



HL7 CIMI Logical Model:
Analysis Normal Form (ANF), Release 1

September 2019

HL7 Informative Ballot

Sponsored by:

**Clinical Information Modeling Initiative Work Group,
Clinical Decision Support Work Group**

Copyright © 2019 HSPC & HL7. Licensed under the Apache License 2.0. HL7 and Health Level Seven are registered trademarks of Health Level Seven International. Reg. U.S. Pat & TM Off.

This material can only be used in compliance with the License.

IMPORTANT NOTES:

HL7 licenses its standards and select IP free of charge. **If you did not acquire a free license from HL7 for this document**, you are not authorized to access or make any use of it. To obtain a free license, please visit <http://www.HL7.org/implement/standards/index.cfm>.

If you are the individual that obtained the license for this HL7 Standard, specification or other freely licensed work (in each and every instance "Specified Material"), the following describes the permitted uses of the Material.

A. HL7 INDIVIDUAL, STUDENT AND HEALTH PROFESSIONAL MEMBERS, who register and agree to the terms of HL7's license, are authorized, without additional charge, to read, and to use Specified Material to develop and sell products and services that implement, but do not directly incorporate, the Specified Material in whole or in part without paying license fees to HL7.

INDIVIDUAL, STUDENT AND HEALTH PROFESSIONAL MEMBERS wishing to incorporate additional items of Special Material in whole or part, into products and services, or to enjoy additional authorizations granted to HL7 ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERS as noted below, must become ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERS of HL7.

B. HL7 ORGANIZATION MEMBERS, who register and agree to the terms of HL7's License, are authorized, without additional charge, on a perpetual (except as provided for in the full license terms governing the Material), non-exclusive and worldwide basis, the right to (a) download, copy (for internal purposes only) and share this Material with your employees and consultants for study purposes, and (b) utilize the Material for the purpose of developing, making, having made, using, marketing, importing, offering to sell or license, and selling or licensing, and to otherwise distribute, Compliant Products, in all cases subject to the conditions set forth in this Agreement and any relevant patent and other intellectual property rights of third parties (which may include members of HL7). No other license, sublicense, or other rights of any kind are granted under this Agreement.

C. NON-MEMBERS, who register and agree to the terms of HL7's IP policy for Specified Material, are authorized, without additional charge, to read and use the Specified Material for evaluating whether to implement, or in implementing, the Specified Material, and to use Specified Material to develop and sell products and services that implement, but do not directly incorporate, the Specified Material in whole or in part.

NON-MEMBERS wishing to incorporate additional items of Specified Material in whole or part, into products and services, or to enjoy the additional authorizations granted to HL7 ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERS, as noted above, must become ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERS of HL7.

Please see <http://www.HL7.org/legal/ippolicy.cfm> for the full license terms governing the Material.

Ownership. Licensee agrees and acknowledges that **HL7 owns** all right, title, and interest, in and to the Materials. Licensee shall **take no action contrary to, or inconsistent with**, the foregoing.

Licensee agrees and acknowledges that HL7 may not own all right, title, and interest, in and to the Materials and that the Materials may contain and/or reference intellectual property owned by third parties ("Third Party IP"). Acceptance of these License Terms does not grant Licensee any rights with respect to Third Party IP. Licensee alone is responsible for identifying and obtaining any necessary licenses or authorizations to utilize Third Party IP in connection with the Materials or otherwise. Any actions, claims or suits brought by a third party resulting from a breach of any Third Party IP right by the Licensee remains the Licensee's liability.

Following is a non-exhaustive list of third-party terminologies that may require a separate license:

Terminology	Owner/Contact
Current Procedures Terminology (CPT) code set	American Medical Association https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/cpt-licensing
SNOMED CT	SNOMED International http://www.snomed.org/snomed-ct/get-snomed-ct or info@ihtsdo.org
Logical Observation Identifiers Names & Codes (LOINC)	Regenstrief Institute
International Classification of Diseases (ICD) codes	World Health Organization (WHO)
NUCC Health Care Provider Taxonomy code set	American Medical Association. Please see www.nucc.org . AMA licensing contact: 312-464-5022 (AMA IP services)

Table of Contents

Intended Audience	viii
Acknowledgements	ix
Abbreviated Glossary	1
1. Why Analysis Normal Form? A Normal Form for Clinical Statements	2
1.1. Motivation: Why Do We Need ANF?	2
1.1.1. Variation by Implementation: Clinical Input Forms	3
1.2. Analysis Normal Form	5
1.2.1. Objectives and Purpose of ANF	5
1.2.2. Assumptions for ANF	6
1.2.3. Approach - Architectural Separation of Concerns	6
1.3. Background: HL7 Clinical Statement Standards	8
1.3.1. HL7 Service-Aware Interoperability Framework (SAIF)	8
1.3.2. HL7 Version 3 Clinical Statement	10
1.3.3. CIMI Statements	10
1.4. About this Document	11
2. Building Blocks: ANF Reference Model	12
2.1. ANF UML Model	12
2.1.1. ANFStatement	13
2.1.2. Circumstance	14
2.1.3. Data Structures	18
2.1.4. References	21
3. How ANF Works: ANF Clinical Statements	23
3.1. Types of <i>ANF Statements</i>	23
3.1.1. Performance of Action Statements	23
3.1.2. Request Clinical Statements	34
4. Methodology—ANF Design Principles and Rules	39
4.1. ANF Design Principles	39
4.2. Shared Modeling Guidelines	40
4.3. Request for Action Guidelines	43
4.4. Performance of Action Guidelines	46
4.5. Editorial Rules	47
5. Putting it Together: Normalization and Transformation	52
5.1. Data Structures	52
5.2. Modeling Style	52
5.3. Transformation to ANF	52
5.4. Transformation Languages and Architecture	54
5.4.1. XSLT	54
5.4.2. FHIR Mapping Language	55
5.4.3. QVT	56
5.4.4. Model Driven Message Interoperability (MDMI)	56
6. Pragmatic Usage and Next Steps	59
6.1. ANF FHIR implementation	59
6.1.1. Analysis API	59
6.1.2. Automated Data Analysis	60
6.2. Other platforms	61
7. Implications—Improving Patient Safety and Outcomes	63
7.1. Improved Data Quality	63
7.2. Enhanced Clinical Decision Support	64
7.3. Increasing Population Health	65
7.4. Summary	66
8. Complete Glossary	67

9. Bibliography	73
Appendices	75
A. Current CIMI Clinical Statement Modeling Effort	76
A.1. Examples Using Topic and Context	78
A.2. CIMI Topic Patterns	79
A.2.1. AssertionTopic	80
A.2.2. Evaluation Result	84
A.2.3. ProcedureTopic	88
A.2.4. Context Patterns	88
B. Differences between ANF and CIMI	90
B.1. The Representation of Topic	90
B.2. The Representation of Results	91
B.3. ANF vs CIMI Examples	95
B.3.1. Simple Systolic Blood Pressure Statement	95
B.3.2. Complex Systolic Blood Pressure Statement	96
B.3.3. Diabetes Mellitus Statement	98
C. Narratives	100
C.1. Request for Action Narratives	100
C.2. Performance of Action Narratives	101
D. ANF Examples	103
D.1. Examples of Performance Clinical Statements	103
D.1.1. Blood Pressure Measurement	103
D.1.2. Pulse Rate Measurement	105
D.1.3. Patient History	106
D.1.4. Condition Present	107
D.1.5. Condition Not Present	107
D.1.6. Three Dot Blot Hemorrhages	108
D.1.7. Dot Blot Hemorrhage Present	109
D.1.8. Family History	110
D.2. Examples of Modeling Request Clinical Statements	110
D.2.1. Medication Order	110
D.2.2. Radiology Order	112
D.3. Examples of Modeling C-CDA Entries Based on ANF	113
D.3.1. Summary of Care	113
D.3.2. Patient Chart Summary (Excerpt)	116
D.4. Examples of Modeling KNARTs Based on ANF	117
D.4.1. Atrial Fibrillation / Atrial Flutter Order Set (Excerpt)	117
D.4.2. Diagnostic Breast Imaging Documentation Template (Excerpt)	118

List of Figures

1.1. Blood Pressure Statement recorded by an EHR system	4
1.2. Alternative Blood Pressure representation in a second EHR system	5
1.3. Separation of Concerns: Knowledge Architecture	7
1.4. Model Derivation based on SAIF-CD	9
2.1. ANFStatement Structure	12
2.2. Circumstance	15
2.3. Data Structures	18
2.4. References	22
3.1. Diabetes Mellitus Present ANF Example	25
3.2. Diabetes Mellitus Type 2 Absent ANF Example	25
3.3. Dot Blot Hemorrhage Present ANF Example	26
3.4. Pulse Rate ANF Example	27
3.5. Systolic Blood Pressure with Associated Statements ANF Example	28
3.6. Systolic Blood Pressure Sitting Position Associated ANF Statement Example	28
3.7. Systolic Blood Pressure Urination Associated ANF Statement Example	29
3.8. Three Dot Blot Hemorrhages ANF Example	29
3.9. Positive Screen for Fall Risk ANF Example	30
3.10. Negative Screen for PTSD ANF Example	31
3.11. Negative Screen for Depression ANF Example	31
3.12. Administration of Medication ANF Example	32
3.13. Provision of Educational Material ANF Example	32
3.14. Family History ANF Example	33
3.15. Systolic Blood Pressure with Normal Range and Health Risk ANF Example	34
3.16. Laboratory Request ANF Example	35
3.17. Imaging Request ANF Example	35
3.18. Referral Request ANF Example	36
3.19. Medication Request ANF Example	37
3.20. Counseling Request ANF Example	38
4.1. Shared Modeling Guideline Decision Tree	41
4.2. Request for Action Modeling Guideline Decision Tree	43
4.3. Performance of Action Modeling Guideline Decision Tree	46
5.1. Transformation to ANF	53
5.2. MDMI Standard	57
5.3. MDMI Transformation Process	58
6.1. ANF-based FHIR API	60
6.2. Derived ANF Statements	61
6.3. Data Mining using ANF statements	61
A.1. CIMI Clinical Statement	77
A.2. CIMI Presence Context Example	78
A.3. CIMI Order Context Example	79
A.4. Topic Hierarchy	80
A.5. AssertionTopic	80
A.6. ConditionTopic	81
A.7. CIMI Assertion Pattern with Context Representing Presence	81
A.8. Assertion Hierarchy	82
A.9. CIMI Assertion Pattern with Presence Context and Age of Onset	82
A.10. CIMI Assertion Pattern with Presence Context of Absent	83
A.11. CIMI Assertion Pattern with Presence Context of Present	83
A.12. CIMI Finding Site Assertion Pattern	84
A.13. Evaluation Result Hierarchy	85
A.14. CIMI Physical Evaluation Result Pattern	85

A.15. CIMI Tubular Breath Sounds Evaluation	86
A.16. CIMI Systolic Blood Pressure Evaluation	86
A.17. CIMI Systolic Blood Pressure with Sitting Position and Urination Evaluation	87
A.18. ProcedureTopic Hierarchy	88
A.19. Context Hierarchy	88
A.20. PerformanceContext	89
B.1. Topic Comparison	90
B.2. Pulse Rate - ANF Representation	91
B.3. Pulse Rate - CIMI Representation	91
B.4. Dot Blot Hemorrhage Present - ANF Representation	92
B.5. Three Dot Blot Hemorrhage - ANF Representation	92
B.6. Systolic Blood Pressure - CIMI Representation	93
B.7. Tubular Breath Sounds - CIMI Evaluation Representation	94
B.8. Tubular Breath Sound - CIMI Assertion Representation	94
B.9. Systolic Blood Pressure - ANF Representation	95
B.10. Systolic Blood Pressure - CIMI Representation	95
B.11. Systolic Blood Pressure with Associated Statements- ANF Representation	96
B.12. Systolic Blood Pressure Sitting Position Associated - ANF Representation	97
B.13. Systolic Blood Pressure Urination - ANF Representation	97
B.14. Systolic Blood Pressure with Associated Statements - CIMI Representation	98
B.15. Diabetes Mellitus Present - ANF Representation	99
B.16. Diabetes Mellitus Present - CIMI Representation	99

List of Tables

1.1. HL7 V3 Clinical Statement Definition	10
B.1. Breath Sound Valueset	93
D.1. Blood Pressure Performance Statement	103
D.2. Blood Pressure Positioning Associated Statement	104
D.3. Blood Pressure Urination Associated Statement	104
D.4. Pulse Rate Measurement Performance Statement	105
D.5. Patient History Performance Statement	106
D.6. Condition Present Performance Statement	107
D.7. Condition Not Present Performance Statement	107
D.8. Three Dot Blot Hemorrhages Performance Clinical Statement	108
D.9. Dot Blot Hemorrhage Present Performance Clinical Statement	109
D.10. Family History Performance Clinical Statement	110
D.11. Ibuprofen Order Request Clinical Statement	110
D.12. Nitroglycerin Order Request Clinical Statement	111
D.13. Radiology Order Request Clinical Statement	112
D.14. Summary of Care	113
D.15. Patient Chart Summary	116
D.16. Atrial Fibrillation	117
D.17. Diagnostic Breast Imaging Documentation Template	118

List of Examples

C.1. Radiology Request for Action Narratives	100
C.2. Pharmacy Request for Action Narratives	100
C.3. Education Request for Action Narratives	100
C.4. Laboratory Request for Action Narratives	100
C.5. Observation Request for Action Narratives	100
C.6. Cardiology Request for Action Narratives	100
C.7. Other Request for Action Narratives	100
C.8. Radiology Performance of Action Narratives	101
C.9. Pharmacy Performance of Action Narratives	101
C.10. Education Performance of Action Narratives	101
C.11. Laboratory Performance of Action Narratives	101
C.12. Observation Performance of Action Narratives	101
C.13. Cardiology Performance of Action Narratives	102
C.14. Other Performance of Action Narratives	102

List of Editorial Rules

4.1. Performance versus request	47
4.2. Topics are always an action	48
4.3. Timing - past, present, or future	48
4.4. Results are always a ranged quantity	48
4.5. Presence and absence are a countable quantity	49
4.6. Separate compound topics	49
4.7. Techniques are inseparable from the topic	49
4.8. Prerequisites must be separated from the topic	49
4.9. Related statements should be associated	49
4.10. Subject of information is used to represent family and donor history	49
4.11. Status indicates the state of a result	49
4.12. HealthRisk indicates the clinical risk of the result	50
4.13. Normal Range can be specified for a result	50
4.14. Participants can be specified or requested	50
4.15. Purpose indicates the reason for a request	50
4.16. Priority defaults to routine for a request	50
4.17. Repetition is used to request multiple occurrences of a topic	50
4.18. A desired result can be specified in a request	51

Intended Audience

Analysis Normal Form (ANF) is intended for projects that aggregate clinical statements from a variety of sources, independent of formalism or approach used by the source system. The users of ANF—and subsequent implementation guidance—are developing applications that require determination if a clinical fact or situation was observed to exist or happened, and they wish to ensure that this determination is reliable and performed in accordance with the principles of patient safety and high-reliability organizations. These applications may include clinical decision support, reimbursement, public health reporting, outcomes research, and other types of data analysis.

The Learning EHR, 21st Century Cures, Patient-Centered Outcomes Research, and other US national, or international initiatives are all examples of efforts that can benefit from ANF as they all depend on interoperable, reusable, and analysis-ready information that can improve outcomes, produce new therapies, and put into practice "precision medicine."

Acknowledgements

The project team would like to acknowledge the leadership and guidance from:

- **Keith E. Campbell, MD, PhD** - Director of Informatics Architecture, Knowledge Based Systems, Veterans Health Administration
- **Richard Esmond** - HL7 CIMI Work Group Co-Chair
- **Diane Montella, MD** - Director of Clinical Decision Support, Knowledge Based Systems, Veterans Health Administration
- **Jonathan Nebeker, MD, MS** - Deputy Chief Medical Informatics Officer, Veterans Health Administration
- **Steven Brown, MD, MS** - Director of Knowledge Based Systems, Veterans Health Administration

This Analysis Normal Form ballot received contributions and assistance from the following individuals:

Keith Campbell¹

Ryan C. Bradley²

Benson Chang¹

Raja A. Cholan²

Joey Coyle³

Kirsten Haake²

Stephanie Klepacki¹

Deb Konicek²

Ken Lord³

Kyle Maulden²

Claude Nanjo⁴

Andrew K. Sills²

Ioana Singureanu³

Walter Sujansky⁵

Andy Chen Wang²

Tim Williams²

¹Veterans Health Administration; ²Deloitte Consulting LLP; ³Book Zurman, Inc; ⁴HL7 CIMI Work Group; ⁵Sujansky & Associates, LLC

This work was primarily funded by the Veterans Health Administration Clinical Informatics and Data Management Office. This work would not have been possible without the support of Jonathan Nebeker and Steven Brown.

Abbreviated Glossary

ANF (Analysis Normal Form)	An approach to clinical statements that ensures the statement representation is reproducible and scalable, with the adherence to principles of being simple, reproducible, and use case driven, with a clean separation between statement concerns, and terminology concerns.
ANF Reference Model	A logical model described herein using Object Management Group (OMG) Unified Modeling Language (UML) 2.0 notation to describe the structure of normalized clinical statements for computational analysis. This logical model may be implemented using any programming language, database technology, or interoperability specification (e.g. FHIR) suitable for analysis. ANF is intended to normalize approaches and methodologies in use across the industry and provide a uniform representation of data to enable analysis.
CDS (Clinical Decision Support)	A function for electronic health records systems designed to help sift through large amounts of electronic health data to suggest next steps for treatments, alert providers to available information they may not have seen, or catch potential problems, such as dangerous medication interaction.
CIF (Clinical Input Forms)	The manner by which clinicians author clinical statements and enter them into their organizations' electronic health record (EHR). Clinical Input Forms (CIFs) have an impact as to how information is presented to the clinicians and how they enter the data. CIFs might be generated by natural language processing, or may use models that constrain structured input to allow only certain values to be entered, such as through a drop-down list or radio button, or breaking up large chunks of related information into smaller parts.
Editorial Rule	Methodological rules to describe the proper modeling of an ANF Statement instance.
Isosemantic Model	A model that, while different in structure, represents the same semantic content as another model. Any particular detailed clinical model exists within a family of isosemantic siblings.
Logical Model	A model expressed independently of a particular implementation technology.
Normal Form	A well-defined definitional structure that eliminates redundancy and improves data integrity. Normal forms are widely used in databases schema design.
Solor	A project sponsored by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Healthcare Services Platform Consortium (HSPC) that represents and brings together different terminology standards by using a single model that can encompass any customized content. Solor allows informaticists and developers to convert user-supplied terminologies into a single model using open source software to produce Solor content. For more information please see http://solor.io
Statement	A representation of a fact or situation that was observed to exist or happen. See Also <u>Clinical Statement</u> , <u>Statement Narrative</u> .
Statement Narrative	A written account of a fact or situation that was observed to exist or happen, corresponding to one or more statements. See Also <u>Clinical Statement</u> , <u>Statement</u> .

1. Why Analysis Normal Form? A Normal Form for Clinical Statements

A *clinical statement* is a definite and clear representation of a clinically-significant fact or situation that was observed to exist or happened. A clinical statement can be expressed as a *narrative* that provides a written account that can be naturally read by humans, as well as a *normal form* which is a machine-processable representation of the statement's data as a standardized and encoded fundamental form. Today, clinical statements are often represented in unpredictable and denormalized forms, which makes reliable and safe decision support challenging, and reduces the quality of other types of data processing.

Healthcare organizations are striving to become *high reliability organizations (HROs)*, characterized by high levels of safety under inherently risky, technologically-complex, and demanding conditions. [1] Deployment of EHR systems is nearly ubiquitous in the US and there is increasing opportunity to leverage standards-based clinical statements to improve population health through quality measures, case reporting, and decision support. The ability to measure and improve outcomes relies on consistent, high-quality data that was aggregated from a variety of systems. Analysis using normal form allows HROs to derive added knowledge from data and reach high levels and safety. [2] A *standard* normal form can help replicate HROs across our industry.

In this document, we present background on other logical *HL7* and *ISO* clinical statement models, and focus on the need for—and logical specification of—an *Analysis Normal Form (ANF)*. ANF is a **normal form** intended to safely and reliably support data analysis that can be used to aggregate data created using any standard or non-standard input form or exchange mechanism. The ANF Reference Model, is a *logical model* and part of the *CIMI* library of models.

ANF is a model for clinical statements used in analysis that meet the following criteria: *Understandable, Reproducible, and Useful* (URU) [3][4]

- ***Understandable***. The content of an *ANF statement* can be processed by health IT systems and understood by most healthcare providers, without reference to private or inaccessible information.
- ***Reproducible***. Multiple users or systems apply the ANF to the same situations and source data with an equivalent result.
- ***Useful***. The ANF statement is fit-for-purpose—it has practical value for data analysis, in support of clinical decision support, research, and population health that requires information aggregated across health IT systems.

This document describes how information systems can improve patient safety and outcomes by increasing the precision of clinical information using a normal form to enhance and support quality data and analysis.

1.1. Motivation: Why Do We Need ANF?

Information systems record and manage clinical statements using a variety of standard or ad-hoc models. However, both treatment and analysis of clinical statements require consistency not only at the format level (e.g. *CDA*, *FHIR*, *V2*) but also the content model (i.e. an instance of an *ISO/TS 13972* DCM, *CIMI* model, etc.). [5] In most cases the data quality is the greatest obstacle to analysis, but even in the case of structured, semantically-clear information, inconsistency across sources of information raises obstacles to analysis. Analysis of aggregate information managed by health information networks poses the greatest challenge today because a meaningful use of data for patient outcomes or research requires a common format, semantic clarity, and quality data.

