

REFERENCES

1. SPENCER RP, KARIMEDDINI MK: Decreased salivary gland accumulation of pertechnetate in neonatal hypothyroidism. *J Nucl Med* 22:96, 1981 (Letter to the Editor)
2. STANBURY JB, CHAPMAN EM: Congenital hypothyroidism with goitre. Absence of an iodide-concentrating mechanism. *Lancet* 1:1162-1165, 1960
3. WOLFF J, THOMPSON RH, ROBBINS J: Congenital goitrous cretinism due to absence of iodide-concentrating ability. *J Clin Endocrinol* 24:699-707, 1964
4. WOLFF J: Iodide goiter and the pharmacologic effects of excess iodide. *Am J Med* 47:101-124, 1969

Reply

Our communication was based on observations of pertechnetate accumulation. We will try to answer their points in order.

- 1: Each of the infants did have gastric imaging; all showed gastric concentration after pertechnetate administration.
- 2: Multiple views were taken in all cases but two. In none of the images with pinhole collimator could the salivary glands be clearly defined within a reasonable imaging time.
- 3: Digitization of data can often be advantageous; however, there was failure to visualize the salivary glands whether the thyroid gland was prominent or absent.
- 4: If Drs. Savoie and Leger have data on the differential handling of pertechnetate and iodide by the salivary glands in neonates, publication of the information would be welcome.
- 5: None of the children studied were the product of markedly premature birth.

We look forward to the publication of data by Drs. Savoie and Leger on congenital lack of iodide transport.

R. P. SPENCER
M. K. KARIMEDDINI
University of Connecticut Health Center
Farmington, Connecticut

Re: Standards for Performance Measurements in Scintillation Cameras (1)

NEMA is to be congratulated for their effort in standardizing factory performance parameters. This will provide better appreciation of specifications. Insofar as these measurements will reflect a part of factory quality control, their value is very clear.

Unfortunately, performance of these tests at the user's site is constrained by several factors. Multichannel analyzers and computers are not too common in nuclear medical facilities. It is even rarer to find a camera with easily accessible connections for the multichannel analyzer.

Acceptance testing is a different matter. Spatial, temporal, and perception perspectives are all involved. Factory and user's site are separated in space and time, and one must question whether the ravages of time and travel have affected performance.

The perceptive perspective is nonquantitative. This is the user's expectations: to wit, does the unit produce images that can be clinically interpreted.

While the existence of standards is admirable and desirable, it is obvious that manufacturer's quality control extends far beyond these important but few parameters. Similarly, acceptance testing is much more than verifying manufacturer's specifications. All

pertinent functions of camera and accessories must be tested.

On quality control, I am certain that all of the authors of the various schemata would agree that their protocols are guidelines and not a total system. It is essential that the testing program be actively pursued and the need for procedure variance be understood in post-facto evaluation of unexpected findings in clinical studies.

JOHN U. HIDALGO
Metairie, Louisiana

REFERENCE

1. MUEHLEHNER G, WAKE RH, SANO R: Standards for performance measurements in scintillation cameras. *J Nucl Med* 22:72-77, 1981

Reply

For many years most reporting of scintillation camera parameters has been through pictures, and Dr. Hidalgo is correct in stating that ultimately the user wants clinically acceptable images. Quality control should provide quantitative measures of whatever the user expects to see nonquantitatively in the images. There is a particularly difficult problem in specifying flood-field uniformity, as we pointed out in our publication (1). However, because a task is difficult or may require certain equipment should not be a reason to give up and go back to acceptable pictures.

NEMA used the approach that the *standard* should be as accurate as possible, hence the requirement for a multichannel analyzer in performing the measurement. *Verification* of performance in the form of acceptance testing may well involve less accurate measurements as long as the sources of error are understood. For example, in a camera with a diameter of 400 mm and a spatial resolution of 4 mm FWHM, 1000 samples are necessary before sampling errors can be ignored in measuring spatial resolution. However, resolution may be measured in a 256 × 256 matrix, and the resulting value can be adjusted to compensate for the sampling error inherent in only 256 samples.

Nuclear medicine departments that do not have a digital imaging system and also do not have access to a multichannel analyzer can engage the services of a consulting physicist. Lewellen et al. (2) described a portable acquisition system that is capable of performing the measurements suggested in the NEMA standards even though the use of a one-parameter multichannel analyzer lengthens the time necessary to perform the measurements.

It should be stressed that such quantitative, time-consuming measurements are not necessary for routine quality control. For comparative specifications and for acceptance testing, however, the use of standardized and quantitative performance measurements is highly recommended.

GERD MUEHLEHNER
Hospital of the University of Penn
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

REFERENCES

1. MUEHLEHNER G, WAKE RH, SANO R: Standards for performance measurements in scintillation cameras. *J Nucl Med* 22:72-77, 1981
2. LEWELLEN TK, WILLIAMS DL, MURANO R, et al: A field procedure for the quantitative assessment of nuclear imaging cameras. *J Nucl Med* 19:954-958, 1978