Quantitative CT Inter-Analyst Agreement in the COPDGene Study

<u>McKenzie A¹</u>, Al Qaisi M¹, Williams A¹, Zach J¹, Richert D¹, Wilson C¹, Stinson D¹, Lynch DA¹, Tschirren J², Hoffman E³ and the COPDGene Investigators ¹National Jewish Health, Denver; ²VIDA Diagnostics, Inc., Iowa City; ³University of Iowa, Iowa City (National Jewish Health, 1400 Jackson St, Denver, CO 80206, <u>McKenzieA@NJHealth.org</u>)

Introduction

This study evaluated inter-analyst agreement of quantitative computerized tomography (QCT) measures, obtained from the same CT images by two analysts.

Methods

48 CT scans, 20 from smoking control subjects (FEV₁/FVC \geq 70%) and 28 from COPD subjects (FEV₁/FVC <70%), were analyzed independently by two trained research analysts using Pulmonary Workstation 2 software from VIDA Diagnostics, Inc. Differences between analysts' measures were normalized using standard deviation and evaluated using Bland-Altman methodology to determine limits of agreement more than two standard deviations from the mean. Linear regression was used to determine R² values for each QCT variable.

Results

Inspiratory and expiratory volume measures between analysts had an average R² value of 0.9829, with limits of agreement of 40.82 ± 221.47 ml and 24.06 ± 37.51 ml respectively. Density measures of the lungs and lobes had an average R² value of 0.9985. Limits of agreement for % inspiratory lung attenuation \leq -950 HU and % expiratory lung attenuation \leq -856 HU were 0.01 ± 0.03% and 0.08 ± 0.11% respectively. Only 4.45% of all data evaluated were greater than 2 σ from the absolute mean difference. Variation in measurements of segmental airway wall thickness, lumen diameter and inner area, was greater, with an average R² value of 0.7430. Limits of agreement for airway wall thickness of RB1 and RB10 were 0.01 ± 0.06 mm and 0.12 ± 0.24 mm, respectively. Limits of agreement for airway wall area of RB1 and RB10 were 0.66 ± 3.02 mm² and 2.74 ± 5.42 mm², respectively.

Conclusion

Two individual analysts, trained to the same standards and using the same analysis software, showed a high degree of reproducibility in QCT measures of emphysema and gas trapping, and a lesser degree of reproducibility for airway data.