Not only is there a potential for a lack of consistency with representing clinical statements with current *detailed clinical modeling* efforts, but there is also further variation in how the data is entered into information systems by end-users. This reality has a direct impact on patient safety if a clinical statement is recorded and displayed differently across the continuum of care. Clinicians author clinical statements and enter them into their organization's EHR systems where they are represented as some type of "*Clinical Input Form*" (CIF). This concept describes the representation of any natural language processing or data entry mechanism used by clinicians to record clinical statements. Vendors may compete on usability which may result in proprietary CIF data, or, clinical statements are based on standards-based models (e.g. CIMI, openEHR archetypes). For the purposes of this document, the type or usability of CIF data structures are not in scope. We assume that **any suitably encoded** clinical statement may be normalized.

Ideally, clinical information is modeled in a manner that is most efficient for use. This is a problem because there are many different use cases for clinical information with a wide range of requirements. There is no single model that can be the most efficient model for all the various use cases. Maximum efficiency for each use case necessitates that any particular clinical information be available in multiple modeled forms. These models, although different in form, semantically represent the same information, and are known as *isosemantic models*. Any particular detailed clinical model exists within a family of isosemantic siblings.

Clinical statements can be expressed and documented in many different ways in EHR systems, where clinical input forms provide different options to document the same clinical statement. These differences pose challenges for how the data is modeled, how the data is stored, and therefore has implications on data retrieval, data analysis, and accuracy of clinical analysis results.

1.1.1. Variation by Implementation: Clinical Input Forms

Clinicians enter clinical statements into their organization's EHR typically in a manner that we call here clinical input form (CIF), or the manner in which information is presented to the clinicians and how they enter the data, such as by constraining the information to allow only certain values to be entered - for instance, through a drop-down list, radio buttons, or breaking up large chunks of related information into smaller parts, or through natural language processing.

Let's consider the following example, represented below, in which data collected by an EHR combines information reported by devices with findings and interpretation:

1. A vital signs monitor transmits the systolic and diastolic blood pressure including date/time and the id of the device.
2. The nurse marks the measurement as "verified".
3. Next, the nurse documents how the measurement was performed:
 - using an adult cuff size
 - in prone position
 - brachial artery
 - on the left side
 - the micturition context is left empty/unknown¹
4. Next, the physician adds an interpretation.

¹Studies have shown that systolic blood pressure measurements could increase 10 to 15mmHg with a full bladder. Micturition, the process of emptying the bladder, is therefore a data element that can be recorded with some Clinical Input Forms. [6][7][8]

In this example the CIF provides the measurement information from the device to be verified by a nurse. The nurse adds annotations describing how the measurement was taken (at rest, prone) and the location (left brachial artery). The user may also fill in information about micturition, if known. A physician may interpret the measurement to be indicative of hypertension.

Figure 1.1. Blood Pressure Statement recorded by an EHR system

Another EHR system may capture or display a subset of information in CIFs about the blood pressure measurement—omitting "micturition context" and pre-coordinates site and laterality as:

- Right brachial artery
- Left brachial artery

The image below illustrates another distinct CIF in which the user interface captures a set of clinical statements related to Blood Pressure.

In the first case, the clinical input form has separate drop-down constraints to enter the artery and laterality as distinct concepts. In the alternative data entry form, the location and laterality are represented by a single, compound concept. This variation present in CIFs may also have implications on how the clinical statement is modeled.

Blood Pressure

Systolic: 140 mm[Hg]
 Diastolic: 90 mm[Hg]
 5/19/2019 2:34:35 pm
 Method: Vital Signs Monitor
☒ Verified by Athena Pallas, RN 5/19/2019 4:30 pm
 ACME Captiosus Monitor

Adult Cuff
 Prone
 At rest
 Left - Brachial Artery

☒ Signed by Athena Pallas, RN 5/19/2019 4:35 pm

Interpretation: Hypertensive disorder
☒ Signed by A Coronis, MD 5/20/2019 9:23 am

In this second CIF example, a similar system (or an alternative configuration of the same system) may support a different set of options to verify and record blood pressure measurement. This representation combines laterality and site and excludes details related to micturition.

Figure 1.2. Alternative Blood Pressure representation in a second EHR system

1.2. Analysis Normal Form

Analysis Normal Form (ANF) is a logical model intended to represent a **normalized** view of aggregate clinical statements recorded during treatment for analysis, research, clinical decision support, and other purposes. ANF can be used to represent any isosemantic clinical statements irrespective of how the information was captured at its source (i.e. information systems or medical devices). ANF can be used in conjunction with other models intended to ensure that clinical information is structured and complete at the time of entry (e.g. CIMI models, [ISO/TS 13972 Detailed Clinical Models](#)) or exchanged among systems (e.g. HL7 CDA templates, *HL7 V2 message profiles*, FHIR profiles).

Clinicians, integrators, health IT developers, and researchers face different priorities, forcing trade-offs to be made that optimize data entry brevity at the cost of computability. ANF represents a collection of patterns and approaches to provide a predictable normal form to aggregate data sets across multiple systems. The more normalized a data set is, the simpler it will become to analyze, and errors will be reduced. In addition to improving analysis, ANF introduces the ability to compare statements with ease and no loss of semantic integrity.

1.2.1. Objectives and Purpose of ANF

ANF's purpose is to introduce standards-based, normalized representation of clinical statements from a heterogeneous source using an objective *measure* to help evaluate the result, presence, and magnitude of a specific finding, request or observation. ANF requires an ability to classify the *topic* of a statement using standard terminology expressions. ANF defines responsibility for different representational aspects of input data along well-defined compositional layers (see [Separation of Concerns](#)). In practice, information systems may create normal data natively or transform other representations of clinical statements (e.g. C-CDA templates, FHIR profiles) to normal form (i.e., ANF).

Overall, ANF allows healthcare enterprises to normalize information aggregated across multiple sources to better support a set of analysis. ANF enhances the ability to analyze and compare clinical statements aggregated across systems and organizations and provide a logical model to:

- Specify a common form for clinical statements extracted from EHR systems and FHIR.
- Provide a common analysis form to data exchange paradigms (e.g. HL7 messages, FHIR and CDA).
- Enhance clinical data for use in *Clinical Decision Support* Systems, Clinical Quality Measures and National Registries, Healthcare Guidelines and Protocols, and Epidemiological Research.

1.2.2. Assumptions for ANF

ANF provides a precise statement specification that is comparable and sharable between multiple care providers, health enterprises, and standards-based Healthcare Information Technology (HIT) systems. ANF does not define the terminology specification but relies on *terminology knowledge* to specify the meaning of clinical statements. ANF coded data may use single codes, as well as any legal terminology expression defined within the terminology layer of the *architecture*.

ANF supports pre-coordinated and *post-coordinated* terminology expressions to provide greater content coverage than can be achieved by relying only on *pre-coordinated concepts*. Post-coordinated compositional terminologies are more expressive and can achieve better analysis than can be achieved by relying only on pre-coordinated concepts.


Successful analysis requires appropriate data quality necessary for systems to define a precise topic, category, and clear measure or *result* of what was observed, requested, or assessed during treatment. ANF can be applied to any input data and any formalism as long as the data semantics and terminology are sufficiently precise to define the elements mandatory for analysis.

1.2.3. Approach - Architectural Separation of Concerns

Increased reliance on computerized health records, including Electronic Health Records Systems, requires standardized medical terminology to encode health information consistently across systems and enterprises. Clinicians require not only objective quantitative measurements (e.g. 90 beats per minute for a patient's pulse) but also contextual or procedural context (e.g. pulse oximetry, manual) about past observations or requests for future interventions. While two quantitative measurements may be the same, the procedural information could indicate meaningful semantic differences and lead to different clinical interpretation and treatment. As information is exchanged across systems, the solution requires a common understanding of data and a method to support knowledge-representation and clinical decision rules based on common terminology and statements. Each component must address an aspect and, together they need to address the requirements of clinicians. Current HL7 standard implementations rely on profiles and templates to disambiguate statement and terminology, and provide sufficient precision for transactions, documents, and standards-based APIs. Therefore the architectural approach described here would be applicable to standards organizations developing interoperability-enterprise, and project-specific implementations in equal measure.

Functional decomposition—often referred to as a *Separation of Concerns* (SoC)—across components or sections with a specific purpose is a foundational design principle for complex system architecture. Enabling a SoC allows a complete system to be subdivided into distinct sections or components with well-defined functionality and dependencies. If successful, this approach allows individual sections to be able to be *reused*, as well as designed, implemented, and updated *independently* to address emerging *requirements*. This is especially useful and important in a medical context given how many different health information and clinical terminology projects are ongoing at any given time. Efforts are often uncoordinated and led by disparate and unrelated standards development organizations. In these cases, SoC allows teams to work independently, in coordination with each other, and reuse the resulting artifacts.

Figure 1.3, “Separation of Concerns: Knowledge Architecture” shows how a layered knowledge architecture can enable a separation of concerns.



Separation of concerns is an architectural design principle, whereby a system is divided into distinct sections, such that each section can address separate concerns. In this case, each architectural layer addresses separate concerns that can make use of the architecture layers below.

Figure 1.3. Separation of Concerns: Knowledge Architecture

Architectural Foundation – The *Architectural Foundation* of the Knowledge Architecture provides the common elements of interoperability such as object identity, versioning, modularity, and knowledge representation. It includes a) the foundation and building blocks of the common model; (b) how the repeatable transformation process of disparate standards into the common model promotes interoperability with other environments; and (c) how the modules of the architecture are tightly version controlled over time.

Terminology Knowledge – The Terminology Knowledge layer is responsible for structured sets of medical terms and codes that *define* concepts of interest, including descriptions, dialects, language, and semantic hierarchy. SNOMED CT, LOINC, and RxNorm are part of this layer. It defines what valid codes or expressions may be used by higher level layers.

Statement Model – The Statement Model layer is responsible for defining how data elements are combined to create a statement. ANF Reference Model belongs in this layer. Other standards-based clinical statements are discussed later in this chapter. This layer reuses the artifacts defined in the Terminology Knowledge layer.

Assertional Knowledge – The Assertional Knowledge layer makes use of the Terminology Knowledge layer concepts to specify *non-defining* facts that may be used by procedural knowledge algorithms. An example of such a fact might be that "thiazide diuretics treat hypertension." Assertional Knowledge may indicate what symptoms may be associated with a disorder.

Procedural Knowledge – Procedural knowledge, also known as imperative knowledge, is the knowledge exercised in the performance of some task, such as determining a hypertension treatment plan by analyzing a combination of a patient's ANF statements, and the available assertional knowledge. The procedural knowledge is responsible for information about standard ways to carry out specific procedures as well as other procedural guidelines, e.g. treatment protocols for diseases and order sets focused on particular patient situations. Procedural knowledge, together with assertional knowledge, enables clinical decision support, quality measurement, and supports patient safety. This layer relies on the architectural foundation and terminology layers, incorporates the statement model for information retrieval, and uses the assertional knowledge. Procedural knowledge artifacts may include clinical alert rules, reminders, etc. that trigger actions or recommend interventions.

Examining a clinical procedure for controlling hypertension illustrates each of the layers of the informatics architectural separation of concerns.

- At the Terminology Knowledge layer, there may be various codes and terms from disparate source terminologies to define a concept (e.g. hypertension). Ideally, these overlapping codes and terms would be oriented to the same parent concept during the transformation and integration process at the Terminology layer (e.g., *Solor*).
- The Statement Model layer enables representation of blood pressure measurement values (e.g., systolic BP = 140 mmHg) or the categorical data (e.g., pregnancy induced hypertension vs. renal hypertension) within a standard data structure to facilitate information exchange or retrieval, such as within a standards-based clinical statement (i.e. CIMI, CDA, FHIR, ANF, etc.).
- The Assertional Knowledge layer represents non-procedural statements, or facts, such "Stage 2 high blood pressure is over 140 systolic or 90 diastolic," or that beta-blockers and ACE inhibitors may be used to treat hypertension, or that beta-blockers are contraindicated in patients with a diagnosis of reactive airway disease.
- Finally, the Procedural Knowledge layer provides algorithms to analyze ANF statements about a patients, in combination with the Assertional Knowledge, to recommend a treatment protocol for different kinds of hypertension, including the considerations of, e.g. patient age, co-morbidities etc., which can be generated by an electronic clinical decision support system (Statement + Assertional layers). This layer adds to support for workflow and conditional logic (i.e. if-then-else).

A clear separation of concerns enables the isosemantic transformation of standards-based clinical statements to normal form by decoupling structure from semantics and workflow in regard to an isosemantic representation in the Statement Model layer.

HL7 relies on implementation guides (for V2, CDA, and FHIR) to add sufficient terminology knowledge to standards-based clinical statements. Vocabulary constraints documented as profiles or templates are the mechanism to create interoperable implementation guides from health IT standards. Only after the Terminology Knowledge is fully defined, the standards-based statements can be used to support business and workflow decision points consistent with Assertional and Procedural layers described above.

1.3. Background: HL7 Clinical Statement Standards

Clinical statement standardization has been a long-standing concern for HL7 and reuse of these content models across paradigms (e.g. messages, documents, services). Standardization has relied on model-driven approaches requiring a separation of concerns along with conceptual, logical, and implementation perspectives.


HL7 Service-Aware Interoperability Framework (SAIF) organizes HL7 standards along three perspectives (i.e. conceptual, logical, and implementable).

1.3.1. HL7 Service-Aware Interoperability Framework (SAIF)

To augment the HL7 Version 2 and Version 3 representations, HL7 introduced an architecture to allow for a clear separation of concerns among interoperability models and specifications from the abstract or conceptual to the most precise, implementable, and testable that ensures semantic interoperability. This architecture is the HL7 Service-Aware Interoperability Framework Canonical Definition (SAIF-CD).[9]

The SAIF-CD specification [9] defines three SAIF Perspectives: Conceptual, Logical, and Implementable. These perspectives are not formally equivalent with *Object Management Group's (OMG)* levels-of-abstraction in *Model-Driven Architecture (MDA)* even though it reuses the same derivation. Therefore, the Implementable Perspective is derived from the Logical Perspective and the Logical Perspective is derived from the Conceptual Perspective. This approach ensures that any implementable artifacts (i.e. service specifica-

tions, implementation guides) are traceable to business/clinical requirements and logical models of knowledge.



Like other CIMI models, ANF is a Logical Model that may be used to create implementation specifications.

Figure 1.4. Model Derivation based on SAIF-CD

However, the SAIF Conceptual Perspective is not completely equivalent to the MDA concept of *Computationally Independent Model (CIM)*, the Logical Perspective is not equivalent to the MDA *Platform Independent Model (PIM)*, nor is the Implementable Perspective equivalent to the MDA *Platform Specific Model* although this Perspective is the SAIF Perspective that most closely aligns with an MDA analogue.

1.3.1.1. Conceptual Perspective

These artifacts are most commonly focused on the “Problem-Space” rather than the “Solution-Space,” and contain explicit, unambiguous descriptions of the various dimensions of the component (e.g. clinical statement) or system being specified.

A fully-specified Conceptual Perspective thus should be both readable and traceable by Domain Experts and Subject Matter Experts and rigorous enough to serve as input into the development in the Logical Perspective.

In HL7, the Conceptual Perspective is represented by *Domain Analysis Models (DAMs)* and business models that represent stakeholder requirements analyzed by subject matter and domain experts. This perspective precedes the development of either logical or implementable artifacts and it is key to successful testing of implementations.

1.3.1.2. Logical Perspective

Artifacts in the Logical Perspective represent traceable translations of Conceptual-level artifacts into a form and format, usable by and useful to architects and “inward-facing analysts.” Also included are additional specification materials required by architects preparing artifacts for consumption by developers. The Logical Perspective contains platform-independent artifacts.

There are no definite boundaries between the Logical and Implementable Perspectives. Therefore, it is important for organizations such as HL7 to standardize logical models used to generate/create implementable artifacts (i.e. implementation guides, profiles, and templates). *CIMI Clinical Statements*, *ISO/TS 13972 Detailed Clinical Models*, and ANF statements all belong in this perspective.

1.3.1.3. Implementable Perspective

Artifacts in the Implementable Perspective are typically defined by developers or standards implementers, often through discussion with software designers, architects, or system integrators. Note that the artifacts in the Implementable Perspective are not actual implementations, but rather implementable in a number of implementation instances. Thus, all the necessary technical bindings, including data types, value sets, class libraries, and interface specifications are part of the Implementable Perspective. FHIR implementation requires a combination of profiles and test cases to ensure that implementations meet the requirements used to derive the conceptual and logical models.

1.3.2. HL7 Version 3 Clinical Statement

Starting with HL7 Version 3 [10] the minimum requirements for the interoperable clinical statement are:

<p><i>“Clinical Statement for the care of patients (persons, animals and other entities) is:</i></p> <p><i>An expression of a discrete item of clinical, clinically-related or public health information that is recorded because of its relevance to the care of a patient or other entities. Clinical or public health information can be expressed with different levels of granularity and therefore the extent and detail conveyed in a single statement may vary. To be regarded as a Clinical Statement, a concept must be associated with a patient or other entity in a manner which makes clear:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Its temporal context</i> <i>• Its relationship to the entity or entities</i> <p><i>In the case of an observation, its mood and presence, absence or value</i></p> <p><i>In the case of a procedure, its mood and status</i></p> <p><i>This clarity may be achieved by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Explicit representation; or,</i> <i>• Implicit application of defaults ONLY where explicitly modeled rules state the appropriate defaults.”</i>

Table 1.1. HL7 V3 Clinical Statement Definition

The V3 Clinical Statement Model is applied across CDA implementation guides including the US-Realm Consolidated CDA (C-CDA) to represent CDA document entries. A V3 Clinical Statement Model is a *polymorphic model*: it can represent observations, procedures, encounters, public health reports, supply, medications, exposure, and derivations of clinical acts. The V3 Clinical Statement model provides a Statement Model with partial Terminology constraints. For example, Clinical Statements in a CDA document section need to be constrained to add the precision needed to support the Terminology Knowledge layer. CDA entry and sub-entry templates can be used to create precise implementations of the V3 Clinical Statement model for a specific type of clinical statement (e.g. Procedure Activity, Problem Observation) sharing a common statement model but different terminology and usage constraints. The US-Realm C-CDA specification consists of a set of templates that constrain the document, sections, and entries used in each section.

1.3.3. CIMI Statements

The *Clinical Information Modeling Initiative (CIMI)* is defining a library of logical *clinical information models* using a common modeling formalism. CIMI intends to improve the interoperability of healthcare information systems through shared detailed clinical information models that can be used to generate

platform-specific model specifications such as FHIR profiles, CDA templates, OpenEHR Archetypes, [ISO 13606](#) Archetypes, [ISO/TS 13972](#) DCMs, CIMI models are grouped into semantically equivalent (or 'isosemantic') families of detailed clinical models, which capture the same clinical meaning using different combinations of pre and *post-coordinated concepts* and corresponding information model structure. The central focus of the CIMI Reference Model is the CIMI Clinical Statement. A CIMI Clinical Statement represents structured electronic communication made about a patient typically documented as an 'entry' in the patient record.

Unlike the V3 Clinical Statement Model applied in C-CDA, CIMI models are designed with Terminology Knowledge and provides a separate model for each type of statements, organized into a comprehensive library.

For reader convenience, CIMI clinical statements are further explained in an appendix of this document ([See Current CIMI Modeling Efforts](#)).

1.4. About this Document

This document describes how information systems can improve patient safety and outcomes by increasing the precision of clinical information using a normal form to enhance and support quality data and analysis. In the subsequent chapter we will provide a deep dive into the building blocks and constructs for ANF, in a chapter containing the ANF Reference Model and illustrative examples of ANF modeling.

Subsequently, we will outline how the various building blocks and attributes work together to create ANF Clinical Statements. We then provide the ANF Modeling Methodology, including a list of modeling principles and rules. Next, we discuss how clinical statements can be transformed and normalized into ANF Clinical Statements. Finally, we discuss the implications of ANF on data quality, clinical decision support, and ultimately, patient safety and outcomes. In the appendices, we explore current CIMI modeling efforts including illustrative examples for modeling CIMI clinical statements. We also compare and contrast ANF Clinical Statements and CIMI Clinical Statements in an appendix.

Note

SNOMED CT is used as a representative example of a terminology system for the coded data elements in the ANF Reference Model. This ballot is focused on defining a Statement Model, not the underlying Terminology Knowledge layer described in the Knowledge Architecture. While the SNOMED CT examples are based on actual SNOMED CT definitions that are part of the SNOMED CT distribution, we recognize that there are inconsistencies within SNOMED CT that allow redundant representations. A first step in addressing the potential for redundant representation in the Terminology Layer is to define a separation of concerns between the Terminology and Statement layers, so that redundancies created by a poor separation of concerns between knowledge layers are eliminated. Subsequent efforts to improve the quality of the Terminology Layer can then be done independent of the Statement layer.

2. Building Blocks: ANF Reference Model

The *ANF Reference Model* is a logical information model describing the format of a normalized clinical statement that may have originated from an information system data store, a standard-based message (e.g. HL7 Version 2), a standard-document (e.g. *HL7 CDA*), a standard-based resource (e.g. *HL7 FHIR*), or an instance of a *CIMI model* (e.g. FHIR-based profile, *openEHR* archetype).

2.1. ANF UML Model

The *ANF Reference Model* is a logical model described herein using the *Object Management Group (OMG) Unified Modeling Language (UML)* 2.0 notation to describe the structure of normalized *clinical statements* for computational analysis. This *logical model* may be implemented using any programming language, database technology, or interoperability specification (e.g. FHIR) suitable for analysis. ANF is intended to normalize approaches and methodologies in use across the industry and provide a uniform representation of data to enable analysis.

The following diagram describes the logical structure of a clinical statement that conforms to the Analysis Normal Form specification. At a high-level an *ANF statement* defines the topic (**WHAT** happened, was observed, requested, measured, asserted, etc.) and under what circumstances-(**HOW, WHY, WHEN, and with what RESULT**).




Figure 2.1. ANFStatement Structure

2.1.1. ANFStatement

This is the main class which describes a clinical statement. Most importantly it contains the '**topic**' which describes what this statement is about, and the '**circumstance**' which will contain either request or result information regarding the '**topic**'.

