Appendix A: BIAS Reporting Guideline

Section/ Topic	Parameter name	ltem No	Checklist Item	Reported on page No
TITLE, ABSTRACT, KEYWORDS	Title	1	 Use the title to convey the essential information on the challenge mission. The title should identify the paper as biomedical image analysis challenge. indicate the image modality(ies) applied with a commonly used term in the title. indicate the task and/or task category (e.g. classification, segmentation; see parameter 18) with a commonly used term in the title. (optionally) include information on the biomedical target application. (optionally) include the year for repeated challenges 	page No
			with fixed cycle.	
	Abstract	2	Provide a summary of the challenge purpose, design and results and report the main conclusion(s).	
	Keywords	3	List the primary keywords that characterize the challenge.	
INTRO- DUCTION	Challenge motivation and objective	4 a	Provide a general introduction to the topic from a biomedical point of view. This should include the envisioned biomedical impact (short-term and/or long-term).	
		4b	Provide a general introduction to the topic from a technical	
			point of view . This should include an overview of the state of the art along the envisioned technical/methodological impact.	
		4c	Based on the biomedical and technical motivation, provide a	
			concise statement of the primary challenge objective . This should include a statement of the task .	
METHODS	Challenge name	5a	Provide a representative name of the challenge.	
Challenge organi-	Chancinge name	Ju		
		5b	Example: MICCAI Endoscopic Vision Challenge 2015	
Zanon		30	Provide the acronym of the challenge (if any). Example: EndoVis15	
	Organizina to a			
	Organizing team	6	Provide information on the organizing team (names and affiliations).	

Life cycle type	7	Define the intended submission cycle of the challenge. Include		
		information on whether/how the challenge has been/will be		
		continued after the present study.		
		Examples:		
		 One-time event with fixed submission deadline 		
		Open call		
		 Repeated event with annual fixed submission deadline 		
Challenge	8a	Report the event (e.g. conference) that was associated with the		
venue and platform		challenge (if any).		
	8b	Report the platform (e.g. grand-challenge.org) used to run the		
		challenge.		
	8c	Provide the URL for the challenge website (if any).		
Participation policies	9a	Define the allowed user interaction of the algorithms assessed		
policies		(e.g. only (semi-) automatic methods allowed).		
	9b	Define the policy on the usage of training data . The data used		
		to train algorithms may, for example, have been restricted to the		
		data provided by the challenge or to publicly available data		
		including (open) pre-trained nets.		
	9c	Define the participation policy for members of the organizers'		
		institutes. For example, members of the organizers' institutes		
		could participate in the challenge but were not eligible for		
		awards.		
	9d	Define the award policy . In particular, provide details with		
		respect to challenge prizes.		
	9e	Define the policy for results announcement .		
		Examples:		
		 Top three performing methods were announced 		
		publicly.		
		 Participating teams could choose whether the 		
		performance results will be made public.		
	9f	Define the publication policy . In particular, provide details		
		on		
		 who of the participating teams/the participating 		
		teams' members qualified as author		
		 whether the participating teams could publish their 		
		own results separately, and (if so)		

		• whether an embargo time was defined (so that	
		challenge organizers can publish a challenge paper first).	
Submission method	10a	Describe the method used for result submission. If available,	
cou		provide a link to the submission instructions .	
		Examples:	
		 Docker container on the Synapse platform. Link to 	
		submission instructions: <url></url>	
		 Algorithm output was sent to organizers via e-mail. 	
		Submission instructions were sent by e-mail.	
	10b	Provide information on the possibility for participating teams to	
		evaluate their algorithms before submitting final results. For	
		example, many challenges allow submission of multiple results,	
		and only the last run is officially counted to compute challenge	
		results.	
Challenge schedule	11	Provide a timetable for the challenge. Preferably, this should	
scriedole		include	
		 the release date(s) of the training cases (if any) 	
		 the registration date/period 	
		 the release date(s) of the test cases and validation cases 	
		(if any)	
		the submission date(s)	
		 associated workshop days (if any) 	
		 the release date(s) of the results 	
Ethics approval	12	Indicate whether ethics approval was necessary for the data. If	
		yes, provide details on the ethics approval, preferably	
		institutional review board, location, date and number of the	
		ethics approval (if applicable). Add the URL or a reference to the	
		document of the ethics approval (if available).	
Data usage	13	Clarify how the data can be used and distributed by the teams	
agreement		that participate in the challenge and by others. This should	
		include the explicit listing of the license applied.	
		Examples:	
		 CC BY (Attribution) 	
		 CC BY-SA (Attribution-ShareAlike) 	
		 CC BY-ND (Attribution-NoDerivs) 	
		 CC BY-NC (Attribution-NonCommercial) 	

