorentsson et al. 2018; 3. Ferrero et al. 2019 AAPM Annual Meeting; 4. Long et al. 2021 AIUM Annual Meeting.

## SYSTEM SENSITIVITY (DEPTH OF PENETRATION, DOP)

#### Subjective assessment

- Consistent imaging mode and transmit frequency, 100% power output, higher dynamic range, one focal zone (if relevant) deeper than expected DOP, turn off speckle reduction/smoothing
- Visually define the deepest depth with consistent presentation of speckles during live scan and measure this depth 7NW

Compare with acceptable range of previous				
	Phantom	Zone	Attenuation (dB/ MHz/cm)	
	٨	Low	0.59	
	A	High	0.94	
	D	Low	0.68	
	D	High	0.90	

revious data Compare with accortable range or

 Objective method using a pair of uniform-gel image and in-air image (IEC 61391-2) (optional)



### **SCANNER DISPLAY PERFORMANCE**

- Clean display
- Use test patterns to visually check luminance, contrast, spatial resolution, pixel defect and other non-uniformities, etc.



#### TG18-LN







Limited patterns on some scanners. May be able to import patterns as DICOM images as a patient

## **SCANNER DISPLAY PERFORMANCE**

- Some scanners have "GSDF enabled" feature, or settings for different ambient light conditions
- Measure luminance response (optional)
  - Maximum and minimum luminance
  - If necessary and available, adjust monitor output and re-measure





#### Ongoing AAPM TG316 effort

#### **SUMMARY FORM**

Ultrasound/Breast Ultrasound Equipment Annual Survey Summary

Facility Name:	ility Name:	
UAP/BUAP #:	Unit #:	Report Date:
Serial Number:		Survey Date:
System Manufacturer:		Model:
Medical Physicist or designee (Print name):		
Medical Physicist or designee (Signature):		

#### Equipment Evaluation Tests

Required	Pass/Fail *	Comments
1. Physical and Mechanical Inspection		
2. Image Uniformity and Artifact Survey		
3. System Sensitivity		
4. Scanner Electronic Image Display Performance		
Were all clinically used transducers tested?	YES [	NO

#### Optional

1. Primary Interpretation Display Performance	
2. Contrast Resolution	
3. Spatial Resolution	
4. Geometric Accuracy	

Overall comments:



Medical Physics A	nnual Equipment Performance Summar	y
		(v2.3
Services for:		
Modality: U	Iltrasound TMS Asset #:	
Manufacturer:	Model:	
Equipment ID:	Serial Number:	
UAP ID #:		
WARS Location:	Room ID:	
Survey Date:	Report Date:	
Service Provider:	Service Provider Number:	
Service Provider:	Service Provider Number:	
Test Description	P = Pass F=Fail NA	=Not Applicable
1. US System Inventory		
Transducer Inventory Verificat	ion	
2. US Scanner Evaluation		
Basic connectivity		
Physical & Mechanical Inspect	ion Safety Evaluation	
Image Uniformity and Artifact	Survey, for each port	
3. Electronic Image Display Perforn	nance	
Ultrasound Scanner		
Displays for primary interpreta	tion of ultrasound exams	
UCT	T All A day I T and I and	

Ultrasound Scanner Displays for primary interpretation of ultrasound exams 4. US Transducer Evaluation (Summary For All Assigned Transducers) Physical & Mechanical Inspection -- Safety Evaluation Image Uniformity and Artifact Survey System Sensitivity (Depth of Penetration) 5. Evaluation of QC Program Review of routine US QC program

Comments and Recommendations (Additional information may be found on the Notes Page)

#### Mayo Clinic Rochester/Midwest

#### AAPM ultrasound subcommittee upcoming effort on multiinstitution QC review

Revised 10/27/2020

Signature

### PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT OR TROUBLE SHOOTING

 SNR based on spherical lesion phantom, resolution integral with Edinburgh pipe phantom, low contrast detectability, etc. [1-5]



Resolution integral (R) Characteristic depth of visibility ( $L_R$ ) Characteristic spatial resolution ( $D_R$ ) Gomez-Cardona et al. RSNA 2020

- 1. Madsen et al. 2014; 2. Kofler et al. 2005; 3. Pye and Ellis, UK Patent GB2396213, 2002;
- 4. Moran et al. 2008; 5, Lorentsson et al. 2016;

Higher Volume Fraction (20%), Random Sphere Phantoms Prototype Random Hypoechoic Sphere phantom, (courtesy of Cristel Baiu, Sun Nuclear)

- Spheres are ~2mm in diameter, -40 dB relative to background



Prototype, 2 mm hypoechoic sphere phantom, built to IEC 62791 Ed 2 (draft) specifications



Task: evaluate imaging presets of scanners when a breast preset is used with a multi-D transducer.

Expect better imaging at the transmit focal depths  $\neq$  visual assessment Sonographers were advised NOT to vary the transmit focus from that in the original preset on this scanner.

#### Slide Courtesy of Dr. James Zagzebski

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

 Donald Tradup, Scott Stekel, Drs. Nicholas Hangiandreou, James Zagzebski, and Zheng Feng Lu

# Thank you for your attention!