Attribute	Multiplicity	Notes
id Identifier	[1...1]	Unique Identifier of the statement.
time Measure	[1...1]	<p>This data element describes when the statement was documented. Is its expressed as a Measure.</p> <p>For example the date of 2019-07-09T00:12:31+00:00 would be represented as Unix Epoch time as 1562631151 seconds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> interval.lowerBound = 1562631151 interval.includeLowerBound = true interval.upperBound = 1562631151 interval.includeLowerBound = true semantic = Seconds 257997001 <p>The ANFStatement separates the timing related to documenting a statement vs, the timing of the phenomenon that the statement is describing. This data element specifies when the statement was recorded/asserted.</p>
s u b j e c t O f R e c o r d Participant	[1...1]	A patient's clinical record will contain many statements. The subjectOfRecord is a reference to the patient clinical record in which this statement is contained.
author Practitioner	[0...*]	Optional reference(s) list of identified authoring practitioners.
subjectOfInformation LogicalExpression	[1...1]	<p>A logical expression describing the subject of the statement; it's used to express WHO the clinical statement is about. A patient's clinical record may contain statements not only about the patient, but also statements about children, relatives and donors. Thus, some possible values for subjectOfInformation, would include codes for 'subject of record' (the patient), 'family member', or 'donor'. The majority of statements will have a subjectOfInformation with a value of 'subject of record', since most statements in a patient record will be about the patient.</p> <p>The subjectOfInformation is used to represent who the statement is about. This is normally the patient unless explicitly stated otherwise.</p>
associatedStatement AssociatedStatement	[0...*]	An ANF statement to the performance of an action. If the topic is a laboratory result panel, each association would point to another statement which is a laboratory result.

Attribute	Multiplicity	Notes
		It may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a precondition • an interpretation
topic LogicalExpression	[1...1]	<p>This data element is an expression of WHAT is being requested or what was performed. For both ANFStatement types (request or performance) a <i>pre-coordinated</i> or <i>post-coordinated</i> “procedure” concept as a logical expression is required to sufficiently capture the action, which is either requested or performed.</p> <p>The topic is the central component of clinical statements. The following are proposed principles for the topic of an ANFStatement.</p> <p>Principle 1: The topic defines the action (being performed or requested) or what is being requested, measured or observed.</p> <p>Principle 2: The topic has to be able to exist on its own and still retain original intent and clarity of meaning.</p> <p>Principle 3: Each clinical statement may only have one topic [but the topic is comprehensive expression].</p>
type LogicalExpression	[1...1]	This data element distinguishes between a performance (' performed ') and a request (' requested '). Performances may be observational performances, e.g. the observation of a clinical finding or disorder being present or absent. They can also be a procedure or intervention which has been performed on the subject of record in the past, e.g. “a procedure using a 12-lead electrocardiogram”. Performances can – but do not have to – include quantitative or qualitative results, e.g. “3 dot blot hemorrhages” or “Hepatitis A antibody positive”.
c i r c u m s t a n c e CircumstanceChoice	[1...1]	A choice of circumstance appropriate to the type of clinical statement.

2.1.2. Circumstance

Circumstances can describe **HOW, WHY, WHEN, and with what RESULT** a requested or performed action will be or was carried out. ANF promotes a normalized representation of observation or intervention results where all results are reduced to a "measure". This approach reduces data retrieval difficulties by eliminating the potential for multiple differing representations of the same clinical statement. For example, with coded results there are multiple potential methods to represent eye color that complicate data retrieval. The Topic could be a Finding refined by an Observable (Iris finding->Interprets = Color of iris) or a Finding with no refinement (Finding of color of iris). In both of these cases the Result would be a qualifier of Blue color. The ANF Statement would represent Eye color using the Blue iris Finding as the Topic and the Result would be Present, represented as interval.lowerBound =1, interval.upperBound=INF.




Figure 2.2. Circumstance

2.1.2.1. CircumstanceChoice

This class provides an exclusive choice of circumstances that may be chosen when an ANFStatement is instantiated:

- [PerformanceCircumstance](#)
- [RequestCircumstance](#)
- [NarrativeCircumstance](#)

2.1.2.2. Circumstance

This abstract class is used to describe the default data needed describe any circumstances associated with a clinical statement.

Attribute	Multiplicity	Notes
timing Measure	[1...1]	<p>WHEN a requested action should be performed or WHEN an observed finding or disorder was present or absent. Timing is used to capture a time or time range for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests for action at a future time • Performance of action, which has taken place in the past (including “History of X....) • Performance of action that hasn't taken place

Attribute	Multiplicity	Notes
p u r p o s e LogicalExpression	[0...*]	<p>This data element describes WHY a procedure was requested or performed in a post-coordinated expression, based on two possible procedures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 386053000 Evaluation procedure (procedure) • 277132007 Therapeutic procedure (procedure) <p>The procedure is then refined by post-coordinating with a “363702006 Has focus (attribute) ” attribute and identifying a finding/disorder or procedure concept as the value for the attribute.</p>

2.1.2.3. RequestCircumstance

This class further specifies **HOW** a requested action is to be performed, e.g. how often or how long.

A Request for Action clinical statement describes a request made by a clinician. Most of the times, but not always, the object of the request (e.g., lab test, medication order) will be fulfilled by someone other than the clinician (e.g., lab technician, pharmacist) making the request. All information about the request will be documented in this clinical statement, including information about details relating to the request, such as patient must fast for 12 hours before having a lipids blood test.

Examples:

- Request for Rheumatoid factor 1 time routine
- Request for X-ray chest to evaluate for heart failure
- Cardiology referral
- Ribavirin 200 mg capsule oral, take 2 capsules every morning
- Advised to participate in tobacco cessation counseling once a week.

Attribute	Multiplicity	Notes
conditionalTrigger AssociatedStatement	[0...*]	This data element is used to represent a condition, or set of conditions that must exist in order for Request to be executed. For example, Ibuprofen 400 mg tablet oral every 6 hours as needed for pain, the use of Ibuprofen is conditional on the presence of back pain.
requestedParticipant Reference	[0...*]	This data element is an optional list of either specific persons or roles who perform an action, assist in performing an action or are targets of an action.
p r i o r i t y LogicalExpression	[1...1]	This data element species the priority with which a requested action has to be carried out, e.g. “routine” or “stat”. By default a Request will be considered "routine" unless otherwise specified.
requestedResult Measure	[1...1]	This data element specifies the measurable result.

Attribute	Multiplicity	Notes
repetition Repetition	[1...1]	<p>This data element describes when an action is requested for more than a single occurrence using the <u>Measure</u> data structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When the repeated action should begin (periodStart), e.g. NOW How long the repetitions should persist (periodDuration), e.g. for 3 weeks How often the action should occur (eventFrequency), e.g. 3 times per week How long between actions (eventSeparation), e.g. for 2 weeks How long every action should last (eventDuration), e.g. for 5 minutes

2.1.2.4. PerformanceCircumstance

This class describes the circumstances associated with a statement. It is used when an action or observation are performed and specifies the result of intervention using both as a measure and a coded status.

For example, "*Insulin placed on hold 24 hours prior to catheterization*" would have a status of "*On hold*". A typical, successfully completed procedure would have a status of "*Completed*".

Attribute	Multiplicity	Notes
s t a t u s LogicalExpression	[1...1]	This is a coded value representing the current status of the intervention (e.g. "completed"). This data element is not intended as a substitute for workflow specification.
result Measure	[1...1]	Intervention result as a <u>measure</u> .
h e a l t h R i s k LogicalExpression	[0...1]	This optional data element is used to flag a result with coded values such as 'low', 'normal', 'high', and 'critical'.
n o r m a l R a n g e Measure	[0...1]	This optional data element is the interval of values that are normal for the observation/finding described by the "topic" for this "subject". It refers to "normal" for the patient/subject with these conditions.
p a r t i c i p a n t Participant	[0...*]	This optional data element identifies the practitioner(s) responsible for the results reported.

2.1.2.5. NarrativeCircumstance

This class is used to describe the circumstances of a clinical statement using natural language/text rather than a structure.

This class may be used to specify either a performance or request circumstance.

	Multiplicity	Notes
text string-primitive	[1...1]	Text description of circumstances.

2.1.3. Data Structures

The following are data structures used to represent an ANFStatement. This section describes the data structures specific to ANF. This model references a set of logical structures to represent unique identifiers (i.e. Identifier, Expression) and primitive types (boolean, float).




Figure 2.3. Data Structures

2.1.3.1. Measure

This class captures measurable elements of clinical statements, e.g. the results of test procedures, time periods, frequencies of repetitions for procedures or medication administrations. The measure formally represents a numeric interval between two non-negative real numbers with a semantic and precision/resolution. The interval can be open or closed depending on whether the upper and lower bounds are included in the measure interval.

The measure provides a single way to represent both "presence" or "absence" values and numeric values for a phenomenon. In general, the interval value represents the numeric range within which the observed value of a phenomenon occurs. Note that this formalism allows both exact values and ranges of values to be expressed. In case that the beginning and end point of an interval are the same value, the meaning is that the value of the phenomenon is exactly that value.

In the case that the lower and upper bound of an measure are the same number, *n*, the meaning is that the value of the phenomenon is exactly *n*.

- `[10, 10]` : means the value is exactly **10** because the *lowerBound* and *upperBound* are both **10**;

In the special case that the beginning of the interval is a number, **n**, and the end point is **INF** (infinity), the meaning is that the value of the phenomenon is $> n$ or $\geq n$, depending on whether the interval is open or closed.

- $(0, \text{INF}) : > 0$; (greater than 0)
- $[10, \text{INF}) : \geq 10$ (greater than or equal to 10)
- $(-\text{INF}, 10) : < 10$ (less than 10)

The interval value also represents whether a phenomenon is "present", "absent", or "indeterminate". Specifically, any interval value that includes only numbers that are > 0 also denotes the value "present".

Any interval value that includes only the number 0, itself, denotes the value "absent". Any interval value that includes both the number 0 and at least one number > 0 denotes the values "indeterminate". Lastly, there are two interval values that explicitly denote "present" and "absent", respectively. These value may be assigned to phenomena that would not otherwise take on a numeric value (such as "nausea"):

- Nausea value = $(0, \text{INF})$: **present** (greater than 0)
- Nausea value = $[0, \text{INF})$: **indeterminate** (greater than or equal to 0)
- Nausea value = $[0, 0]$: **absent** (exactly zero)

The numeric attributes of this class are of type "**float**" to support both positive and negative values that conform to [IEEE 754 standard for Floating Point Numbers](#).

Note

A Java **float** number uses 32 bits to represent the sign, exponent, and mantissa consistent with [IEEE 754:1985](#). The values **+infinity** and **-infinity** are denoted with an exponent of all ones and a mantissa of all zeros. The sign bit distinguishes between negative infinity and positive infinity.

Attribute	Multiplicity	Notes
lowerBound float	[1...1]	It specifies the lower bound of a measurable element. This can be the lower bound of a range: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the "Tumor greater than 1 cm but less than 4 cm" the lower bound is 1. • For a test result, which is not a range, lower and upper bound are the same. Example: systolic blood pressure 110 mmHg. The lower and upper bound are both 110 mmHg. • For an unbound measure, the lowerBound is -INF(negative infinity) and <i>includeLowerBound</i> is "false"
includeLowerBound boolean	[1...1]	It states whether the lower bound in the interval is included in the interval. In the tumor size example above, the lower bound would not be included. The lower range size of 1cm is not included. The inclusion or exclusion of lower bound is needed to express measurable elements which include relative properties, such as "greater than", "less than" and others.

Attribute	Multiplicity	Notes
		<p>Example: “Persistent cough for more than 10 days”. If a lower bound of “10” is chosen, it would not be included, because the example states: more than 10 days. Choosing “11” would require it to include the lower bound. If “true” the lower bound is part of the interval.</p> <p>Invariant: if (<i>lowerBound</i> == - INF) { <i>includeLowerBound</i> = false }.</p>
s e m a n t i c LogicalExpression	[1...1]	<p>Measure semantic represents a unit of measure or scale specified by the interval values. It is described using a logical expression using standard-based terminology (i.e. SNOMED CT).</p> <p>For systolic blood pressure, the unit of measure is millimeters of mercury, and thus the measure semantic is a SNOMED CT concept: 259018001 Millimeter of mercury (qualifier value).</p> <p>For blood glucose measurement daily for 2 weeks, the measure semantic would be “258705008 week (qualifier value)”.</p> <p>For quantity/count measure values, the measure semantic to express a number of findings or phenomena described in the ANFStatement.topic "3 dot-and-blot hemorrhages " would be "30766002 Quantitative (qualifier value)".</p> <p>If Measure is used to represent date or time:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date/time using Unix Epoch time: [762636008] Duration, [257997001] Seconds • Duration using Unix Epoch time start time and end time: [762636008] Duration, [257997001] Seconds
resolution decimal-primitive	[0...1]	<p>It defines the possible or allowed increments in which the measured “thing” can be counted. In the example of the systolic blood pressure of 120 mmHg, the resolution is “1”, because the blood pressure measurement result can be counted in 1 mmHg increments. The Resolution is not always defined or known. Example: a clinical statement like “History of breast cancer” implies an undefined amount of time in the past and it is not stated, if it is years, months, etc.</p>
upperBound float	[1...1]	<p>It represents the upper bound of a measurable element. This can be the upper boundary of a range: For the “Tumor greater than 1 cm but less than 4 cm” the upper bound is 4. In cases, where the measurable element does not represent a range, upper and lower bound have the same value.</p> <p>Invariant: <i>upperBound</i> >= <i>lowerBound</i>.</p>
includeUpperBound boolean	[1...1]	<p>It states whether the upper bound in the interval is included in the interval. Similar to lower bound, where the measurable</p>

Attribute	Multiplicity	Notes
		<p>element has relative properties, the same rules apply. If the upper bound of a measure is not defined, e.g. “blood glucose measurement daily for at least 2 weeks”, the upper bound will be captured as “INF” (infinite). Infinite as an upper bound is never included. If "true" the upper bound is part of the interval.</p> <p>Invariant: if (<i>upperBound</i> == INF) { <i>includeUpperBound</i> = false }.</p>

2.1.3.2. Repetition

This class builds on [Measure](#) and it is used to represent when an action is requested for more than a single occurrence. Repetition is an optional component for a RequestCircumstance.

Attribute	Multiplicity	Notes
periodStart Measure	[1...1]	This required field is used to represent when a repeated action should begin (e.g. NOW). If it is not specified, a default value of [0,INF) will be used.
periodDuration Measure	[1...1]	This required field is used to represent how long a repeated action should persist (e.g. for a year). If it is not specified, a default value of [0,INF) will be used.
eventSeparation Measure	[1...1]	This required field is used to represent how long between actions (e.g. 1 week). If it is not specified, a default value of [0,INF) will be used.
eventDuration Measure	[0...1]	This optional field is used to represent how long a repetition should persist (e.g. for 2 hours). If it is not specified, a default value of [0,INF) will be used.
eventFrequency Measure	[1...1]	This required field is used to represent how often the action should occur (e.g. 4 times per month). If it is not specified, a default value of [0, INF) will be used.

2.1.3.3. LogicalExpression

This class represents is a wrapper for logical expression.

Attribute	Multiplicity	Notes
expression Expression	[1...1]	<p>Logical expression could be represented using FHIR Expression structure or a similar standard-based syntax (e.g. SNOMED CT Expression Constrain Language - ECL).</p> <p>The expression must use valid, standard-based terminology.</p>

2.1.4. References

A clinical statement references other information managed by a system:

- references to patient/records
- references to health practitioners

ANF statements may also reference other related statements




Figure 2.4. References

2.1.4.1. AssociatedStatement

This class specifies how a statement may be associated with another statement.

Attribute	Multiplicity	Notes
id Reference	[1...1]	A reference to the associated statement.
semantic LogicalExpression	[1...1]	A logical expression to capture how the target statement is associated (e.g. a precondition, an interpretation, a component).

2.1.4.2. Participant

This class specifies the role/specialties/services that a practitioner may perform relative to the ANFStatement:

- the author
- requested participant
- performance participant

Attribute	Multiplicity	Notes
id Identifier	[1...1]	Unique identifier (e.g. National Provider Identifier).
practitioner Reference	[1...1]	Reference to the participating practitioner.
code LogicalExpression	[0...1]	Role(s) which this practitioner is authorized to perform for the organization.

3. How ANF Works: ANF Clinical Statements

In the context of the ANF Model, a *clinical statement* represents an entry in the patient record that documents, in a structured/computable manner, clinical information related to the patient that is asserted by a particular source, recorded, and potentially verified.

As seen in the *CIMI Clinical Statements* section, clinical information related to the patient can be entered and stored in an EHR in multiple different ways. ANF strives to standardize the structure of clinical statements to eliminate the disparity of clinical information by limiting the design choices a clinical modeler must make. ANF can then act as a consistent transformation target for the multiple differing clinical information representations that currently exist, making this clinical information more easily computable and eliminating the need to create multiple ways to analyze the same data.

3.1. Types of *ANF Statements*

There are two types of ANF Statements:

Performance of Action

A Performance may include the observation of a phenomenon related to patients and their health status or family history, and may also include interventions, such as providing education or administering medications or documenting that a patient is participating in exercise to improve their overall health status.

Request for Action

Requests for clinical testing, active interventions, future goals, or consultation with other providers.

See Editorial Rule: Performance versus request

- ANF Statements must be either a Performance of an action or a Request for an action.
- A Performance may include the passive observation of a phenomenon related to patients and their health status or family history, and may also include active interventions, such as providing education or administering medications or documenting that a patient is participating in exercise to improve their overall health status.
- A Request may include requests for clinical testing, active interventions, future goals, or consultation with other providers.

3.1.1. Performance of Action Statements

A Performance of Action statement describes a topic that has previously been performed, and—if applicable—the result that corresponds to the topic. As shown in the examples below, this can range from documenting that a subject of information:

- The presence or absence of a clinical phenomenon
 - Diabetes mellitus is present
 - Diabetes mellitus is not present
 - Dot blot hemorrhage is present
- The results of specific test/screening or procedure
 - Pulse Rate 68 bpm, taken by pulse oximeter

- Systolic blood pressure 120 mmHg, taken on right brachial artery, using BP cuff adult size, patient in sitting position for at least 5 minutes, urinated not more than 30 minutes prior to measurement
- Three dot blot hemorrhages
- Positive screen for fall risk
- Negative screen for PTSD and depression
- Administered a medication or other substance
 - Patient took one Acetaminophen 500 mg tablet by mouth for pain
- Provision of educational materials
 - Patient was provided with educational materials on diabetes
- Has any other state or specific characteristic that is clinically relevant
 - Family history of breast cancer

3.1.1.1. Presence or Absence of a Clinical Phenomenon

See Editorial Rule: Timing - past, present, or future

- For a Performance of Action, the Timing can represent a time in the past or a current time. If a history of a performance of action is to be represented in ANF the Timing will be for a time in the past prior to the statement. Otherwise the Timing will be represented with the current time of the statement.
- For a Request of Action, the Timing will always represent a future time.


See Editorial Rule: Topics are always an action

- The particulars of how topics—and other statement fields—are modeled as a Terminology Knowledge layer concern, not a Statement Layer concern. The Statement Layer does require that the Terminology Expression fields in a statement are disjoint: There should be no confusion—or creation of false dichotomies. There should be one, and only one, place to put each type of information in a terminology expression. For example, the Statement Layer defines a particular place to represent the subject of information. Therefore, the terminology layer must not allow the subject of information to be redundantly—and possibly contradictory—represented in a topic expression (such as would be the case if "maternal history of diabetes" where an allowed topic expression). The Statement Layer requires that the topic represent an Action as a code or expression according to the rules of the terminology layer, and that the rules of the terminology layer enforce a disjointness of between different types of terminology expressions. Here we present a starting point for what the Terminology Layer editorial rules may look like, based on current SNOMED CT practice.
- SNOMED CT can accommodate this requirement for simple observations by using Observation procedure to represent the topic (or other types of procedures when appropriate, such as the administration of a medication). In SNOMED CT examples, the Observation procedure specifies a Has focus attribute linking it to the Clinical Finding or Disorder that it is being observed. The observation procedure can also be further refined by adding attributes in the terminology model, including Method, Procedure site - Direct, (if appropriate) Laterality, and Using device.
- Medication administrations will use an Administration of substance concept to represent the topic. All Administration of substance concepts will be refined with the substance and dose form and strength being requested. If Route of administration exists, then it will also be added.
- Laboratory tests will use a Laboratory Procedure concept to represent the topic. These concepts can be further refined.

- Imaging Procedures with use an Imaging Procedure concept to represent the topic. These concepts will be further refined with a Method, Procedure site and (if appropriate) a laterality for those sites that are lateralizable.

See Editorial Rule: Presence and absence are a countable quantity

- Any statement that represents the Presence or implies Presence of a Topic will have a Result with an upperBound of infinite (inf), lowerBound of 1, and Measure.semantic of "Countable quantity".
- Any statement that represents the Absence or implies Absence of a Topic will have a Result with an upperBound of 0, lowerBound of 0, and Measure.semantic of "Countable quantity".




Diabetes Mellitus Type 2 Present.

Figure 3.1. Diabetes Mellitus Present ANF Example

In the Diabetes Mellitus type 2 example above, the Topic is an Observation procedure with a Has focus of Diabetes mellitus type 2. To represent that it is present, the Result is a lowerBound of 1, an upperBound of infinite (inf), and a measureSemantic of "Countable quantity". To see a more detailed representation see the tabular form here: [Section D.1.4, "Condition Present"](#)


See Editorial Rule: Presence and absence are a countable quantity



Diabetes Mellitus Type 2 Absent.

Figure 3.2. Diabetes Mellitus Type 2 Absent ANF Example

In the Diabetes Mellitus Type 2 Absent example, the topic is the same as Diabetes Mellitus Type 2 Present example. The difference is in the Result which is represented as an upperBound and lowerBound of zero with the same measureSemantic. To see a more detailed representation see the tabular form here: [Section D.1.5, “Condition Not Present”](#)



Dot Blot Hemorrhage Present.