			CC BY-NC-SA (Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike)
			 CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs)
	Code availability	14a	Provide information on the accessibility of the organizers'
	availability		evaluation software (e.g. code to produce rankings). Preferably,
			provide a link to the code and add information on the
			supported platforms.
		14b	In an analogous manner, provide information on the
			accessibility of the participating teams' code.
	Conflicts of interest	15	Provide information related to conflicts of interest. In particular
	interest		provide information related to sponsoring/funding of the
			challenge. Also, state explicitly who had access to the test case
			labels and when.
	Author	16	List the contributions of all authors to the paper (preferably in the
	contributions		appendix).
METHODS Mission of	Field(s) of application	17	State the main field(s) of application that the participating
the	application		algorithms target.
challenge			Examples:
			 Diagnosis
			• Education
			 Intervention assistance
			Intervention follow-up
			Intervention planning
			 Prognosis
			Research
			• Screening
			Training
			Cross-phase
	Task category(ies)	18	State the task category(ies).
	calegory(les)		Examples:
			 Classification
			Detection
			 Localization
			Modeling
			Prediction
			Reconstruction
			Registration
			Retrieval
	_		

		Segmentation					
		Tracking					
Cohorts	We distinguish between the target cohort and the challenge cohort. For example, a challenge could be designed around the task of medical instrument tracking in robotic kidney surgery. While the challenge could be based on ex vivo data obtained from a laparoscopic training environment with porcine organs (challenge cohort), the final biomedical application (i.e. robotic kidney surgery) would be targeted on real patients with certain characteristics defined by inclusion criteria such as restrictions regarding gender or age (target cohort). 19a Describe the target cohort, i.e. the subjects/objects from whom/which the data would be acquired in the final						
	101	biomedical application.					
	19b	Describe the challenge cohort , i.e. the subject(s)/object(s) from					
		whom/which the challenge data was acquired.					
lmaging modality(ies)	20	Specify the imaging technique(s) applied in the challenge.					
Context		de additional information given along with the images . The information may					
information		spond					
	21a	directly to the image data (e.g. tumor volume). If necessary,					
		differentiate between target and challenge cohort.					
	21b	to the patient in general (e.g. gender, medical history). If					
		necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.					
	21c	to the acquisition process (e.g. medical device data during					
		endoscopic surgery, calibration data for an image modality). If					
		necessary, differentiate between target and challenge cohort.					
Target entity(ies)	22a	Describe the data origin , i.e. the region(s)/part(s) of					
		subject(s)/object(s) from whom/which the image data would					
		be acquired in the final biomedical application (e.g. brain					
		shown in computed tomography (CT) data, abdomen shown in					
		laparoscopic video data, operating room shown in video data,					
		thorax shown in fluoroscopy video). If necessary, differentiate					
		between target and challenge cohort.					
	22b	Describe the algorithm target , i.e. the					
		structure(s)/subject(s)/object(s)/component(s) that the					
		participating algorithms have been designed to focus on (e.g.					
		tumor in the brain, tip of a medical instrument, nurse in an					
		operating theater, catheter in a fluoroscopy scan). If necessary,					
		differentiate between target and challenge cohort.					
Assessment	23	Identify the property(ies) of the algorithms to be optimized to					
aim(s)	23						
		perform well in the challenge. If multiple properties were					

assessed, prioritize them (if appropriate). The properties should then be reflected in the metrics applied (parameter 29), and the priorities should be reflected in the ranking when combining multiple metrics that assess different properties.

- Example 1: Find liver segmentation algorithm for CT images that processes CT images of a certain size in less than a minute on a certain hardware with an error that reflects inter-rater variability of experts.
- Example 2: Find lung tumor detection algorithm with high sensitivity and specificity for mammography images.

Corresponding metrics are listed below (parameter 29).

METHODS Challenge data sets

Data source(s)

Specify the **device(s)** used to acquire the challenge data. This includes details on the device(s) used to acquire the imaging data (e.g. manufacturer) as well as information on additional devices used for performance assessment (e.g. tracking system

used in a surgical setting).

Describe relevant details on the imaging process/data acquisition for each acquisition device (e.g. image acquisition protocol(s)).

Specify the **center(s)/institute(s)** in which the data was acquired and/or the **data providing platform/source** (e.g. previous challenge). If this information is not provided (e.g. for anonymization reasons), specify why.

Describe relevant **characteristics** (e.g. level of expertise) **of the subjects** (e.g. surgeon)/objects (e.g. robot) involved in the data acquisition process (if any).

Training and test case characteristics

25a

State what is meant by one **case** in this challenge. A case encompasses all data that is processed to produce one result that is then compared to the corresponding reference result (i.e. the desired algorithm output).

Examples:

 Training and test cases both represented a CT image of a human brain. Training cases had a weak annotation (tumor present or not and tumor volume (if any)) while the test cases were annotated with the tumor contour (if any).

