

September 30, 2015

George Segall, MD  
Executive Director  
American Board of Nuclear Medicine (ABNM)

Valerie P. Jackson, MD  
Executive Director  
American Board of Radiology (ABR)

Dear George and Valerie,

On behalf of SNMMI, I would like to thank the ABR-ABNM for allowing SNMMI to weigh in on the proposal that was sent to us on April 3, 2015. As you know the SNMMI BoD discussed this proposal during our Annual Meeting in June 2015 in Baltimore, MD, and an initial response letter was sent to the Task Force on June 3, 2015, signed by then SNMMI President, Dr. Peter Herscovitch. We quickly established a web portal survey for both the SNMMI and the SNMMI-TS, and the proposal was presented along with our response letter to the SNMMI House of Delegates during the Annual Meeting. Moreover, the entire SNMMI leadership met with ABNM representatives (George Segall, Janis O'Malley, Louise Thomson) and the ABR representative (Milton Guiberteau) during the ACR-ISC meeting in Tabernash, CO, on July 24, 2015, after receiving a letter from Louise Thomson and the FAQ sheet dated July 17, 2015. Since then, our HOD has had two additional conference calls on this topic on August 17 and September 9, 2015. The SNMMI BoD also had conference calls on August 24 and September 18, 2015, with the latter as a joint call with the ABNM BoD. The minutes of these calls as well as the results of the SNMMI and SNMMI-TS surveys were submitted to the Task Force when they became available.

Most recently, the SNMMI BoD and SNMMI-TS BoD met on September 26-27, 2015, in Leesburg, VA, and discussed all the information (including the preliminary ABNM-ABMS survey results), to provide this final response letter as requested, to be submitted prior to the ABR Board meeting scheduled for October 24-27, 2015. There was a thoughtful discussion on this topic and many worthwhile comments were recorded. **The SNMMI BoD voted unanimously that SNMMI could not support the principles of the proposal as they were presented.** A summary of both the SNMMI and SNMMI-TS surveys are provided along with this letter for your records.

In summary, the majority of our membership, whether from the United States or from the international community, were against the proposal. The main concerns were dissolution of the ABNM (and hence loss of primary specialty status) and the notion of a single training pathway (despite subsequent mention of the possibility of multiple entry pathways that remain otherwise undefined), which prohibited non-imaging specialists from entering nuclear medicine training. Also the fact that diagnostic radiology trainees with 4-month training would still be able to practice the full scope of nuclear medicine was considered objectionable, since in essence this would have established two parallel but very different pathways for nuclear medicine clinical practice.

The SNMMI BoD, however, acknowledged wholeheartedly the importance of the underlying reasons for the

proposal related to the current challenges facing nuclear medicine training and the need for this training to assure value-based quality nuclear medicine practice. To that end, the SNMMI is immediately forming a Task Force to assess the landscape and work with all relevant stakeholders (including but not limited to ABR, ABNM, ACNM, SCARD, RRCs, ACR, RSNA) to advise the SNMMI on how to address this important challenge. We will soon reach out to these entities and hope to establish a firm and rigorous dialogue to move forward, leveraging the valuable input from all these stakeholders. The goal, as I mentioned before, is to form a partnership to come up with one or more pathways that optimize high quality value-driven practice of nuclear medicine and molecular imaging.

Sincerely,



Hossein Jadvar, MD, PhD, MBA, MPH, FACNM  
SNMMI President

Cc: SNMMI Board of Directors  
Virginia Pappas, CAE – SNMMI Chief Executive Officer  
Louise Thomson, MB.,ChB. – ABNM Chair  
Milton J. Guiberteau, MD – ABR President