Figure 3.3. Dot Blot Hemorrhage Present ANF Example

To see a more detailed representation see the tabular form here: [Section D.1.7, “Dot Blot Hemorrhage Present”](#)


3.1.1.2. Test/Screening or Procedure and Resultant Value

See Editorial Rule: Results are always a ranged quantity

- Results are always a Measure, which is a ranged quantity. Measure includes both a numeric interval along with a Measure Semantic specified as a Logical Expression.
- If a Result is intended to represent a numeric result then the upperBound and lowerBound would be populated with the appropriate numeric values and the Measure Semantic would indicate the unit of measure.

See Editorial Rule: Techniques are inseparable from the topic

- A technique must be true within the duration of the performance.
- A technique is inseparable from the topic and cannot be expressed as a stand-alone clinical statement.
- A technique is a device used, a method applied, or a temporary state in which the patient was actively placed during performance of the action.




Pulse Rate 68 bpm, Taken by Pulse Oximeter.

Figure 3.4. Pulse Rate ANF Example

The Pulse Rate example above utilizes a technique, the pulse oximeter device, and contains a resultant value of 68 beats/minute. Since a Result is represented with an upperBound and lowerBound they are both represented as 68 in this case. To see a more detailed representation see the tabular form here: [Section D.1.2, “Pulse Rate Measurement”](#)


See Editorial Rule: [Prerequisites must be separated from the topic](#)

- A prerequisite is separable from the topic and can be expressed as a stand-alone clinical statement
- A prerequisite is a state that must exist before something else can happen or be done. Prerequisites are part of the details under which a procedure is being performed. The state must exist prior to the performance of the action.




Systolic Blood Pressure 120 mmHg, Taken on Right Brachial Artery, Using BP Cuff Adult Size, Patient in Sitting Position for at Least 5 Minutes, Urinated Not More Than 30 Minutes Prior to Measurement.

Figure 3.5. Systolic Blood Pressure with Associated Statements ANF Example



Patient in Sitting Position for at Least 5 Minutes.


Figure 3.6. Systolic Blood Pressure Sitting Position Associated ANF Statement Example



Urinated Not More Than 30 Minutes Prior to Measurement.

Figure 3.7. Systolic Blood Pressure Urination Associated ANF Statement Example


The systolic blood pressure example above not only includes a technique of using an adult sized cuff, but also includes two prerequisites that are represented as separate associated ANF Statements. In the Associated Statements we see examples of Results having a range of values using the upperBound and lowerBound. To see a more detailed representation see the tabular form here: [Section D.1.1, “Blood Pressure Measurement”](#)



Three Dot Blot Hemorrhages.

Figure 3.8. Three Dot Blot Hemorrhages ANF Example

To see a more detailed representation see the tabular form here: [Section D.1.6, “Three Dot Blot Hemorrhages”](#)



Positive Screen for Fall Risk.


Figure 3.9. Positive Screen for Fall Risk ANF Example

See Editorial Rule: Separate compound topics

- For the purposes of ANF, a statement is a request or performance of an action that should exist independently. Thus, if a compound topic contains two topics that could each exist separately, then they should be divided into separate ANF Statements. These independent ANF Statements can then be associated with each other as associated statements.
- For example, "Negative screen for PTSD and depression", contains two separate ANF Statements that would then be associated to each other. However, if the narrative represents two or more actions that are performed as a single activity at the same time without the need for stopping the action, then a single topic would be used. For example, "Lumbar/Thoracic Spine CT" would be represented with a single topic as it represents a single activity that is performed at the same time even though a Lumbar CT and a Thoracic CT could be done separately.


See Editorial Rule: Related statements should be associated

- Use an associated statement when it is important for the interpretation of one statement that the other statements were observed, performed, or requested. Also, if there is some implicitness that the two statements are related (pleural empyema with fistula) or that they are unrelated (Akinetic seizure without atonia) then the two statements should be associated.



Negative Screen for PTSD.

Figure 3.10. Negative Screen for PTSD ANF Example



Negative Screen for Depression.


Figure 3.11. Negative Screen for Depression ANF Example

3.1.1.3. Administering a Medication or Other Substance

See Editorial Rule: Purpose indicates the reason for a request

- The purpose is why an action was requested. The purpose of the topic is typically some type of therapeutic intent, diagnostic intent, or both. There can be more than one therapeutic intent and diagnostic intent.

See Editorial Rule: Topics are always an action




Patient Took One Acetaminophen 500 mg Tablet by Mouth for Pain.

Figure 3.12. Administration of Medication ANF Example

In the medication example above a purpose is specified using Pain control which has a focus of pain. The Topic is built using Administration of substance with a Direct substance specifying the pharmaceutical product and a Route of Administration specifying Oral.

3.1.1.4. Provision of Educational Materials

See Editorial Rule: Topics are always an action



Patient was Provided with Educational Material on Diabetes.


Figure 3.13. Provision of Educational Material ANF Example

In this example, the concept Provision of educational material is used with a Has focus of Diabetes mellitus.

3.1.1.5. Other States or Specific Characteristics That Are Clinically Relevant

See Editorial Rule: Subject of information is used to represent family and donor history

- The subjectOfInformation is used to represent who the statement is about. This is normally the patient (Subject of record) unless explicitly stated otherwise, for example Mother, Sibling, Donor, etc.



Family History of Breast Cancer.

Figure 3.14. Family History ANF Example

In the Family history of breast cancer example we see that the Family history is represented by the Subject of information with a value of Person in the family.


See Editorial Rule: Normal Range can be specified for a result

- In PerformanceCircumstance, normalRange is used to flag a result with coded values such as 'low', 'normal', high', and 'critical'.

See Editorial Rule: HealthRisk indicates the clinical risk of the result

- In PerformanceCircumstance, healthRisk is used to flag a result with coded values such as 'low', 'normal', high', and 'critical'.

3.1.1.6. Normal Range Information or Health Risk Specified



Systolic Blood Pressure 180 mmHg, Normal Range (90-120), Health Risk Critical.

Figure 3.15. Systolic Blood Pressure with Normal Range and Health Risk ANF Example

Systolic Blood Pressure for adults has a normal range of 90-120 and is represented in the normalRange. Systolic Blood pressure above 180 would represent a critical health risk and is represented in the healthRisk.

3.1.2. Request Clinical Statements

A Request for Action clinical statement describes a request made by a clinician. Most of the times, but not always, the object of the request (e.g., lab test, medication order) will be fulfilled by someone other than the clinician (e.g., lab technician, pharmacist) making the request. All information about the request will be documented in this clinical statement, including information about details relating to the request, such as patient must fast for 12 hours before having a lipids blood test.

Examples of Request clinical statements:

- Request for Rheumatoid factor 1 time routine
- Request for X-ray chest to evaluate for heart failure
- Cardiology referral
- Ribavirin 200 mg capsule oral, take 2 capsules every morning
- Advised to participate in tobacco cessation counseling once a week.


3.1.2.1. Request Examples

See Editorial Rule: Timing - past, present, or future

See Editorial Rule: Topics are always an action

See Editorial Rule: Priority defaults to routine for a request

- Priority is used to represent the priority for which a request is to be carried out. By default a Request will be considered "routine" unless otherwise specified.




Rheumatoid Factor 1 Time Routine.

Figure 3.16. Laboratory Request ANF Example

The Laboratory Request example above shows how the topic is built using a laboratory procedure concept, with no refinements in this case. It also has a Priority of Routine as stated in the narrative description.


See Editorial Rule: Topics are always an action



X-ray Chest to Evaluate for Heart Failure.

Figure 3.17. Imaging Request ANF Example

The Imaging Request example above is built using a subtype of image procedure concept and includes a Purpose to record why the procedure is being done.




Cardiology Referral.

Figure 3.18. Referral Request ANF Example

See Editorial Rule: Topics are always an action

See Editorial Rule: Repetition is used to request multiple occurrences of a topic


- Repetition is used to represent when an action is requested for more than a single occurrence.
- Repetition is an optional component for a RequestCircumstance and contains five Measures that are used to further define the parameters of the Repetition:
 - *periodDuration*: This required field is used to represent how long a repetition should persist. If it is not specified, a default value of [0,inf) will be used. e.g. for 3 weeks
 - *periodStart*: This required field is used to represent when a repeated action should begin. If it is not specified, a default value of [0,inf) will be used. e.g. NOW
 - *eventSeparation*: This required field is used to represent how long between actions. If it is not specified, a default value of [0,inf) will be used. e.g. for 2 weeks
 - *eventFrequency*: This required field is used to represent how often the action should occur. If it is not specified, a default value of [0,inf) will be used. e.g. 3 times per week
 - *eventDuration*: This is an optional field that is used to represent how long every action should last.



Ribavirin 200 mg Capsule Oral, Take 2 Capsules Every Morning.

Figure 3.19. Medication Request ANF Example

The Medication request example represents one of the more complicated ANF Statements that includes not only the Topic, but also the Repetition information for completing the request.



Advised to Participate in Tobacco Cessation Counseling Once a Week.

Figure 3.20. Counseling Request ANF Example

In this example we see Repetition used only to define the eventFrequency while the other Repetition information is defaulted to [0,inf) Unit of time.

4. Methodology—ANF Design Principles and Rules

4.1. ANF Design Principles

As an overarching principle we favor the simpler, consistent model over more complex models that allow for multiple inconsistent representations. As such, the following principles have been used when designing the ANF model:

- A. **Overall Model Simplicity:** In cases where different principles collide, we shall favor simplicity of the entire system over simplicity in one area of the system.
- B. **Convention Over Configuration:** Convention over configuration is a design paradigm used by frameworks that decreases the number of decisions that a developer using the framework is required to make, without necessarily losing flexibility because conventions can be overridden when necessary.
- C. **Model Consistency:** Patterns should allow the consistent representation of information that is commonly shared across models. For instance, attribution and participation information should be captured consistently. Failure to do so forces implementers to develop heuristics to capture and normalize attribution information that is represented or extended differently in different classes (e.g., FHIR).
- D. **No Semantic Overloading:** Semantic overloading occurs when a model attribute's meaning changes entirely, depending on context. While the refinement of the semantics of an attribute in a subclass is acceptable, a change of meaning is problematic. For instance, in FHIR, the Composition class defines an attribute called Subject. In some subclasses, the attribute may be the entity that this composition refers to (e.g., the patient in a medical record). In other cases, it is the topic being discussed by the composition (e.g., a medication orderable catalog).
- E. **Assumption-free:** Implied semantics must be surfaced explicitly in the model.
- F. **Composition Over Inheritance:** Composition over inheritance (or composite reuse principle) is the principle that classes should achieve polymorphic behavior and code reuse by their composition (by containing those instances of other classes that implement the desired functionality) rather than inheritance from a base or parent class.

To favor composition over inheritance is a design principle that gives the design higher flexibility. It is more natural to build business-domain classes out of various components than trying to find commonality between them and creating a family tree.

Initial design is simplified by identifying system object behaviors in separate interfaces instead of creating a hierarchical relationship to distribute behaviors among business-domain classes via inheritance. This approach more easily accommodates future requirements changes that would otherwise require a complete restructuring of business-domain classes in the inheritance model.
- G. **ANF Clinical Statements Represent the Minimum Disjoint Set:** Analysis Normal Form (ANF) clinical statements represent the minimum disjoint set of statement topic, result, and circumstance and may not be further specified.
- H. **Clinical Statement Model Stability:** Stable means that the model can still meet unanticipated requirements without having to change. It is not acceptable to change the model every time a new way to administer a drug or to treat a condition is identified. By representing these types of potentially dynamic

concerns in the terminology expressions, as opposed to static fields in a class structure, we do not have to change the model every time something new is discovered. A design imperative is anticipating breakdowns, and providing a space for action when they occur. [11]

In some regards, in this context “stable” means “not brittle.” A model easily broken by changes that someone could anticipate is one possible definition of brittle. A stable model is critical in the phase of a known changing landscape. We do that by isolating areas of anticipated change into a dynamic data structure. That dynamic data structure may also be immutable in an object that represents a clinical statement.

- I. **Reusability:** Architectural patterns should encourage class reusability where possible. Reusability may further refine encapsulation when composition is considered.
- J. **No False Dichotomies:** Dichotomies are created when model fields are not completely disjoint (mutually exclusive), such as allowing family history to be represented in the topic field in addition to the subject of information field. False dichotomies lead to arbitrary classification rules and result in ambiguity based on different assumptions about the domain. False dichotomies must be eliminated by ensuring that fields in the model are mutually exclusive.
- K. **Model Symmetry:** Symmetric models are more consistent, and easier to comprehend and use.
- L. **Iterative development and validation of model using use cases:** ANF has been developed using an iterative approach evaluating the model with narrative use cases. Examples of narratives used to evaluate the model can be found in the [Appendix](#).

4.2. Shared Modeling Guidelines

All ANF statements share some common model components. The following modeling guidelines can be used to properly model a narrative into the appropriate components of a single statement or a statement that has multiple associated statements. For the purposes of ANF, a statement is a request for—or performance of—an action that has to be able to exist on its own. Therefore a narrative would be separated into multiple clinical statements if it contains multiple requests or performance of actions that could exist on their own.




Figure 4.1. Shared Modeling Guideline Decision Tree

Editorial Rule: Techniques are inseparable from the topic

- A technique must be true within the duration of the performance.
- A technique is inseparable from the topic and cannot be expressed as a stand-alone clinical statement.

- A technique is a device used, a method applied, or a temporary state in which the patient was actively placed during performance of the action.

Editorial Rule: Prerequisites must be separated from the topic

- A prerequisite is separable from the topic and can be expressed as a stand-alone clinical statement
- A prerequisite is a state that must exist before something else can happen or be done. Prerequisites are part of the details under which a procedure is being performed. The state must exist prior to the performance of the action.

Editorial Rule: Subject of information is used to represent family and donor history

- The subjectOfInformation is used to represent who the statement is about. This is normally the patient (Subject of record) unless explicitly stated otherwise, for example Mother, Sibling, Donor, etc.

Editorial Rule: Purpose indicates the reason for a request

- The purpose is why an action was requested. The purpose of the topic is typically some type of therapeutic intent, diagnostic intent, or both. There can be more than one therapeutic intent and diagnostic intent.

4.3. Request for Action Guidelines




Figure 4.2. Request for Action Modeling Guideline Decision Tree

Editorial Rule: Timing - past, present, or future

- For a Performance of Action, the Timing can represent a time in the past or a current time. If a history of a performance of action is to be represented in ANF the Timing will be for a time in the past prior to the statement. Otherwise the Timing will be represented with the current time of the statement.
- For a Request of Action, the Timing will always represent a future time.

Editorial Rule: Participants can be specified or requested

- A Performance of action can specify participants using participant in PerformanceCircumstance.
- A Request for action can specify requested participants using requestedParticipant in RequestCircumstance.

Editorial Rule: Priority defaults to routine for a request

- Priority is used to represent the priority for which a request is to be carried out. By default a Request will be considered "routine" unless otherwise specified.

Editorial Rule: Topics are always an action

- The particulars of how topics—and other statement fields—are modeled as a Terminology Knowledge layer concern, not a Statement Layer concern. The Statement Layer does require that the Terminology Expression fields in a statement are disjoint: There should be no confusion—or creation of false dichotomies. There should be one, and only one, place to put each type of information in a terminology expression. For example, the Statement Layer defines a particular place to represent the subject of information. Therefore, the terminology layer must not allow the subject of information to be redundantly—and possibly contradictory—represented in a topic expression (such as would be the case if "maternal history of diabetes" where an allowed topic expression). The Statement Layer requires that the topic represent an Action as a code or expression according to the rules of the terminology layer, and that the rules of the terminology layer enforce a disjointness of between different types of terminology expressions. Here we present a starting point for what the Terminology Layer editorial rules may look like, based on current SNOMED CT practice.
- SNOMED CT can accommodate this requirement for simple observations by using Observation procedure to represent the topic (or other types of procedures when appropriate, such as the administration of a medication). In SNOMED CT examples, the Observation procedure specifies a Has focus attribute linking it to the Clinical Finding or Disorder that it is being observed. The observation procedure can also be further refined by adding attributes in the terminology model, including Method, Procedure site - Direct, (if appropriate) Laterality, and Using device.
- Medication administrations will use an Administration of substance concept to represent the topic. All Administration of substance concepts will be refined with the substance and dose form and strength being requested. If Route of administration exists, then it will also be added.
- Laboratory tests will use a Laboratory Procedure concept to represent the topic. These concepts can be further refined.
- Imaging Procedures will use an Imaging Procedure concept to represent the topic. These concepts will be further refined with a Method, Procedure site and (if appropriate) a laterality for those sites that are lateralizable.

Editorial Rule: Repetition is used to request multiple occurrences of a topic

- Repetition is used to represent when an action is requested for more than a single occurrence.

- Repetition is an optional component for a RequestCircumstance and contains five Measures that are used to further define the parameters of the Repetition:
 - *periodDuration*: This required field is used to represent how long a repetition should persist. If it is not specified, a default value of [0,inf) will be used. e.g. for 3 weeks
 - *periodStart*: This required field is used to represent when a repeated action should begin. If it is not specified, a default value of [0,inf) will be used. e.g. NOW
 - *eventSeparation*: This required field is used to represent how long between actions. If it is not specified, a default value of [0,inf) will be used. e.g. for 2 weeks
 - *eventFrequency*: This required field is used to represent how often the action should occur. If it is not specified, a default value of [0,inf) will be used. e.g. 3 times per week
 - *eventDuration*: This is an optional field that is used to represent how long every action should last.

Editorial Rule: A desired result can be specified in a request

- A desired result can be specified as a Measure using requestedResult in RequestCircumstance.
- If a requestedResult is specified, the appropriate upperBound and lowerBound is specified with the correct Measure.semantic.
- If a requestedResult is not specified in the request, an upperBound and lowerBound of 1 is used with a Measure.semantic of ISO 8601 after statement time.

4.4. Performance of Action Guidelines




Figure 4.3. Performance of Action Modeling Guideline Decision Tree

Editorial Rule: Timing - past, present, or future

- For a Performance of Action, the Timing can represent a time in the past or a current time. If a history of a performance of action is to be represented in ANF the Timing will be for a time in the past prior to the statement. Otherwise the Timing will be represented with the current time of the statement.
- For a Request of Action, the Timing will always represent a future time.

Editorial Rule: Topics are always an action

Editorial Rule: Status indicates the state of a result

- The status of a Performance of action can be specified with concepts such as (on hold, needed, rejected, etc).

Editorial Rule: HealthRisk indicates the clinical risk of the result

- In PerformanceCircumstance, healthRisk is used to flag a result with coded values such as 'low', 'normal', 'high', and 'critical'.

Editorial Rule: Normal Range can be specified for a result

- In PerformanceCircumstance, normalRange is used to flag a result with coded values such as 'low', 'normal', 'high', and 'critical'.

Editorial Rule: Results are always a ranged quantity

- Results are always a Measure, which is a ranged quantity. Measure includes both a numeric interval along with a Measure Semantic specified as a Logical Expression.
- If a Result is intended to represent a numeric result then the upperBound and lowerBound would be populated with the appropriate numeric values and the Measure Semantic would indicate the unit of measure.

4.5. Editorial Rules

Editorial Rule 4.1. Performance versus request

- ANF Statements must be either a Performance of an action or a Request for an action.
- A Performance may include the passive observation of a phenomenon related to patients and their health status or family history, and may also include active interventions, such as providing education or administering medications or documenting that a patient is participating in exercise to improve their overall health status.
- A Request may include requests for clinical testing, active interventions, future goals, or consultation with other providers.

Editorial Rule 4.2. Topics are always an action

- The particulars of how topics—and other statement fields—are modeled as a Terminology Knowledge layer concern, not a Statement Layer concern. The Statement Layer does require that the Terminology Expression fields in a statement are disjoint: There should be no confusion—or creation of false dichotomies. There should be one, and only one, place to put each type of information in a terminology expression. For example, the Statement Layer defines a particular place to represent the subject of information. Therefore, the terminology layer must not allow the subject of information to be redundantly—and possibly contradictory—represented in a topic expression (such as would be the case if "maternal history of diabetes" where an allowed topic expression). The Statement Layer requires that the topic represent an Action as a code or expression according to the rules of the terminology layer, and that the rules of the terminology layer enforce a disjointness of between different types of terminology expressions. Here we present a starting point for what the Terminology Layer editorial rules may look like, based on current SNOMED CT practice.
- SNOMED CT can accommodate this requirement for simple observations by using Observation procedure to represent the topic (or other types of procedures when appropriate, such as the administration of a medication). In SNOMED CT examples, the Observation procedure specifies a Has focus attribute linking it to the Clinical Finding or Disorder that it is being observed. The observation procedure can also be further refined by adding attributes in the terminology model, including Method, Procedure site - Direct, (if appropriate) Laterality, and Using device.
- Medication administrations will use an Administration of substance concept to represent the topic. All Administration of substance concepts will be refined with the substance and dose form and strength being requested. If Route of administration exists, then it will also be added.
- Laboratory tests will use a Laboratory Procedure concept to represent the topic. These concepts can be further refined.
- Imaging Procedures will use an Imaging Procedure concept to represent the topic. These concepts will be further refined with a Method, Procedure site and (if appropriate) a laterality for those sites that are lateralizable.

Editorial Rule 4.3. Timing - past, present, or future

- For a Performance of Action, the Timing can represent a time in the past or a current time. If a history of a performance of action is to be represented in ANF the Timing will be for a time in the past prior to the statement. Otherwise the Timing will be represented with the current time of the statement.
- For a Request of Action, the Timing will always represent a future time.

Editorial Rule 4.4. Results are always a ranged quantity

- Results are always a Measure, which is a ranged quantity. Measure includes both a numeric interval along with a Measure Semantic specified as a Logical Expression.
- If a Result is intended to represent a numeric result then the upperBound and lowerBound would be populated with the appropriate numeric values and the Measure Semantic would indicate the unit of measure.

Editorial Rule 4.5. Presence and absence are a countable quantity

- Any statement that represents the Presence or implies Presence of a Topic will have a Result with an upperBound of infinite (inf), lowerBound of 1, and Measure.semantic of "Countable quantity".
- Any statement that represents the Absence or implies Absence of a Topic will have a Result with an upperBound of 0, lowerBound of 0, and Measure.semantic of "Countable quantity".