		A case refers to all information that is available for one
		particular patient in a specific study. This information
		always includes the image information as specified in
		data source(s) (parameter 24) and may include context
		information (parameter 21). Both training and test cases
		were annotated with survival (binary) 5 years after (first)
		image was taken.
	25b	State the total number of cases as well as the number of training,
		validation and test cases separately.
	25c	Explain why a total number of cases and the specific proportion
		of training, validation and test cases was chosen.
	25d	Mention further important characteristics of the training,
		validation and test cases (e.g. class distribution in classification
		tasks chosen according to real-world distribution vs. equal class
		distribution) and justify the choice.
Annotation	26a	Describe the method for determining the reference annotation,
characteristics		i.e. the desired algorithm output. Provide the information
		separately for the training, validation and test cases if necessary.
		Possible methods include manual image annotation, in silico
		ground truth generation and annotation by automatic methods.
		If human annotation was involved, state the number of
		annotators.
	26b	Provide the instructions given to the annotators (if any) prior to
		the annotation. This may include description of a training phase
		with the software. Provide the information separately for the
		training, validation and test cases if necessary. Preferably,
		provide a link to the annotation protocol .
	26c	Provide details on the subject(s)/algorithm(s) that annotated the
		cases (e.g. information on level of expertise such as number of
		years of professional experience, medically-trained or not).
		Provide the information separately for the training, validation
		and test cases if necessary.
	26d	Describe the method(s) used to merge multiple annotations for
		one case (if any). Provide the information separately for the
		training, validation and test cases if necessary.
Data pre-	27	Describe the method(s) used for pre-processing the raw training
processing method(s)		data before it is provided to the participating teams. Provide the

	30011113310113	32a	the number of registrations .
RESULTS	Challenge submissions		de summarizing information on
DEGILI-		31b	Justify why the described statistical method(s) was/were used.
		211	data analysis.
			indication of any software product that was used for
			statistical approach, or
			data met the assumptions, required for the particular
			description of any method used to assess whether the
			 details about the assessment of variability of rankings,
			description of the missing data handling,
	dialyses		challenge analysis. This may include
	Statistical analyses	31a	Provide details for all statistical methods used in the scope of the
		30c	Justify why the described ranking scheme(s) was/were used.
			missing results on test cases.
		30b	Describe the method(s) used to manage submissions with
			final score/ranking.
			obtained per case and metric are aggregated to arrive at a
			on the test cases. Typically the text will describe how results
	method(s)		all submitted algorithms based on the generated metric results
	Ranking	30a	Describe the method used to compute a performance rank for
			reference to the biomedical application.
		29b	Justify why the metric(s) was/were chosen, preferably with
			Example 2: Area under curve (AUC)
			Example 1: Dice Similarity Coefficient (DSC) and run-time
			used to compute the ranking(s) (if any).
ment methods			in assessment aim(s) (parameter 21). State which metric(s) were
Assess-	- \ - \		metrics should reflect the desired algorithm properties described
METHODS	Metric(s)	29a	Define the metric(s) to assess a property of an algorithm. These
		200	sources of error.
		28b	validation and test cases, if necessary. In an analogous manner, describe and quantify other relevant
			example. Provide the information separately for the training,
			these errors, using inter-and intra-annotator variability, for
			image annotation. If possible, estimate the magnitude (range) of
	Sources of error	28a	Describe the most relevant possible error sources related to the
			if necessary.
			information separately for the training, validation and test cases

Challenge outcome		32b	the number of participating teams that provided valid submissions (if applicable in each phase).
		32c	the number of participating teams that the paper refers to
			(with justification).
	Information on selected	Provid pape	de the following information for the participating teams that are included in the er:
	participating teams	33a	Team identifier.
		33b	A method description including parameter instantiation and/or
			a reference/URL to a document containing this information.
	Metric values	34	Provide raw and/or aggregated metric values (including
			measure of variability) for all participating teams and each
			metric (if applicable) as well as the numbers of test set
			submissions (the last one was used to compute metric(s)) for
			each participating team.
	Ranking(s)	35a	Report the ranking(s) (if any) including the number of test set
			submissions for each participating team.
		35b	Provide the results of the statistical analyses .
	Further Analyses	36	Present results of further analyses (if applicable), e.g. related to
			 combining algorithms via ensembling,
			inter-algorithm variability,
			 common problems/biases of the submitted methods, or
			ranking variability.
DISCUS-	Summary	37	Summarize the main results of the challenge.
SION	Impact	38a	Describe the (expected) biomedical impact of the challenge in
			the context of the state of the art with reference to the
			challenge motivation (parameter 4a).
		38b	Describe the (expected) technical impact of the challenge in
			the context of the state of the art with reference to the
			challenge motivation (parameter 4b).
	Discussion of challenge results	39a	Provide a detailed discussion and conclusion whether the task is
	challenge results		now solved in a satisfactory way (e.g. the remaining errors are
			comparable to inter-annotator variability).
		39b	Provide a detailed analysis of individual cases , in which the
			majority of algorithms performed poorly (if any).
		39c	Provide a discussion on advantages and disadvantages of the
			submitted methods. Include time and memory consumption
			comparison if time and memory were not among the metrics.

Limitations of the challenge	40	Discuss limitations related to the challenge design and
		execution.
Future work	41	Provide recommendations for future work and maintenance
		plans for the challenge and its website (if any).
Conclusions	42	Provide a concise conclusion based on the results of the study.