Editorial Rule 4.6. Separate compound topics

- For the purposes of ANF, a statement is a request or performance of an action that should exist independently. Thus, if a compound topic contains two topics that could each exist separately, then they should be divided into separate ANF Statements. These independent ANF Statements can then be associated with each other as associated statements.
- For example, "Negative screen for PTSD and depression", contains two separate ANF Statements that would then be associated to each other. However, if the narrative represents two or more actions that are performed as a single activity at the same time without the need for stopping the action, then a single topic would be used. For example, "Lumbar/Thoracic Spine CT" would be represented with a single topic as it represents a single activity that is performed at the same time even though a Lumbar CT and a Thoracic CT could be done separately.

Editorial Rule 4.7. Techniques are inseparable from the topic

- A technique must be true within the duration of the performance.
- A technique is inseparable from the topic and cannot be expressed as a stand-alone clinical statement.
- A technique is a device used, a method applied, or a temporary state in which the patient was actively placed during performance of the action.

Editorial Rule 4.8. Prerequisites must be separated from the topic

- A prerequisite is separable from the topic and can be expressed as a stand-alone clinical statement
- A prerequisite is a state that must exist before something else can happen or be done. Prerequisites are part of the details under which a procedure is being performed. The state must exist prior to the performance of the action.

Editorial Rule 4.9. Related statements should be associated

- Use an associated statement when it is important for the interpretation of one statement that the other statements were observed, performed, or requested. Also, if there is some implicitness that the two statements are related (pleural empyema with fistula) or that they are unrelated (Akinetic seizure without atonia) then the two statements should be associated.

Editorial Rule 4.10. Subject of information is used to represent family and donor history

- The subjectOfInformation is used to represent who the statement is about. This is normally the patient (Subject of record) unless explicitly stated otherwise, for example Mother, Sibling, Donor, etc.

Editorial Rule 4.11. Status indicates the state of a result

- The status of a Performance of action can be specified with concepts such as (on hold, needed, rejected, etc).

Editorial Rule 4.12. HealthRisk indicates the clinical risk of the result

- In PerformanceCircumstance, healthRisk is used to flag a result with coded values such as 'low', 'normal', 'high', and 'critical'.

Editorial Rule 4.13. Normal Range can be specified for a result

- In PerformanceCircumstance, normalRange is used to flag a result with coded values such as 'low', 'normal', 'high', and 'critical'.

Editorial Rule 4.14. Participants can be specified or requested

- A Performance of action can specify participants using participant in PerformanceCircumstance.
- A Request for action can specify requested participants using requestedParticipant in RequestCircumstance.

Editorial Rule 4.15. Purpose indicates the reason for a request

- The purpose is why an action was requested. The purpose of the topic is typically some type of therapeutic intent, diagnostic intent, or both. There can be more than one therapeutic intent and diagnostic intent.

Editorial Rule 4.16. Priority defaults to routine for a request

- Priority is used to represent the priority for which a request is to be carried out. By default a Request will be considered "routine" unless otherwise specified.

Editorial Rule 4.17. Repetition is used to request multiple occurrences of a topic

- Repetition is used to represent when an action is requested for more than a single occurrence.
- Repetition is an optional component for a RequestCircumstance and contains five Measures that are used to further define the parameters of the Repetition:
 - *periodDuration*: This required field is used to represent how long a repetition should persist. If it is not specified, a default value of [0,inf) will be used. e.g. for 3 weeks
 - *periodStart*: This required field is used to represent when a repeated action should begin. If it is not specified, a default value of [0,inf) will be used. e.g. NOW
 - *eventSeparation*: This required field is used to represent how long between actions. If it is not specified, a default value of [0,inf) will be used. e.g. for 2 weeks
 - *eventFrequency*: This required field is used to represent how often the action should occur. If it is not specified, a default value of [0,inf) will be used. e.g. 3 times per week
 - *eventDuration*: This is an optional field that is used to represent how long every action should last.

Editorial Rule 4.18. A desired result can be specified in a request

- A desired result can be specified as a Measure using requestedResult in RequestCircumstance.
- If a requestedResult is specified, the appropriate upperBound and lowerBound is specified with the correct Measure.semantic.
- If a requestedResult is not specified in the request, an upperBound and lowerBound of 1 is used with a Measure.semantic of ISO 8601 after statement time.

5. Putting it Together: Normalization and Transformation

Normalization of *clinical statements* is defined as "the ability to identify every representational format that confers the same meaning as being equivalent (i.e., unambiguous representation)." [12]

5.1. Data Structures

Currently, the standard is to define detailed clinical models using different data structures for different domains of clinical statements. For example, *FHIR* independently defines the resources for Conditions, Observations, Diagnosis, Procedure, Goal, Medication Administration, Medication Request, etc. Some implementations, such as *FHIR*, explicitly define the property names for the parts of each data structure tree and other formalisms such as *BMM/ADL* and *CEML* use a form of key-value pairing to genericise the property naming of the data structure tree. But in all these cases, the fact remains that the resulting structure of the tree still remains different for different domains of clinical statements. Thus, computation and analysis of data instances, that conform to these models, requires a prior understanding of the tree structure for each domain.

ANF seeks to simplify the complexity that currently exists in detailed clinical models. As its name suggests, Analysis Normal Form provides one normalized data structure to describe clinical statements from all domains. *ANF* accomplishes this simplification by moving the complexity from static statement data structures to dynamic *pre-coordinated*, or *post-coordinated* terminology expressions, as defined by the Terminology Knowledge layer of the architecture.

5.2. Modeling Style

Another variation that currently exists is the allowed design choices which can be made by model authors. For example, a modeler may choose to model breath sounds, as 'breath sounds' with a coded result of 'rales', or as 'rales' with a result of 'present'. Currently, organizations try to minimize this type of variation by documenting design choice rules in modeling "style guides". For instance, a common style guide choice in the *CIMI Clinical Statement* model is to either use the *Assertion* style or the *Evaluation Result* style, and *CIMI* documents which types of clinical statement are best suited for each. Assignment of clinical statement types into these categories creates false dichotomies, since there are a myriad of examples where clinical statement types can readily fit in both categories.


ANF's approach is to solve the problem by eliminating the need to make choices between overlapping statement types. *ANF* seeks to minimize this variation by only allowing quantitative results. This eliminates the choice between Evaluation style versus Assertion style clinical statements as coded results are not possible.

5.3. Transformation to ANF

The previous sections have described the variation that can exist in the data structure and modeling style of a single standard. Moreover, this variation is significantly compounded when simultaneously using data from multiple standards, such as when receiving data from multiple institutions.

Analysis Normal Form can act as a transformation target to normalize these disparate representations of clinical statements, shown in [Figure 5.1](#). Normalization implies the ability to recognize all representations that express the same meaning as being algorithmically equivalent.

To be clear, the transformation discussed is a data instance to data instance transformation. An example could be John Doe's Systolic Blood Pressure measurement taken on June 4, 2019 represented as a FHIR Observation instance, which is then transformed to an ANF instance representing this same data. This is not to be confused with a detailed clinical model transformation between two formalisms, such as an *ISO DCM* for Systolic Blood Pressure transformed to a FHIR profile for Systolic Blood Pressure.



Various isosemantic representations of statement models can be brought together into Analysis Normal Form

Figure 5.1. Transformation to ANF

Transformation, in this case, is not a simple endeavor that one can hope to automate across domains of clinical statements or even within a single domain of clinical statements. As presented, it will involve navigating disparate data structure trees and include variable representations to then generate a well-formed terminology expression. It is most likely possible to target subdomains for consistent transformation, such as all quantitative laboratory results, but in some cases, it may be that each detailed clinical model needs its own unique transformation.

Potential areas of difficulty during transformation

- One source instance will frequently be transformed to many ANF instances
- Implied clinical meaning of some data structure and bound terminology must be transformed into complex post-coordinated SNOMED CT expression for inclusion as *ANF Topic*

Currently, there are three basic categories of errors that might be associated with attempts at normalizing clinical statement representation. The first is error associated with normalization of content of the termin-

ology; the second is error associated with normalization of the semantics of the terminology; and, third are errors that result from ambiguous or misleading interaction between the structured clinical input and presentation of compound terminology to clinician end-users.

5.4. Transformation Languages and Architecture

A number of options exist for expressing transformation logic and for executing the transformation on specific instances of clinical data for normalization into ANF. These range from transformation languages to expensive middleware options commonly used in healthcare interfaces. The suitability of the chosen language highly depends on the format of the source data, and the quality and accuracy of the transformation is left to the transformation author. One option described here is Model Driven Message Interoperability (MDMI), which is an architecture for transformation that assists in producing semantically accurate transformations.

5.4.1. XSLT

XSLT is a W3C-standard language for the transformation of structured data. [13] XSLT transformation scripts take as input any valid XML document and produce as output an ASCII-formatted document (including XML, HTML, other formatting languages, free text, etc.). The XSLT language specifies transformations through declarative, rule-based commands (see below).

XSLT is widely used in modern information processing, including in health care applications. Numerous XSLT transformation engines exist, including commercial and open-source versions. These implementations are mature, stable, and high-performance, and are available as runtime libraries or embedded in XSLT authoring/editing applications. Excellent documentation and training are available for XSLT.

XSLT scripts operate over source “trees” containing the structured contents of parsed XML documents. These trees contain as their nodes the various constructs of specific XML documents, i.e., the named elements, attributes, and text values that appear in the documents, and upon parsing, becomes a source tree for XSLT transformations.

XSLT uses the sub-language “XPath” to reference portions of the XML source tree for purposes of navigating the tree and selecting specific parts of it to translate. [14] XPath is essentially a query language for identifying and retrieving XML sub-trees that match specified criteria.

The actual transformation logic in XSLT scripts is specified as a series of “templates”. Each template matches to a specified sub-part of the source tree and specifies what output will be generated for that sub-part. Templates are generally called from within other templates via a declarative template-matching process, and a recursive traversal and transformation of the input tree occurs through this template-invocation model. The transformation logic within templates may include various conditional, branching, and formatting constructs, as well as calls to external functions written in various programming languages (such as Java).

XSLT is effective in representing and executing the transformation logic needed for clinical translations. In general, XSLT provides various advantages, as well as limitations, for this task.

Advantages

- A powerful language
- Declarative – automated matching of templates to data
- Extensible via extension functions and external function calls
- Many mature implementations
- Good tooling (e.g., Eclipse plugin, XMLSpy)
- Good documentation

Limitations

- Transformation specifications are verbose and hard to read/understand/debug/maintain
- Transformations are entirely syntactic
- Limited to XML input – instances rendered in other formats cannot be translated

5.4.2. FHIR Mapping Language

The FHIR mapping language (FML) [15] is a relatively new, bespoke transformation language specifically designed to transform HL7 FHIR resources to alternative representations, including different FHIR resources, C/CDE documents, etc. The mapping language was created by Graham Grieve as a specification of the QVT framework for model-transformation languages (see [Section 5.4.3, “QVT”](#)).

Conceptually, FML is similar to XSLT in that it (a) consists of declarative rules that are automatically matched to input data, (b) includes a sub-language (“FHIRPath”) to reference parts of source parse trees, and (c) has the ability to reference external functions written in different languages. There are also notable differences between FML and XSLT. The source input of FML is not limited to XML documents, but may include any object models and rendering syntaxes conformant with *OMG’s Meta Object Facility (MOF)* language. [16] MOF is a general formalism for representing object models as directed acyclic graphs (DAGs), and MOF-compliant models can use various syntactic constructs to represent the classes, attributes, and attribute values of such graphs.

Hence, in FML, there is no built-in notion of source trees containing XML “elements”, “attributes”, “comments”, “namespaces”, etc. In fact, FML transformation rules do not specify any target syntax for inputs or outputs, just the general concepts of named classes, class members, and member values. This flexibility would allow transformation source inputs used in the normalization to ANF to be represented in different formats than XML, were that to be deemed preferable. For example, instances rendered using JSON, ODIN, or ASN1 syntax could be the inputs of FML transformations.

The output of an FML transformation is not a text-rendered document (unlike XSLT), but an internally stored DAG consistent with the specified output model. Subsequently, the DAG may be rendered in any number of syntaxes, including XML, JSON, or the tables and fields of a relational database.

The FHIR Mapping Language may also be effective in representing and executing the transformation logic needed for normalization to ANF. As with XSLT, however, there exist certain trade-offs in its use.

Advantages

- Support for input formats other than XML
- Transformation logic produces semantic DAGs, which can be subsequently rendered in a variety of syntaxes.
- The mapping specifications are more concise and easier to read/understand than XSLT

Limitations

- Inputs/outputs other than FHIR *logical models* currently require additional custom programming
- Only XML and JSON are currently supported as output syntaxes without custom programming
- Only one implementation to date (as a library)
- Limited tools for authoring/editing transformation scripts
- Limited sources of documentation
- Few knowledgeable programmers

5.4.3. QVT

A third alternative is to develop a new transformation language customized to support the requirements of a normalization to ANF, based on the QVT language used to develop the FHIR Mapping Language.

QVT [17] is a general model-transformation framework and language developed by the Object Management Group. It includes both an imperative (“QVT-O”) and a declarative (“QVT-R”) version, and offers considerable flexibility in defining the constructs of purpose-specific transformation languages. Although QVT is intended for the transformation of data *models* rather than data instances, the FHIR Mapping Language shows that it can be applied to the latter task as well.

A number of implementations of QVT exist as open-source and commercial software offerings. These include:

- ATL (open source). Probably the most widely used and maintained of the available implementations. Includes a library of existing QVT transformations, to serve as examples and templates.
- Eclipse M2M Project (open source). An Eclipse project that includes authoring tools for QVT transformations, as well as various transformation engines (including the one from ATL).
- ModelMorf (proprietary)
- Others (see [17])

Advantages


- QVT is very abstract, which confers great flexibility and configurability to create custom transformation languages.

Limitations

- the abstractness also makes QVT quite difficult to understand and learn, and there are limited resources to assist in the learning process.

5.4.4. Model Driven Message Interoperability (MDMI)

MDMI is an Object Management Group Standard for the transformation of data in one format to data in another format. MDMI Standard is not a language. The MDMI Standard is a specification for addressing this problem and was developed by multiple domain experts. The specification contains two major sections: the MDMI Transformation Metamodel and the MDMI Semantic Element Exchange Repository (SEER).




The MDMI Transformation Metamodel.

Figure 5.2. MDMI Standard

The MDMI Transformation Metamodel is composed of a syntax model and a semantic model. The syntax model contains the syntactical representation of each data element in a format and the semantic model contains the semantic concept represented by the data element. The syntax model is used to compose a collection of semantic representations into a target file format or to decompose a source file into its semantic representations. The syntax model can be used for any format. XML, JSON, HL7 V.2, CVS, various EDI payment, and proprietary formats have been used.

The semantic model captures the semantic concepts in the format and the relationships between the semantic concepts in a format. Probably the most important relationship is the containership relationships. The semantic model of the MDMI is also used to capture other relationships and rules required to create unambiguous semantic representations. An example of this is a data element that can have multiple semantics concepts that must be disambiguated based on other values contained in format.

The MDMI SEER is a repository for the semantically unique concepts, called Business Elements, that are exchanged in healthcare transformations. One can view the MDMI SEER as a bag of unique, atomic semantic concepts exchanged, primarily driven by the *HL7 standards of v.2*, *CDA*, and *FHIR* that are used to exchange information. If there is a new semantic concept that does not exist in the SEER, then a new Business Element is simply added. Each MDMI Transformation Model uses the MDMI SEER to create an iso-semantic relationship with its own semantic concepts and a Business Element.



The MDMI Transformation Process

Figure 5.3. MDMI Transformation Process

There is a project underway in the OMG to extend the MDMI SEER. The Business Elements in the MDMI SEER are *pre-coordinated semantic concepts* represented in industry standard healthcare ontologies and terminologies. The project is using the ANF Clinical Statement Model as a Reference Model to develop a semantic model that can precisely define the meaning of the Business Element in a detailed, structured, unambiguous, computable formalism.

An open source implementation of MDMI started in the Open Healthcare Tools organization which built an MDMI compliant tooling for healthcare. The MDMI Open Source Project continues today in GitHub and has been and is being used in HL7 projects as well as in commercial implementations.

MDMI is a model driven approach. Having a formal model, the open source project has been able to develop tooling based on the MDMI model as well as leverage other modeling efforts. Examples are Information Models such as FHIR and the FHIM using the model driven MDHT tooling and Ontological Models such as ANF / *Solor*.

Advantages

- Any to Any transformations versus point to point language mappings allow reuse of transformation models for different use cases.
- It minimizes change. If one MDMI Model changes (e.g. FHIR 4 to FHIR 5), this does not require changes to other existing MDMI Models such as CCDA 2.1, HL7 V2.8, or a proprietary model.
- It simplifies development. Tooling exists to develop and maintain individual MDMI Models by SMEs who do not need to be developers. The scope of expertise is further reduced because the knowledge one needs to create a MDMI Model is primary to know what the data in their format means.
- It enables automation tooling for creating MDMI models, for creating computable artifacts, and generating reports.
- There are Open Source Models for HL7 formats as well as the MDMI tooling.

Limitations

- MDMI has limited experience with transformations of detailed clinical models.
- User Documentation of MDMI is lacking.
- The MDMI runtime tool is complex.

6. Pragmatic Usage and Next Steps

Like other *CIMI isosemantic models*, ANF is a *logical model* and therefore it may be implemented using relevant implementable models and technology (see [SAIF-CD](#)). Therefore, this project will expand on the use of ANF alongside preexisting information exchange HL7 standards (i.e. *HL7 V2 messaging*, *CDA documents*) and HL7 standards-based APIs (i.e., FHIR resources). In practice, ANF is applicable to systems normalizing or creating normalized data to support *Assertional* and *Procedural* knowledge (e.g. clinical alerts, workflow, data analysis, decision support). These need to aggregate data from many isosemantic source models into a single analysis format.

Implementers may use the logical model and methodology in this document to design software components, databases, or APIs that support reuse and analysis of treatment information captured using best practices (e.g. *CIMI models*) and exchanged using interoperability specifications required across the US (e.g. FHIR US Core, Consolidated CDA). Since information sharing already relies on a variety of clinical statement approaches and syntax representations, it will become necessary to create normalized instances of those clinical statements intended for reuse. Not all the data produced by a system is necessary for analysis; and, the ANF model—like other CIMI models—is focused on clinical information. ANF does not require a specific input form syntax, its focus is on implementations where data quality and semantics and information is aggregated from many and diverse sources.

The ANF logical model can be used to create practical implementation guidance (i.e. implementation guide, profiles, value sets based on standard terminology) and can be applied to design data analysis solutions. Implementation specifications include vocabulary bindings based on standard terminologies (e.g. SNOMED CT, LOINC, RxNorm) to support the Terminology layer of the *Knowledge Architecture*. For simplicity, SNOMED CT is used for all logical expressions and examples in this specification but ANF implementation may require LOINC or RxNorm as well.

6.1. ANF FHIR implementation


ANF is a logical model intended to represent any clinical data using a complete yet simple normal form. It allows other software modules to reuse the information and derive new knowledge from it. Examples of ANF's benefits include improved ability to (1) analyze the care that was delivered, (2) find out what type care leads to the best patient outcomes, and (3) use rules and business triggers to automate clinical decision and workflow steps. ANF could be used to design standards-based Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) optimized for a specific analysis purpose. ANF APIs may be implemented using FHIR resources, profiles, and extensions to access clinical decision support, clinical quality measures, and to support workflow automation by triggering reminders and clinical notifications.

ANF statements may be created from existing clinical statements and patient-entered data to support APIs intended for Analysis or to automate information derived from device measurements, clinician inputs, and patient-generated data.

6.1.1. Analysis API

The typical implementation of ANF will be a system that normalizes clinical information (e.g. FHIR, CDA documents) to be used by business and decision support rules. Healthcare enterprises may use middleware, standards-based transformation and terminology servers to normalize a variety of observations, orders, diagnoses, medications, procedure notes, and other interventions to a set of *Performance* or *Request* statements. Narrative clinical statements may not be immediately reducible to ANF and it may require natural language processing and other methods of augmentation and enhancement.

ANF-specific resources and implementation guidance can be tested during FHIR Connectathons to validate that the logical model outlined in this specification is suitable to data aggregation and supports the analysis objectives of researchers, before proposing them as new resources for future versions of FHIR and as extensions and profiles for current versions. Both approaches may be desirable.




ANF-based information can be used to create data warehouses and support data mining.

Figure 6.1. ANF-based FHIR API

6.1.2. Automated Data Analysis

ANF statements may be created as an outcome of evaluating device, clinician, patient-entered data (e.g. questionnaires) automatically and in near-real-time. For example, specific answers to a PHQ-9 screening tool along with previous assessments could trigger a specific type of follow-up screening regarding substance use treatment or further evaluation, consideration of Social Determinants of Health, or alert to a provider. While ANF statements are not intended as an input form, such statements could be automatically generated by learning EHR systems [18] using a combination of pre-existing clinical data, clinical guidelines/rules, medical device observation and patient-generated data. The promise of the Learning EHR system [18] is the ability to learn new knowledge from previous clinical statements and latest scientific developments. This approach is also conducive to tailoring treatment consistent with Precision Medicine [19] and reducing provider burden through automation.




ANF statements may be derived from other data inputs and combined to support near-real-time analysis.

Figure 6.2. Derived ANF Statements

6.2. Other platforms

Big data analytics, data mining, business intelligence, healthcare quality programs, registries etc. all require large data sets of consistent structure and semantics that can be analyzed and aggregated for the benefit of individual patients, to evaluate an organization, or to establish new facts.



Standards-based information may be normalized to ANF to be used for clinical decision support.

Figure 6.3. Data Mining using ANF statements

Interoperability standards sometimes pose challenges due to the use of synthetics/abstract data types that attempt to capture the complexity of healthcare data. ANF simplifies the statement structure by using a small set of primitive types (e.g. float, varchar, boolean) and a sophisticated terminology. Data warehousing and mining solutions rely on a consistent simple representation of data organized along facts and axes. ANF borrows from Database Normalization the idea that "normalization" reduces data redundancy and improves data integrity. The ANF logical model can be used to design "fact-based" dimensional schemas for databases which enables analysis of specific set of facts and dimensions, such as evaluation of outcomes associated with the use of a specific therapy, device, or medication.

7. Implications—Improving Patient Safety and Outcomes

ANF has implications on clinical data quality, *clinical decision support*, patient safety and population health because it promotes the reuse of information aggregated to derive new information about treatment quality, patient safety, and outcomes.

7.1. Improved Data Quality

Information systems record and manage clinical statements using a variety of standard or ad-hoc models and formats. However, analysis of clinical statements require consistency, not only at the format level (e.g. CDA, FHIR, V2), but also at the content and semantic levels (i.e. ANF, *CIMI model*, etc.). In most cases, the data quality is the greatest obstacle to analysis. Analysis Normal Form aims to minimize data quality challenges and provide a common format with semantic clarity to allow for a meaningful secondary uses of clinical data.

The design of ANF is based on research into data quality frameworks [20] that identified that information conformance, completeness, and plausibility are all necessary to analysis.

- **Conformance:** Conformance describes how well a system or implementation meets a specification. ANF provides a logical structure and constraints of clinical data for value conformance, relational conformance, and computational conformance irrespective of data representation (e.g. CDA, FHIR)
- **Value Conformance:** Value conformance seeks to determine if recorded data elements are in agreement with a predefined, constraint-driven data architecture. Internal data constraints are typically imposed by the *ANF Reference Model*
- **Relational Conformance:** Relational conformance seeks to determine if the recorded data elements are in agreement with additional information referenced by a *clinical statement*. An *ANF Statement* may reference other information about patients, practitioners, encounters, etc. to provide context to the topic and result recorded.
- **Computational Conformance:** Computational conformance seeks to determine if computations used to create derived values from existing variables yield the intended results either within a data set (Verification) or between data sets (Validation), when programs are based on identical specifications. Computational conformance focuses on the correctness of the output value of calculations against technical functional specifications. ANF highlights the measure in which an action, finding, or observation was either requested or performed to a common "measure" thus supporting the development of computational, assertional, and procedural predicates.
- **Completeness:** Completeness focuses on features that describe the frequencies of data attributes present in a data set without reference to data values. Completeness measures assess the absence of data at a single moment over time or when measured at multiple moments over time. ANF disambiguates the date a statement was made/asserted from the timing of the circumstances in which the underlying action, observation, or finding.
- **Plausibility:** Plausibility focuses on features that describe the believability or truthfulness of data values. For this category, plausibility is determined by a variable's value, when a value is placed within the context of another variable (i.e., two independent variables assessing the same construct), or a temporal sequence or state transition (e.g., patient follow-up treatment for a disease must be preceded by a corresponding diagnosis).

- **Uniqueness Plausibility:** The Uniqueness subcategory seeks to determine if objects (entities, observations, facts) appear multiple times in settings where they should not be duplicated or cannot be distinguished within a database (Verification) or when compared with an external reference (Validation). Duplication frequently occurs when disparate data streams that contain overlapping objects are combined. ANF provides the contextual data needed to de-duplicate clinical statement prior to analysis.
- **Atemporal Plausibility:** Atemporal Plausibility seeks to determine if observed data values, distributions, or densities agree with local or “common” knowledge (Verification) or from comparisons with external sources that are deemed to be trusted or relative gold standards (Validation). For example, in the case of systolic blood pressure, an independent verification of the value measured by a device is provided by the practitioner who conducts performance. ANF clinical statements support results that are evaluated based on a “reference range” of plausible values based on patient status, device-supported ranges, or human physiology.
- **Temporal Plausibility:** Temporal plausibility seeks to determine if time-varying variables change values as expected based on known temporal properties or across one or more external comparators or gold standards. Temporal properties that establish expectations in this subcategory include temporal stability (do values vary over time as expected), temporal continuity (do values persist over time as expected), state transitions (do sequences of events occur as expected), and temporal dependencies between time-varying variables.

7.2. Enhanced Clinical Decision Support

A 2012 Literature Review commissioned by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) found evidence showing that CDS had positive impact on process measures and increasing user knowledge relevant to a medical condition. [21]

Additional studies show that well-executed CDS can [21] :

- reduce adverse drug-drug interaction events and medication errors;
- decrease unnecessary lab testing;
- reduce cardiovascular risk in patients with type 2 diabetes;
- improve practitioner performance;
- increase cardiovascular disease risk assessment in routine primary care practice;
- improve public health outcomes associated with outbreaks of food-borne illness;
- and, produce cost savings associated with hospital-based pharmacy interventions.

Taken together, the available evidence shows that CDS—when implemented in the right context, and when governed with formal management—can reduce errors, improve the quality of care, reduce cost, and ease the cognitive burden on health care providers.[21] As a result, the impetus for achieving standardized, widespread adoption of CDS across health systems is clear.

A report entitled “*Optimizing Strategies for Clinical Decision Support: Summary of a Meeting Series*” [21] was produced out of the collaboration between the ONC and the National Academy of Medicine (NAM). The report states that there are at least four important technical challenges to sharing and therefore standardizing implementations of CDS content: [21]

- (1) **insufficient standardization of patient data representation;**
- (2) insufficient standardization of CDS knowledge representation;
- (3) insufficient standardization of CDS integration mechanisms;
- (4) a need to align with broader standardization initiatives.

One of the reasons that CDS interventions are difficult to implement between health care systems is because disparate EHR systems and health care systems utilize different underlying patient data models and clinical statement representation mechanisms. Even distinct instantiations of use of the same EHR systems differ in how they encode patient data and in how they represent clinical statements. The ONC and NAM report states that "[b]ecause CDS relies on inferencing using patient data, this heterogeneity in patient data representation poses an immense obstacle to sharing CDS." [21]

ANF aims to reduce the variability of clinical data inputted into EHR systems and modeled/stored in data repositories. The standardization of clinical observations in a manner that supports automated processing requires a formal clinical statement model, such as ANF. The most important requirements of such a statement model are that (1) it can represent any clinician-specified observation accurately and precisely and (2) it can support automated query and retrieval operations correctly and efficiently.

ANF aims to reduce the variability of how clinical data within the value sets and clinical decision rules managed by EHR systems and modeled/stored in data repositories. For example, a clinician could document that a patient has "bacterial pneumonia caused by methicillin-resistant Staph. Aureus" by combining the pre-existing concept "bacterial pneumonia" with the pre-existing concept "Methicillin Resistant Staph. Aureus" and specifying that the latter is the "causative agent" of the former. The patient's medical record would then contain an entry consisting of the following expression:

Bacterial Pneumonia (ConceptID = 53084003) : Causative Agent (ConceptID=246075003) = Methicillin Resistant Staph. Aureus (ConceptID=115329001)

If specified correctly, post-coordinated expressions also support subsumption testing. Hence, the patient whose record contains the expression above would also be identified by the query "find all patients with a diagnosis of any infectious disease (Infectious Disease : ConceptID = 40733004) in their record."

7.3. Increasing Population Health

Electronic clinical quality measures (eCOMs) and CDS alerts are triggered by clinical data that is represented in data repositories by clinical statements represented by detailed clinical models with data elements encoded by standards-based clinical terminologies. Because these measures and alerts intend to promote evidence-based clinical processes, variations in clinical data caused by having inaccurate, incomplete, or antiquated implementations of underlying logical models may impact the ability of clinicians to assess care and improve quality. Health information technology-supported quality improvement (QI) initiatives can decrease disparities for some chronic disease management and preventive measures QI. [22] Data-driven QI efforts rely heavily on patient-level data generated by eCQM reports or CDS alerts, which are dependent upon standards-based encoded clinical data. If clinicians rely on inaccurate implementations of eCQMs and CDS, then they may have lists/alerts with patients intended to be excluded from a measure/alert, and may therefore, target inappropriate patients for therapies, such as recommending aspirin use for someone at high-risk for a fatal bleeding event. Similarly, life-saving treatment may be denied or delayed.

Implementation research shows that variations in implementations of eCQM specifications for cardiovascular event prevention could result in potential lives saved or harms avoided in quality improvement activities. [23] For aspirin use for secondary prevention of heart attacks, *Number-Needed-to-Treat (NNT)* statistics show that of patients with known cardiovascular risk who took aspirin, 1.3% were helped by preventing a non-fatal heart attack, and 0.25% were harmed by a major bleeding event. An implementation study [23] against clinical data from two primary care clinics shows that 121 (92%) of the patients were inappropriately included in a measure's denominator. These patients were also taking an anticoagulant medication, so the *Number-Needed-to-Harm (NNH)* statistic for this subset of patients for aspirin usage is likely much higher, and for this study, 1 to 2 people may have been harmed if the inaccurate implementation persisted, as evidence shows that patients with combinations of aspirin, warfarin, and clopidogrel are associated with up to a three-fold higher risk of bleeding for patients on dual therapy and triple therapy. With another measure for statin therapy, 1 in 21 people have a repeat heart attack, stroke or death avoided, so

even 10 missed people have significant risk of events. Similarly, 10% are harmed by muscle damage or pain, or ~1 of the 14 inappropriately included in the study. [23] Even in the small eCQM implementation study [23] with data from two primary care clinics, failure to include or exclude patients could have led to real harm.

With eCQM implementation and QI infrastructure increasing, the problem of having, and using, inaccurate eCQM implementations or CDS implementations could have significant potential negative impact on population health by not avoiding events and avoiding harms for patients. ANF reduces these erroneous implementations. Without a precise logical model for clinical data like ANF, comparability of eCQMs for payment programs and utility of CQM data for targeted quality improvement may be limited.

7.4. Summary

In conclusion, Analysis Normal Form (ANF) presents a simple reproducible approach to modeling clinical statements specifically for data analysis. It reduces clinical statements to two types, Performance of an action, finding, or observation and Request for Action, both clinical statement types with topics. ANF is compatible with other work in statement representation models such as the CIMI Clinical Statement approach, with its focus on more traditional complex structured trees, whereas ANF focuses on structuring data in a way CDS systems can extract data in an unambiguous way. ANF provides a single, normalized, form for clinical statements that may be used to create assertional or procedural knowledge artifacts, such as clinical decision support rules and clinical alerts.

8. Complete Glossary

ANF (Analysis Normal Form)	An approach to clinical statements that ensures the statement representation is reproducible and scalable, with the adherence to principles of being simple, reproducible, and use case driven, with a clean separation between statement concerns, and terminology concerns.
ANF Circumstance	ANF Circumstance is a property of ANF Statement with a value representing the HOW, WHY, WHEN, and with what RESULT a requested or performed action will be or was carried out.
ANF Performance	An ANF Performance is an instance of an ANF Statement that represents the performance of an action.
ANF Reference Model	A logical model described herein using Object Management Group (OMG) Unified Modeling Language (UML) 2.0 notation to describe the structure of normalized clinical statements for computational analysis. This logical model may be implemented using any programming language, database technology, or interoperability specification (e.g. FHIR) suitable for analysis. ANF is intended to normalize approaches and methodologies in use across the industry and provide a uniform representation of data to enable analysis.
ANF Request	An ANF Request is an instance of an ANF Statement that represents the request of an action.
ANF Statement	An ANF Statement is a technology construct used to represent an instance of a clinical statement as defined by the Analysis Normal Form specification.
ANF Topic	A property of ANF Statement with a value of a Logical Expression representing WHAT is being requested or what was performed
Architectural Foundation	The Architectural Foundation of the Knowledge Architecture provides the common elements of interoperability such as object identity, versioning, modularity, and knowledge representation. It includes (a) the foundation and building blocks of the common model; (b) how the repeatable transformation process of disparate standards into the common model promotes interoperability with other environments; and (c) how the modules of the architecture are tightly version controlled over time.
Assertion	Assertion is a design pattern to represent a clinical statement in a form which specifies what is being asserted paired with a form of presence or absence. Examples would include 'Rales are present' and 'Diabetes is not present'.
Assertional Knowledge	The Assertional Knowledge layer reuses information based on Statement Model. It is responsible for guidelines and business rules to assist clinical decision making. This includes facts and knowledge upon which concepts and combinations of concepts can assimilate into protocols. ANF statements can be used to support assertional artifacts.

CIMI Clinical Statement	A CIMI Clinical Statement is a technology construct defined by the HL7 CIMI working group used to represent an instance of a clinical statement.
CDS (Clinical Decision Support)	A function for electronic health records systems designed to help sift through large amounts of electronic health data to suggest next steps for treatments, alert providers to available information they may not have seen, or catch potential problems, such as dangerous medication interaction.
CIMI Model (Clinical Information Model)	A representation of the structured clinical information (including relationships, constraints and terminology), that describes a specific clinical concept - e.g. a blood pressure observation, a Discharge Summary, or a Medication Order.
CIMI (Clinical Information Modeling Initiative)	See Also CIMI Model .
CIF (Clinical Input Forms)	The manner by which clinicians author clinical statements and enter them into their organizations' electronic health record (EHR). Clinical Input Forms (CIFs) have an impact as to how information is presented to the clinicians and how they enter the data. CIFs might be generated by natural language processing, or may use models that constrain structured input to allow only certain values to be entered, such as through a drop-down list or radio button, or breaking up large chunks of related information into smaller parts.
Clinical Statement	A clinical statement is a general informatics term. It is a definite and clear representation of a clinically-significant fact or situation that was observed to exist or happen. See Also Statement , Statement Narrative .
CIM (Computationally Independent Model)	According to Model-Driven Architecture, a Computation Independent model (CIM) corresponds to a view defined by a computation independent viewpoint. It describes the business context and business requirements for the software system(s).
Constraint Model	A model which constrains or limits the allowable values of a reference model, or further constrains another constraint model.
Context expression	The 'context' describes the circumstances that form the setting in which the 'topic' should be evaluated.
DCM (Detailed Clinical Model)	A detailed clinical model is a general informatics term. As its name suggests, it is a model that describes the fine details of specific clinical information. For example, a detailed clinical model representing a systolic blood pressure measurement would describe allowable body locations to take this measurement and the allowable units of measure. Thus, a detailed clinical model for systolic blood pressure would disallow the nonsensical clinical statement of "A systolic blood pressure taken on the femur with a result of 3 inches".
DAM (Domain Analysis Model)	An abstract representation of a subject area of interest, complete enough to allow instantiation of all necessary concrete classes needed to develop child design artifacts.

Editorial Rule	Methodological rules to describe the proper modeling of an ANF Statement instance.
eCQM (Electronic Clinical Quality Measures)	An electronic clinical quality measure (eCQM) is a clinical quality measure that is expressed and formatted to use EHR data to measure healthcare quality, specifically data captured in structured form during the process of patient care.
Evaluation Result	Evaluation Result is a design pattern to represent a clinical statement in a form which specifies what is being evaluated paired with the result of that evaluation. Examples would include 'Heart Rate = 80 bpm' and 'Breath sounds = rales'.
HRO (High Reliability Organization)	Organizations characterized by high levels of safety under inherently risky, technologically-complex, and demanding conditions.
CDA (HL7 Clinical Document Architecture Release 2)	See: HL7 CDA Release 2. Health Level 7 International. Available from: https://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product_brief.cfm?product_id=7
HL7 Service Aware Interoperability Framework Canonical Definition (SAIF-CD)	HL7 Service Aware Interoperability Framework Canonical Definition (SAIF-CD) – HL7 introduced an architecture to allow for a clear separation of concerns among interoperability models and specification from the abstract or conceptual to the most precise, implementable, and testable that ensures semantic interoperability. [SAIF-CD] defines three SAIF Perspectives: Conceptual, Logical, and Implementable.
V2 (HL7 V2 Message Profile)	See: HL7 Version 2.x Message Profiling Specification. Health Level 7 International. Available from: https://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product_brief.cfm?product_id=244
HL7 V3	See: HL7 Version 3 Product Suite. Health Level 7 International. Available from: https://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product_brief.cfm?product_id=186
ISO (International Organization for Standardization)	A worldwide federation of national standards bodies from more than 160 countries, with one standards body representing each member country.
ISO DCM (ISO/TS 13972 Detailed Clinical Models)	ISO standard for detailed clinical models, characteristics and processes; this describes principles, requirements, governance, methods and a Logical Model to describe the contents Detailed Clinical Models.
Isosemantic Model	A model that, while different in structure, represents the same semantic content as another model. Any particular detailed clinical model exists within a family of isosemantic siblings.
Knowledge Architecture	A layered healthcare informatics knowledge architecture; it enables a clean separation of concerns and contains the following layers: Architectural, Terminology, Statement Model, Assertion Knowledge, and Procedural Knowledge.
Logical Model	A model expressed independently of a particular implementation technology.

Measure	Measure captures measurable elements of clinical statements, e.g. the results of test procedures, time periods, frequencies of repetitions for procedures or medication administrations using an Interval (upper and lower bound) as well as a measureSemantic representing the unit of measure.
MOF (Meta Object Facility)	The foundation of OMG's industry-standard environment where models can be exported from one application, imported into another, transported across a network, stored in a repository and then retrieved, rendered into different formats (including XMI™, OMG's XML-based standard format for model transmission and storage), transformed, and used to generate application code
MDA (Model Driven Architecture)	An approach to software design, development and implementation spearheaded by the OMG. MDA provides guidelines for structuring software specifications that are expressed as models.
Normal Form	A well-defined definitional structure that eliminates redundancy and improves data integrity. Normal forms are widely used in databases schema design.
Normalization	The process of eliminating redundancy and improving data integrity by transforming a data definition (e.g. database schema).
NNH (Number-Needed-to-Harm)	A measure of how many people need to be treated (or exposed to a risk factor) in order for one person to have a particular adverse effect.
NNT (Number-Needed-to-Treat)	The number of patients you need to treat to prevent one additional bad outcome (death, stroke, etc.)
OMG (Object Management Group)	The Object Management Group® is an international, open membership, not-for-profit technology standards consortium.
openEHR	openEHR is an open standard specification in health informatics that describes the management and storage, retrieval and exchange of health data in electronic health records.
PIM (Platform Independent Model)	A model of a software system or business system that is independent of the specific technological platform used to implement it.
Platform Specific Model	A model of a software system or business system that is independent of the specific technological platform used to implement it.
Polymorphic model	A model representing relationships from one class to multiple classes (e.g., observations, procedures, encounters, public health reports, supply, medications, exposure)
Post-coordinated concept	A notion represented by language, which identifies one idea. These are terms which are considered single concepts within the host terminology.
Pre-coordinated concept	A notion represented by language, which identifies one idea. These are terms which are considered single concepts within the host terminology.

Prerequisite	A prerequisite is a state that must exist prior to the performance of an action. It is clinical information that will be modeled as an independent clinical statement which will then be associated with other clinical statements that require this clinical information as a prerequisite.
Procedural Knowledge	The Procedural Knowledge Layer is responsible for information about standard ways to carry out specific procedures as well as other procedural guidelines, e.g. treatment protocols for diseases and order sets focused on particular patient situations. Procedural knowledge, together with assertional knowledge, enables clinical decision support, quality measurement, and supports patient safety. This layer is based on the interoperability infrastructure and terminology layers, incorporates the statement model for information retrieval, and uses the assertional layer to apply rules.
Reproducible	Multiple users or systems apply the ANF to the same situations and source data with the same/similar result.
Separation of Concerns	A design principle that allows a complete system to be subdivided into distinct sections or components with well-defined functionality and dependencies. If successful, this approach allows individual sections to be able to be reused, as well as worked on and updated independently to address new requirements and use cases.
Situation with Explicit Context	A SNOMED CT Concept Model that defines the context of a clinical finding or procedure.
ECL (SNOMED CT Expression Constrain Language)	The SNOMED CT Expression Constraint Language is a formal language for defining bounded sets of clinical meanings represented by either pre-coordinated or post-coordinated expressions.
Solor	A project sponsored by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Healthcare Services Platform Consortium (HSPC) that represents and brings together different terminology standards by using a single model that can encompass any customized content. Solor allows informaticists and developers to convert user-supplied terminologies into a single model using open source software to produce Solor content. For more information please see http://solor.io
Statement	A representation of a fact or situation that was observed to exist or happen. See Also <u>Clinical Statement</u> , <u>Statement Narrative</u> .
Statement Model	The Statement Model layer is responsible for defining how terminology concepts can be combined to create a statement. Within the data structures, additional detail to describe subject, numerical, and categorical information related to concepts can be added in this layer. ANF introduces a statement model specific to analysis and clinical decision support.
Statement Narrative	A written account of a fact or situation that was observed to exist or happen, corresponding to one or more statements. See Also <u>Clinical Statement</u> , <u>Statement</u> .

Systematized Nomenclature of Medicine	Clinical Terms is a standardized, multilingual vocabulary of clinical terminology that is used by physicians and other health care providers for the electronic exchange of clinical health information.
Technique	A technique is a method applied, device used, or a temporary state in which the patient was actively placed at the moment in time of the performance of an action. It is clinical information that will be modeled as part of the topic of a clinical statement.
Terminology Knowledge	The Terminology Knowledge layer is responsible for structured sets of medical terms and codes that define concepts of interest, including descriptions, dialects, language, and semantic hierarchy. SNOMED CT, LOINC, and RxNorm are part of this layer.
Topic expression	The 'topic' is the clinical entity described by a clinical statement.
Understandable	The content of an ANF statement can be processed by health IT systems and understood by most healthcare providers, without reference to private or inaccessible information.
URU (Understandable, Reproducible, Useful)	A design principle that defines the solution to be Understandable, Reproducible, and Useful. See Also Understandable, Reproducible, Useful
UML (Unified Modeling Language)	Unified Modeling Language is an Object Management Group (OMG) specification defining a graphical language for visualizing, specifying, constructing, and documenting the artifacts of distributed object systems. [definition from OMG]
Useful	The ANF statement has a practical value: analysis, research, outcomes, etc. that requires information aggregated across health IT systems.

9. Bibliography

1. Ratwani R, Hettinger Z, Rollin F. The Role of Health IT Developers in Improving Patient Safety in High Reliability Organizations [Internet]. Anticipating Unintended Consequences of Health Information Technology and Health Information Exchange. The Office of the National Coordinator for Health IT; 2014. Available from: https://www.healthit.gov/sites/default/files/medstar_hit_safety_1_29_v2.pdf.
2. Chassin MR, Loeb JM. High-reliability health care: getting there from here. *Milbank Q*. 2013;91(3):459-90.
3. Spackman KA, Reynoso G. Examining SNOMED from the perspective of Formal Ontological Principles: Some Preliminary Analysis and Observations. *Proc. KR-MED*, 2004: 72-80.
4. Cimino JJ. Desiderata for controlled medical vocabularies in the twenty-first century. *Methods of information in medicine*. 1998;37(4-5):394-403.
5. Ahn S, Huff SM, Kim Y, Kalra D. Quality metrics for detailed clinical models. *International journal of medical informatics*. 2013;82(5):408-17.
6. Handler, J. The Importance of Accurate Blood Pressure Measurement. *The Permanente Journal* (2009) 13:3: 51-54.
7. O'Brien E, R. Asmar, L Beilin, Y Imai, J. Mallion, G. Mancia, T. Mengden, M. Myers, P. Padfield, P. Palatini, G. Parati, T. Pickering, J. Redon, J. Staessen, G. Stergiou, P. Verdecchia. European Society of Hypertension recommendations for conventional, ambulatory, and home blood pressure measurements. *Journal of Hypertension* (2003) 21: 821-848.
8. Pickering, T.G., J.E. Hall, L.J. Appel, B.E. Falkner, J. Graves, M.N. Hill, D.W. Jones, T. Kurtz, S.G. Sheps, E. J. Roccella. Recommendations for Blood Pressure Measurement in Humans and Experimental Animals: Part 1: Blood Pressure Measurement in Humans: A Statement for Professionals From the Subcommittee of Professional and Public Education of the American Heart Association Council on High Blood Pressure Research. *Hypertension* (2005) 45:142-161.
9. HL7 Service-Aware Interoperability Framework: Canonical Definition Specification, Release 2. Health Level 7 International. Available from: https://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product_brief.cfm?product_id=3.
10. HL7 Version 3 Standard: Clinical Statement CMETs Release 1. Health Level Seven International. Available from: https://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/product_brief.cfm?product_id=40.
11. Winograd T, Flores F. Understanding computers and cognition: a new foundation for design. Boston: Addison-Wesley; 2008.
12. Elkin P. Terminology And Terminological Systems. Springer London LTD; 2016.
13. XSL Transformations (XSLT) Version 2.0. Worldwide Web Consortium. Available from: <https://www.w3.org/TR/xslt20/>.
14. XPath Syntax. Worldwide Web Consortium. Available from: https://www.w3schools.com/xml/xpath_syntax.asp.
15. FHIR Mapping Language. HL7 FHIR. Available from: <https://www.hl7.org/fhir/mapping-language.html>.
16. MetaObject Facility Specification. OMG MetaObject Facility. Object Management Group. Available from: <https://www.omg.org/mof/>.

17. Query/View/Transformation Specification.Object Management Group. Available from: <https://www.omg.org/spec/QVT/About-QVT/>.
18. Friedman C, Rubin J, Brown J, Buntin M, Corn M, Etheredge L, et al. Toward a science of learning systems: a research agenda for the high-functioning Learning Health System. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association : JAMIA. 2015;22(1):43-50.
19. Precision Medicine in Cancer Treatment [Internet]. National Cancer Institute. [cited 2019Aug1]. Available from: <https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/treatment/types/precision-medicine>.
20. Kahn MG, Callahan TJ, Barnard J, Bauck AE, Brown J, Davidson BN, et al. A Harmonized Data Quality Assessment Terminology and Framework for the Secondary Use of Electronic Health Record Data. EGEMS (Washington, DC). 2016;4(1):1244.
21. Tchong JE. Optimizing Strategies for Clinical Decision Support: Summary of a Meeting Series: National Academy of Medicine; 2018.
22. Jean-Jacques M, Persell SD, Thompson JA, Hasnain-Wynia R, Baker DW. Changes in disparities following the implementation of a health information technology-supported quality improvement initiative. Journal of general internal medicine. 2012;27(1):71-7.
23. Cholan RA, Weiskopf NG, Rhoton DL, Colin NV, Ross RL, Marzullo MN, et al. Specifications of Clinical Quality Measures and Value Set Vocabularies Shift Over Time: A Study of Change through Implementation Differences. AMIA Annual Symposium proceedings AMIA Symposium. 2017;2017:575-84.

Appendices

A. Current CIMI Clinical Statement Modeling Effort

This chapter describes the CIMI clinical statement model. This model uses a traditional structured data tree approach which can then be compared and contrasted with the ANF model.

The central focus of the CIMI Reference Model is the CIMI Clinical Statement. A CIMI Clinical Statement represents structured electronic communication made about a patient typically documented as an 'entry' in the patient record. For example, a CIMI Clinical Statement can be used to represent the following statements made about a patient.

- Was observed to have the presence or absence of a clinical phenomenon
 - Diabetes mellitus is present
 - Diabetes mellitus is not present
 - Dot blot hemorrhage is present
- Underwent a specific test/screening or procedure, and its resultant value, if any
 - Pulse Rate 68 bpm, taken by pulse oximeter
 - Systolic blood pressure 120 mmHg, taken on right brachial artery, using BP cuff adult size, patient in sitting position for at least 5 minutes, urinated not more than 30 minutes prior to measurement
 - Three dot blot hemorrhages
 - Positive screen for fall risk
 - Negative screen for PTSD and depression
- Was administered a medication or other substance
 - Patient took one Acetaminophen 500 mg tablet by mouth for pain
- Was provided educational materials
 - Patient was provided with educational materials on diabetes
- Clinical History
 - History of breast cancer
 - Family history of breast cancer

CIMI Clinical Statement, shown in [Figure A.1](#), has a 'topic', 'context', and 'various metadata'. The 'topic' is the clinical entity being described. The 'context' describes the circumstances that form the setting in which the 'topic' should be evaluated. Finally, 'various metadata' is shown in the diagram for purely illustrative purposes to represent the collection of attributes that represent the who, where, why and when information. But 'various metadata' itself is not actually an attribute of CIMI Clinical Statement.

CIMI adopts a compositional approach rather than inheritance, where a particular topic and context are added to a CIMI Clinical Statement. But topics and contexts themselves are defined with inheritance. This is the same general approach taken by ANF except for the following differences. CIMI defines the topic as a structured tree where ANF defines topic as a post-coordinated SNOMED CT expression. Both CIMI and ANF define context as a structured tree, but ANF has alternatively named 'context' to be 'circumstance'. This difference is illustrated for Pulse rate in [Figure B.2](#) and [Figure B.3](#).




Figure A.1. CIMI Clinical Statement

Topic

The 'topic' is the clinical entity described by the Clinical Statement. A few examples of topic include clinical assertions, evaluation results, and procedures. For each of these topics the information described is quite different. Therefore, CIMI describes topic types that contain the appropriate attributes to describe the required information for the given topic. The number of topic types will change as CIMI progresses. Currently the allowable topic types are ProcedureTopic and FindingTopic which has subtypes of EvaluationResultTopic and AssertionTopic.

The topic in ANF Statement and CIMI Clinical Statement should contain the same information. The ANF Statement will represent this information as a Logical Expression, and CIMI represents this same information as a structured tree.

In both ANF Statement and CIMI Clinical Statement, the topic is represented consistently across both performances and requests. The difference between a performance and request is expressed in 'circumstance' for ANF Statement, and in 'context' for CIMI Clinical Statement.

- ProcedureTopic
- FindingTopic
 - EvaluationResultTopic
 - AssertionTopic

In ANF, these various structured trees representing the topic will all be represented with a SNOMED CT concept or post-coordinated expression. Some CIMI uses of topic will be illegal in ANF. For example, if CIMI modeled using EvaluationResultTopic with a coded result in the Context, this would not be possible in ANF because ANF does not allow coded results. Instead, this would need to be modeled in an AssertionTopic style with the result moved into the topic to be representable by ANF. Again, this difference is illustrated for Pulse rate in [Figure B.2](#) and [Figure B.3](#).

Context

The 'context' describes the circumstances that form the setting in which the 'topic' should be evaluated. The various CIMI context types contain the appropriate attributes required for the given context. The number of context types will change as CIMI progresses. Currently the allowable context types are ActionContext and FindingContext. ActionContext has subtypes with examples including RequestContext, OrderContext and PerformanceContext.

FindingContext has subtypes with examples such as PresenceContext, AbsenceContext, and GoalContext.


- ActionContext
 - RequestContext
 - OrderContext
 - PerformanceContext
- FindingContext
 - PresenceContext
 - AbsenceContext
 - GoalContext

ANF has alternatively named 'context' to be 'circumstance' but it serves the same function in both models. A major difference is that ANF only allows quantitative results whereas CIMI also allows coded results. Another difference is that ANF describes all quantitative results as a range. This allows ANF to describe presence and absence using this quantitative range, thus eliminating the need for many of the CIMI contexts describing presence and absence

Metadata 'metadata' is not actually an attribute of CIMI Clinical Statement, but is intended to represent the various attributes in a clinical statement that represent metadata about the clinical statement. This includes attribution information relating to the statement itself such as who authored, verified, recorded, or signed the statement or more informally, the who, where, why, and when information. Other attributes of this nature are recordStatus and encounter.

A.1. Examples Using Topic and Context


Earlier, various descriptive examples of textual examples of clinical statements were given. Here we will represent similar examples using the CIMI Clinical Statement 'topic - context' paradigm. In Congestive Heart Failure, the topic has been declared to be a subtype of AssertionTopic called ConditionTopic stating "assertion of congestive heart failure", and the context has been declared to be of type PresenceAbsenceContext stating "Known Present". What may not be apparent in the figure is that when the topic is declared to be of type AssertionTopic then all the attributes of AssertionTopic are available for use. However, in the figure only the attribute named 'topicCode' is shown for clarity.



Patient has diagnosis of congestive heart failure

Figure A.2. CIMI Presence Context Example

In Order for physical therapy, the example for "Patient has an order for Physical Therapy." is shown. The topic has been declared to be of type ProcedureTopic stating "procedure of type physical therapy", and the context has been declared to be of type OrderContext. Again, the majority of attributes for ProcedureTopic and OrderContext are not shown for clarity.



Patient has an order for Physical Therapy

Figure A.3. CIMI Order Context Example

StatementTopic and StatementContext are both collections of attributes and have the following characteristics:

1. They are reusable components that can be assembled to form clinical statements. For instance, one can coordinate the ProcedureTopic with the ProposalContext to represent a ProcedureProposal statement. Alternatively, ProcedureTopic may be paired with OrderContext to create a ProcedureOrder statement.
2. They represent groupings of attributes aligned with the SNOMED CT Concept Model. For instance, ProcedureTopic is aligned with the SNOMED CT Procedure Concept Model. PerformanceContext aligns with the Situation with Explicit Context (SWEC) Concept Model.
3. They provide for a mechanism to state presence or absence of a finding as well as performance or non-performance of an action. For instance, the pairing of ProcedureTopic with NonPerformanceContext allows for the expression of a procedure that was not performed.

A.2. CIMI Topic Patterns

Topic Patterns include all the attributes required to fully describe a clinical entity. The topic patterns CIMI has developed to date include FindingTopic and ProcedureTopic, with FindingTopic having children of AssertionTopic and EvaluationResultTopic. They are shown in [Figure A.4](#) and are described in the following sections. Each of these topic subtypes contain a collection of attributes that describe the given pattern. These patterns provide the foundational structure for detailed clinical model (DCM) archetype instances that can be visualized at <http://models.opencimi.org>

ANF, on the other hand, does not create its own topic patterns, and instead relies on SNOMED CT post-coordinated expressions to represent the topic. ANF operates under the principle of separation of concerns, and believes that terminology should be a separate concern from the ANF Statement data structure and its properties.




Figure A.4. Topic Hierarchy

A.2.1. AssertionTopic

The first CIMI topic type described here is the AssertionTopic pattern with its included attributes, as shown in Figure A.5. Not shown in the previous diagram is that AssertionTopic has been further refined with subtypes. ConditionTopic, shown in Figure A.6 is a child of AssertionTopic which is used to represent clinical findings such as the presence (or absence) of a condition in a patient. For example:

- Assert the presence of chest pain.
- Assert the absence of chest pain.
- Assert the presence of edema.




Figure A.5. AssertionTopic





Figure A.6. ConditionTopic

The assertion pattern for a clinical statement is as follows:



Diabetes Mellitus Type 2 Present

Figure A.7. CIMI Assertion Pattern with Context Representing Presence

A.2.1.1. Assertion Hierarchy

The full hierarchy for AssertionTopic is shown in [Figure A.8](#). AssertionTopic serves the following purposes: (1) it provides the core set of assertion attributes that are relevant in assertion of presence and absence; and (2) it is the parent type for the more specific assertions such as ConditionTopic and FindingSiteAssertionTopic. If additional attributes are identified as required to properly model assertions, they would either be added to one of the existing assertion types or a new type could be created with these attributes. This modeling decision would be based on whether adding these attributes make sense for existing assertions or only for a new subset of assertions. Typically an attribute is added to the parent class if that attribute is relevant in all the subclasses derived from the parent class. If an attribute is only relevant in some of the subclasses, then the attribute is introduced in these subclasses. This ensures that a class does not have an attribute that is incongruent and thus requires that attribute to be frequently constrained out. As an analogy, CIMI wants to minimize the design practice that would create an Animal class that contains arms, legs, and wings and then create an instance of a dog that constrains out wings since dogs do not have wings.





Figure A.8. Assertion Hierarchy


A.2.1.2. Assertions

Assertions affirm or deny the existence of clinical conditions, diseases, symptoms, etc., in the patient. As just described, different varieties of assertion may extend an existing AssertionTopic class with any additional attributes necessary to fully represent this new group of assertions. In the following sections, Diabetes Present and Diabetes not present show examples of clinical statements using the AssertionTopic class for the topic, and later, Right femur fracture shows a clinical statement using FindingSiteAssertionTopic for the topic. These examples show the 'topic.topicCode' and 'context.contextCode' for each, with the addition of any extra attributes from the chosen topic needed to describe the clinical statement. Context will be discussed in depth later in this document. For now, be aware the chosen context is a full class with many attributes but here we are only showing the context code attribute that is common to all context types.




Diabetes Mellitus Type 1 Which was Diagnosed at Age 24

Figure A.9. CIMI Assertion Pattern with Presence Context and Age of Onset



The Patient does not Have Diabetes Mellitus Type 1

Figure A.10. CIMI Assertion Pattern with Presence Context of Absent



Diabetes Mellitus Type 2 Present


Figure A.11. CIMI Assertion Pattern with Presence Context of Present

Note, in the CIMI alignment with the SNOMED CT concept model, the AssertionTopic pattern corresponds to the Finding hierarchy as inflected by the Situation hierarchy.

Other attributes may also inflect the semantics; e.g., an AssertionStatement.topic.findingMethod that would align with the concept model's Finding.findingMethod.

A.2.1.3. Finding Site Assertions

A FindingSiteAssertionTopic is an assertion about a finding found on the body. This assertion is a “design by extension” assertion because it contains the additional attribute findingSite that is used to capture the body site affected by the condition. The FindingSiteAssertionTopic encourages post-coordination as shown in Right femur fracture, and intentionally aligns with the SNOMED CT Clinical Findings concept model.



Femur fracture of the right leg

Figure A.12. CIMI Finding Site Assertion Pattern

A.2.2. Evaluation Result

The second topic pattern we will discuss is EvaluationResultTopic which is used to document a characteristic of a patient or a clinical value being observed. An EvaluationResultTopic may hold the name of a test in the 'topicCode' attribute (e.g., "heart rate evaluation", "serum glucose lab test", etc.) and the resulting value of the test would be represented in the context 'result' attribute. Viewed another way, the EvaluationResultTopic topicCode holds a question (e.g., "what is the heart rate?", "what is the serum glucose?") and the context 'result' holds the answer. Any clinical statement such as a laboratory test, a vital sign, or a questionnaire question that fits this pattern of a question and a resulting value is modeled with the EvaluationResultTopic pattern.

The evaluation result pattern for a clinical statement is as follows:

- topic.topicCode = what's being evaluated ("heart rate", "serum glucose", "breath sound", etc.).
- context.result = the result of the evaluation ("72 bpm", "100 mg/dL", "rales")

The following is an isosemantic comparison of the evaluation result pattern to the previously described assertion pattern using blue eye color as an example

Assertion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • topic.topicCode = blue eye color • context.contextCode = present
EvaluationResult	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • topic.topicCode = eye color • topic.result = blue eye color

Like Assertion, Evaluation Result corresponds to the SNOMED CT concept model. The EvaluationResult-Statement.topic.topicCode attribute corresponds to the observation being evaluated.

A.2.2.1. Evaluation Result Hierarchy

EvaluationResultTopic currently has two subtypes; LaboratoryTestResultTopic (which includes additional attributes necessary to describe laboratory tests) and PhysicalEvaluationResultTopic.




Figure A.13. Evaluation Result Hierarchy

A.2.2.2. Modeling in the Constraint Layer

This section will use LaboratoryTestResultTopic, which exists in the Reference Model Layer, to further describe modeling in the Constraint Layer. There are different categories of laboratory tests that differ in their resulting data type, such as quantitative labs and nominal labs, where the former would have a Quantitative result and the latter would have a Coded result. For the different lab categories there is not a need for new named attributes to be added in the reference model layer, but only a need to constrain the result to the appropriate datatype. Since a new named attribute is not required, the style CIMI has adopted is to create subtypes in the constraint layer, where in this case, an ADL Archetype would be created for both QuantitativeLaboratoryTestResult and NominalLaboratoryTestResult.


A.2.2.3. Evaluation Result Subtypes in the Reference Layer

LaboratoryTestResultTopic

LaboratoryTestResultTopic contains attributes specific to the lab evaluation process. These include information about the physical process (e.g., specimen) plus process management information (e.g., status).


PhysicalEvaluationResultTopic

PhysicalEvaluationResultTopic contains attributes specific to the clinical evaluation process. These include information about the physical examination process (e.g., patient position, body site).



The patient's skin turgor is friable


Figure A.14. CIMI Physical Evaluation Result Pattern



Tubular Breath Sounds


Figure A.15. CIMI Tubular Breath Sounds Evaluation

Figure A.16 and Figure A.17 are both Evaluation Result style representations of a systolic blood pressure. In the first, where CIMI has a simple topic, the style is very similar to how it would be modeled in ANF. But in Figure A.17, which has a complex topic, CIMI represents this with named properties in a tree structure. ANF, on the other hand, would put all this structured topic complexity into a post-coordinated SNOMED CT expression.



Systolic Blood Pressure 120 mmHg

Figure A.16. CIMI Systolic Blood Pressure Evaluation



Systolic Blood Pressure 120 mmHg, Taken on Right Brachial Artery, Using BP Cuff Adult Size, Patient in Sitting Position for at Least 5 Minutes, Urinated Not More than 30 Minutes Prior to Measurement

Figure A.17. CIMI Systolic Blood Pressure with Sitting Position and Urination Evaluation

A.2.2.4. Guideline: Assertion versus Evaluation

Any evaluation model may be transformed into an assertion model. Conversely, any assertion model may be transformed into an evaluation model. Some more easily than others.

The general guideline is if it is natural to think of the concept as a noun, as a condition or state that exists in the patient, model as an assertion or set of assertions. If the statement about the patient is thought of as a name/value pair (i.e., a noun representing the attribute and an adjective representing the value), such as “hair color” = (“black”, “brown”, “blonde”), then model it as an evaluation. However, it is important to note both styles are allowed and the true determinant of their use is whether a result for a given criteria other than true/false or present/absent is specified.

This discussion highlights the importance of isosemantic models. Even if one model or set of models can be agreed upon as the preferred style (e.g., assertion models for “bradycardia” and “tachycardia” instead of an evaluation model with “bradycardic” and “tachycardic” as values), inevitably there will be use cases (e.g., data entry, messaging, reporting, etc.) for the other model and a need to identify use cases where different modeling patterns describe semantically identical phenomena. These patterns are isosemantic. An essential (as of now unfulfilled) requirement is for a mechanism of identifying isosemantic models, managing isosemantic groups, and transforming between them. We expect a great deal of this work to be facilitated by the semantic underpinnings of the models supporting the ability to classify the content of two models and determine their logical relations (equivalent, subsumed, disjoint).

It should be noted the Assertion vs. EvaluationResult topic is solely concerned with the structure and schema pattern used to capture clinical information. Choosing Assertion vs. EvaluationResult patterns has nothing to do with whether the information being captured is subjective vs. objective.

A.2.3. ProcedureTopic

Procedure models are used to represent actions taken related to the care of a patient such as a cholecystectomy, peripheral IV placement, delivery of a warm blanket, dressing change, ambulation, patient education, etc. The CIMI ProcedureTopic, as shown in [Figure A.18](#), is a base class for a number of specializations such as surgical, imaging, and laboratory procedures. The CIMI Procedure Model is aligned with the SNOMED CT Procedure Concept Model when such an alignment exists.




Figure A.18. ProcedureTopic Hierarchy

A.2.4. Context Patterns

When a Clinical Statement is defined it will be modeled as a combination of a topic and a context. The ‘context’ describes the circumstances that form the setting in which the ‘topic’ should be evaluated. Specializations within the context hierarchy, shown in [Figure A.19](#), add important attribution information for the situation being described. This is a partial view of the context hierarchy for illustration purpose, but it should be clear that more context classes exist, and more will be modeled in the future as necessary.




Figure A.19. Context Hierarchy

The StatementContext abstract class has the following specializations:

FindingContext The FindingContext class aligns with the SNOMED CT Situation with Explicit Context for findings and provides the context for either the EvaluationResultTopic

or AssertionTopic of a clinical statement. For example, a context about a finding may state that the finding was present or absent.

ActionContext

The ActionContext class aligns with the SNOMED CT Situation with Explicit Context for procedures and provides the context for the topic of a clinical statement. For instance, a statement about a procedure may specify the procedure has been proposed, ordered, planned, performed, or not performed. Each action context, in turn, has its own lifecycle. Another child of ActionContext, not shown in [Figure A.19](#) is PerformanceContext shown in [Figure A.20](#).




Figure A.20. PerformanceContext

B. Differences between ANF and CIMI

There are two fundamental differences between the ANF and CIMI Statement approach.

1. The representation of topic.
2. The representation of results.

B.1. The Representation of Topic

In the ANF Statement model, the topic is represented by a single field containing a terminology expression. This expression is not limited to any particular terminology model, but in this document we use SNOMED CT, as Solor would potentially have extensions to SNOMED CT. In the CIMI Statement model, all the pieces of information that make up the topic can be broken out and structured as needed into a tree of objects with multiple properties and appropriate datatypes.




Figure B.1. Topic Comparison

As we can see in the Pulse Rate examples below, the ANF topic is represented as a post-coordinated expression while the CIMI topic is represented with a topic containing a single concept along with associated structural properties representing the pulse oximeter device. Since the ANF Statement will always be either the request for an action or the performance of an action, the post-coordinated expression will always be a procedure that is further refined providing a consistent representation.





Figure B.2. Pulse Rate - ANF Representation



Pulse Rate 68bpm, Taken by Pulse Oximeter ANF vs CIMI Representations

Figure B.3. Pulse Rate - CIMI Representation

One implication of this is that the ANF Statement Model is using two formalisms to represent the clinical statement. First it uses the formalism that represents the ANF reference model. Second, it uses SNOMED CT's syntax for post-coordinated SNOMED CT expressions. Tools for authoring and analysis would be required to parse and process both syntaxes.


The CIMI Statement model in this example, on the other hand, would be fully represented using the formalism that represents the CIMI reference model. This model however allows for the possibility of multiple modeling style representations of the same data that are then not easily queried for equivalence.

B.2. The Representation of Results

In the CIMI model, EvaluationResult and Assertion models are used to represent observations. Evaluation-Result has a topic representing what is being observed, and a result represented by a choice of datatypes.


EvaluationResult can be thought of as a question and an answer. An Assertion on the other hand, has simply a topic stating what is observed, and a coded result stating presence or absence.

In the ANF model, the topic represents what is being observed and the result may only be a range of a quantity. No coded results are allowed. Not allowing coded results forces more of the semantics to be represented in the terminology model and limits the ability to allow multiple different representations of the same data. In the example below we see Dot blot hemorrhage represented in ANF as either present or with the number of hemorrhages that exist.



Dot Blot Hemorrhage Present - ANF Representation


Figure B.4. Dot Blot Hemorrhage Present - ANF Representation



Three Dot Blot Hemorrhage - ANF Representation

Figure B.5. Three Dot Blot Hemorrhage - ANF Representation

In the CIMI Statement model, when creating a model with a numeric result, the choice is quite clear, and the choice will be an EvaluationResult, such as a topic of 'Systolic Blood Pressure' and result with a numeric quantity. In this case, the CIMI and ANF model are very aligned, except for the fact that the ANF model will always use a range of that quantity.



Systolic Blood Pressure 120 mmHg - CIMI Representation


Figure B.6. Systolic Blood Pressure - CIMI Representation

But when a CIMI model has a potential coded result, the choice between EvaluationResult and Assertion becomes muddled. For example, a model for Breath Sound could be an EvaluationResult with a topic of 'breath sound' and a coded result with the following valueset. Thus, any of the breath sounds within the valueset can act as a result for this model.


Breath Sound Value
Absent
Audible
Clear
Coarse Breath Sounds
Coarse Crackles
Crackles
Diminished
Expiratory wheezing
Faint
Fine Crackles
Forced
Inspiratory wheezing
Left Ventricular Assist Device Noise
Markedly Decreased
Moderately Decreased
Pleural Rub
Prolonged Expiration
Rhonchi
Slightly Decreased

Breath Sound Value
Stridor
Tubular Breath Sounds
Upper Airway Congestion
Wheeze

Table B.1. Breath Sound Valueset

*Tubular Breath Sounds - CIMI Evaluation Representation***Figure B.7. Tubular Breath Sounds - CIMI Evaluation Representation**

The other option, is that each of the breath sounds in the valueset is modeled as an Assertion with a topic of Tubular breathing and a contextCode indicating presence or absence. To decide which model is better, usually we ponder how the clinician thinks about the data, or how it will be collected, or how it will be queried.

*Tubular Breath Sounds - CIMI Evaluation Representation***Figure B.8. Tubular Breath Sound - CIMI Assertion Representation**

In this example, the ANF model doesn't support an EvaluationResult style model as it doesn't allow coded results. Thus, ANF is forced to make one and only one choice, which is an assertion style where the particular breath sound is the topic, and the result will be a countable quantity indicating presence or absence.

When querying instance data, the Assertion or ANF style can be more difficult to represent as it requires concepts to be pre-coordinated in the terminology or having sufficient semantics available in the concept model to allow for representation of a post-coordinated expression. To successfully query any breath sound instances using the Assertion/ANF style, the underlying terminology must be correctly modeled to support. If one of the breath sound values is not correctly placed under the higher level concept of 366135003 [Finding of breath sounds (finding)], then retrieving all breath sounds will require knowledge of all the possible breath sound values. With the EvaluationResult style, querying is simpler as you simply query

for a topic of 'breath sound', and the coded result tells you what type of breath sound it is. Thus, you do not have to know all the members of the valueset apriori to form the query.

B.3. ANF vs CIMI Examples

The following examples seek to highlight the differences between the ANF and CIMI models. These representations are at a graphic high level and are not intended to be exact representations.

B.3.1. Simple Systolic Blood Pressure Statement

In this systolic blood pressure example both the ANF and CIMI models are closely aligned. Since the ANF model requires both an upper and lower bound there is extra information required.





Figure B.9. Systolic Blood Pressure - ANF Representation




Systolic Blood Pressure 120 mmHg - ANF vs CIMI Representations

Figure B.10. Systolic Blood Pressure - CIMI Representation

B.3.2. Complex Systolic Blood Pressure Statement


In this systolic blood pressure example the ANF model requires multiple statements to accurately capture all parts of the narrative clinical statement. The ANF model requires a clinical statement to be separated if the clinical statement could stand on its own. For example, in the clinical statement "Systolic Blood Pressure 120 mmHg, taken on right brachial artery, using BP cuff adult size, patient in sitting position for at least 5 minutes, urinated not more than 30 minutes prior to measurement", the patient sitting position and urination parts of the statement are recorded as separate associated clinical statements since they could both be recorded as clinical statements on their own if they were not associated with the blood pressure clinical statement.

The ANF model is much more expressive and is able to capture the timing information for the position and urination that requires a separate precondition code to be created in the CIMI model.




Systolic Blood Pressure 120 mmHg, Taken on Right Brachial Artery, Using BP Cuff Adult Size, Patient in Sitting Position for at Least 5 Minutes, Urinated Not More Than 30 Minutes Prior to Measurement - ANF Representation

Figure B.11. Systolic Blood Pressure with Associated Statements- ANF Representation




Patient in Sitting Position for at Least 5 Minutes - ANF Representation

Figure B.12. Systolic Blood Pressure Sitting Position Associated - ANF Representation



Urinated Not More Than 30 Minutes Prior to Measurement - ANF Representation

Figure B.13. Systolic Blood Pressure Urination - ANF Representation




Systolic Blood Pressure 120 mmHg, Taken on Right Brachial Artery, Using BP Cuff Adult Size, Patient in Sitting Position for at Least 5 Minutes, Urinated Not More than 30 Minutes Prior to Measurement - CIMI Representation

Figure B.14. Systolic Blood Pressure with Associated Statements - CIMI Representation


B.3.3. Diabetes Mellitus Statement

The Diabetes Mellitus example highlights the main difference between ANF and CIMI in the case of stating that a condition is present. In the case of ANF, since Result is not allowed to use a coded value it represents the presence as a lowerBound of 1 and an upperBound of infinite. Representing absence would be done with an upper and lower bound of zero.



Diabetes Mellitus Type 2 - ANF Representation

Figure B.15. Diabetes Mellitus Present - ANF Representation



Diabetes Mellitus Type 2 - CIMI Representation

Figure B.16. Diabetes Mellitus Present - CIMI Representation

C. Narratives

C.1. Request for Action Narratives

Example C.1. Radiology Request for Action Narratives

- X-ray chest to evaluate for heart failure now
- X-ray Knee-right to evaluate for psoriatic arthritis, routine
- Lumbar/Thoracic Spine CT with and without contrast

Example C.2. Pharmacy Request for Action Narratives

- Ibuprofen 400 mg tablet oral every 6 hours as needed for back pain; may increase dose frequency to one tablet every 4 hours 100 tablets 2 refills
- Ribavirin 200 mg capsule oral, take 2 capsules every morning and 3 capsules every evening
- Ribavirin 200 mg capsule oral, take 2 capsules every morning
- Ribavirin 200 mg capsule oral, 3 capsules every evening

Example C.3. Education Request for Action Narratives

- Advised to participate in tobacco cessation counseling once a week
- Food cross-reactivity education (routine)

Example C.4. Laboratory Request for Action Narratives

- Rheumatoid factor 1 time routine
- Brain natriuretic peptide STAT

Example C.5. Observation Request for Action Narratives

- Breast Screening Appointment on X Date

Example C.6. Cardiology Request for Action Narratives

- Cardiology referral
- Resting 12-lead electrocardiogram to evaluate for arrhythmia now
- Referral to cardiology to evaluate supraventricular tachycardia

Example C.7. Other Request for Action Narratives

- Proctoscopy with biopsy
- Hold insulin per Cardiac Catheterization Guidelines (just need an X start and stop time in relation to procedure)

C.2. Performance of Action Narratives

Example C.8. Radiology Performance of Action Narratives

- Lumbar/Thoracic Spine CT
- Lumbar/Thoracic Spine CT Myelogram Interpretation

Example C.9. Pharmacy Performance of Action Narratives

- Patient took one Acetaminophen 500 mg tablet by mouth for pain

Example C.10. Education Performance of Action Narratives

- Patient was provided with education on diabetes

Example C.11. Laboratory Performance of Action Narratives

-

Example C.12. Observation Performance of Action Narratives

- History of Cocaine Use
- First degree relatives with ovarian cancer
- Blue Eye Color
- Dot blot hemorrhage Present
- Family history of breast cancer
- Systolic Blood Pressure 120 mmHg
- Systolic Blood Pressure 180 mmHg, normalRange (90-120), health risk critical
- Systolic Blood Pressure 120 mmHg, taken on right brachial artery, using BP cuff adult size, patient in sitting position for at least 5 minutes, urinated not more than 30 minutes prior to measurement
- Pulse Rate 68 bpm, taken by pulse oximeter
- Diabetes mellitus type 2
- Diabetes mellitus type 2 Absent
- Had an appendectomy 3-4 years ago
- Nausea and vomiting
- Ischemic stroke without coma
- Akinetic seizure without atonia
- Incontinence without sensory awareness
- Blister with infection

- Patient reports experiencing anxiety and fear
- Pleural empyema with fistula

Example C.13. Cardiology Performance of Action Narratives

-

Example C.14. Other Performance of Action Narratives

- Insulin placed on hold 24 hours prior to catheterization
- Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale (C-SSRS) Screen Negative Result
- Candidate for Osteoporosis Screening
- Positive screen for fall risk
- Negative screen for PTSD and Depression

D. ANF Examples

D.1. Examples of Performance Clinical Statements

For the examples in the following chapters, the focus has been to illustrate the ANF Model, using easy and intuitive examples, rather than focus on the correctness of the modeling. The modeling within the post-coordinated expressions of the “topic” could potentially be done in different ways.

D.1.1. Blood Pressure Measurement

Narrative: *Systolic blood pressure 120 mmHg; taken on right brachial artery using adult blood pressure cuff; patient in sitting position for at least 5 minutes; urinated not more than 30 minutes prior to measurement*

Statement type: *[Performance]*

Subject of info: *[Subject of record]*

Authors: *[Healthcare professional]*

Topic: *[Observation procedure]-*

(Method) [Examination - action]-

(Has focus) [On examination - Systolic blood pressure reading]-

(Procedure site – Direct) [Structure of right brachial artery]-

(Using device) [Blood pressure cuff, adult size];

Circumstance:	Performance Circumstance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timing: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i> Purposes: Ø Triggers: Ø Participants: <i>[Subject of record]</i> Priority: Ø
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [120,120] Millimeter of mercury

Associations:

[UUID] (Table: Associated Clinical Statement 1)

[UUID](Table: Associated Clinical Statement 2)

Statement time: *[ISO 8601 date/time format]*

Stamp coordinate: *[Solor Module]* , *[Release Path]* , 2007-04-05T14:30Z Statement id: *[UUID]*
 Subject of record ID:*[UUID]*

Table D.1. Blood Pressure Performance Statement

Narrative: Arterial blood pressure 120 mmHg; taken on right brachial artery using adult blood pressure cuff; <i>patient in sitting position for at least 5 minutes</i> ; urinated not more than 30 minutes prior to measurement Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Subject of info: <i>[Subject of record]</i> Authors: <i>[Healthcare professional]</i> Topic: <i>[Observation procedure]</i> - <i>(Has focus) [Sitting position finding]</i>	
Circumstance:	Performance Circumstance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing: ≥ 5 min. prior to statement time • Purposes: \emptyset • Triggers: \emptyset • Participants: <i>[Subject of record]</i> • Priority: \emptyset
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [5,inf) minute
Associations: <i>[UUID]</i> Statement time: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i> Stamp coordinate: <i>[Solor Module]</i> , <i>[Release Path]</i> , 2007-04-05T14:30Z Statement id: fc48551f-876a-42c1-b179-3169e3748332 Subject of record ID: <i>[UUID]</i>	

Table D.2. Blood Pressure Positioning Associated Statement

Narrative: Arterial blood pressure 120 mmHg; taken on right brachial artery using adult blood pressure cuff; patient in sitting position for at least 5 minutes; <i>urinated not more than 30 minutes prior to measurement</i> Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Subject of info: <i>[Subject of record]</i> Authors: <i>[Healthcare professional]</i>

Topic: <i>[Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(Has focus) [Micturition finding]</i>	
Circumstance:	Performance Circumstance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing: ≤ 30 min. prior to statement time • Purposes: Ø • Triggers: Ø • Participants: <i>[Subject of record]</i> • Priority: Ø
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [0,30] minute
Associations: <i>[UUID]</i>	
Statement time: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i>	
Stamp coordinate: <i>[Solor Module]</i> , <i>[Release Path]</i> , 2007-04-05T14:30Z, Statement id: <i>[UUID]</i>	
Statement id: df478857-2eae-40b2-909f-68ef0d0b9eb5	
Subject of record ID: <i>[UUID]</i>	

Table D.3. Blood Pressure Urination Associated Statement

D.1.2. Pulse Rate Measurement

Narrative: <i>Pulse Rate 68 bpm, taken by pulse oximeter</i>	
Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i>	
Subject of info: <i>[Subject of record]</i>	
Authors: <i>[Healthcare professional]</i>	
Topic: <i>[Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(Method) [Examination - action]-</i> <i>(Has focus) [On examination - pulse rate]-</i> <i>(Using device) [Pulse oximeter];</i>	
Circumstance:	Performance Circumstance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i> • Purposes: Ø • Triggers: Ø

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants: <i>[Subject of record]</i> Priority: \emptyset
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [68,68] Beats/minute
Associations: \emptyset Statement time: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i> Stamp coordinate: <i>[Solor Module]</i> , <i>[Release Path]</i> , 2007-04-05T14:30Z, Statement id: <i>[UUID]</i> Subject of record ID: <i>[UUID]</i>	

Table D.4. Pulse Rate Measurement Performance Statement

D.1.3. Patient History

Narrative: <i>Patient has thromboembolism history</i> Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Subject of info: <i>[Subject of record]</i> Authors: <i>[Healthcare professional]</i> Topic: <i>[Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(Method) [Examination - action]-</i> <i>(Has focus) [Thromboembolic disorder];</i>	
Circumstance:	Performance Circumstance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timing Value: [1, inf) ISO 8601 prior to statement time Purposes: \emptyset Triggers: \emptyset Participants: <i>[Subject of record]</i> Priority: \emptyset
Associations: \emptyset Statement time: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i> Stamp coordinate: <i>[Solor Module]</i> , <i>[Release Path]</i> , 2007-04-05T14:30Z, Statement id: <i>[UUID]</i>	

Subject of record ID:[*UUID*]

Table D.5. Patient History Performance Statement

D.1.4. Condition Present

Narrative: <i>Diabetes Mellitus present</i> Statement type:[<i>Performance</i>] Subject of info: [<i>Subject of record</i>] Authors: [<i>Healthcare professional</i>] Topic: [<i>Observation procedure</i>]- (Method) [<i>Examination - action</i>]- (Has focus) [<i>Diabetes mellitus</i>];	
Circumstance:	Performance Circumstance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timing: [<i>ISO 8601 date/time format</i>] Purposes: Ø Triggers: Ø Participants: [<i>Subject of record</i>] Priority: Ø
Associations: Ø Statement time: [<i>ISO 8601 date/time format</i>] Stamp coordinate: [<i>Solor Module</i>] , [<i>Release Path</i>] , 2007-04-05T14:30Z, Statement id: [<i>UUID</i>] Subject of record ID:[<i>UUID</i>]	

Table D.6. Condition Present Performance Statement

D.1.5. Condition Not Present

Narrative: <i>Diabetes Mellitus not present</i> Statement type:[<i>Performance</i>] Subject of info: [<i>Subject of record</i>] Authors: [<i>Healthcare professional</i>]

Topic: <i>[Observation procedure]-</i> (Method) <i>[Examination - action]-</i> (Has focus) <i>[Diabetes mellitus];</i>	
Circumstance:	Performance Circumstance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i> • Purposes: Ø • Triggers: Ø • Participants: <i>[Subject of record]</i> • Priority: Ø
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [0,0] Unit of time
Associations: Ø Statement time: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i> Stamp coordinate: <i>[Solor Module] , [Release Path] , 2007-04-05T14:30Z, Statement id: [UUID]</i> Subject of record ID: <i>[UUID]</i>	

Table D.7. Condition Not Present Performance Statement

D.1.6. Three Dot Blot Hemorrhages

Narrative: <i>Three dot blot hemorrhages</i> Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Subject of info: <i>[Subject of record]</i> Authors: <i>[Healthcare professional]</i> Topic: <i>[Observation procedure]-</i> (Method) <i>[Examination - action]-</i> (Has focus) <i>[Deep retinal hemorrhage];</i>	
Circumstance:	Performance Circumstance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i> • Purposes: Ø • Triggers: Ø • Participants: <i>[Subject of record]</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority: Ø
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [3,3] Number
Associations: Ø Statement time: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i> Stamp coordinate: <i>[Solor Module]</i> , <i>[Release Path]</i> , 2007-04-05T14:30Z, Statement id: <i>[UUID]</i> Subject of record ID: <i>[UUID]</i>	

Table D.8. Three Dot Blot Hemorrhages Performance Clinical Statement

D.1.7. Dot Blot Hemorrhage Present

Narrative: <i>Dot blot hemorrhage present</i> Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Subject of info: <i>[Subject of record]</i> Authors: <i>[Healthcare professional]</i> Topic: <i>[Observation procedure]</i> - <i>(Method) [Examination - action]</i> - <i>(Has focus) [Deep retinal hemorrhage];</i>	
Circumstance:	Performance Circumstance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i> • Purposes: Ø • Triggers: Ø • Participants: <i>[Subject of record]</i> • Priority: Ø
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [1,inf) Countable quantity
Associations: Ø Statement time: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i> Stamp coordinate: <i>[Solor Module]</i> , <i>[Release Path]</i> , 2007-04-05T14:30Z, Statement id: <i>[UUID]</i>	

Subject of record ID:[*UUID*]

Table D.9. Dot Blot Hemorrhage Present Performance Clinical Statement

D.1.8. Family History

<p>Narrative: <i>Family history (mother) of colon cancer</i></p> <p>Statement type:[<i>Performance</i>]</p> <p>Subject of info: [<i>Mother of subject</i>]</p> <p>Authors: [<i>Healthcare professional</i>]</p> <p>Topic: [<i>Observation procedure</i>]-</p> <p>(<i>Method</i>) [<i>Examination - action</i>]-</p> <p>(<i>Has focus</i>) [<i>Malignant neoplasm of colon</i>];</p>	
Circumstance:	<p>Performance Circumstance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing: [1, inf) ISO 8601 prior to statement time • Purposes: Ø • Triggers: Ø • Participants: [<i>Subject of record</i>] • Priority: Ø
<p>Associations: Ø</p> <p>Statement time: [<i>ISO 8601 date/time format</i>]</p> <p>Stamp coordinate: [<i>Solor Module</i>] , [<i>Release Path</i>] , 2007-04-05T14:30Z, Statement id: [<i>UUID</i>]</p> <p>Subject of record ID:[<i>UUID</i>]</p>	

Table D.10. Family History Performance Clinical Statement

D.2. Examples of Modeling Request Clinical Statements

D.2.1. Medication Order

Narrative: *Request for administration of Ibuprofen 400 mg tablet oral every 6 hours as needed for back pain; may increase dose frequency to one tablet every 4 hours*

Statement type: <i>[Request]</i>	
Subject of info: <i>[Subject of record]</i>	
Authors: <i>[Healthcare professional]</i>	
Topic: <i>[Procedure]</i> -	
<i>(Method) [Administration - action] (Direct substance) [Ibuprofen 400 MG Oral Tablet]</i>	
<i>(Route of administration) [Oral]</i>	
Circumstance:	RequestCircumstance:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • timing: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i> • purpose: <i>[Backache]</i> • requestedParticipant: <i>[Subject of record]</i> • priority: <i>[Routine]</i>
	• repetition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eventFrequency: <i>[4,6] hour</i>
	• requestedResult
Associations: \emptyset	
Statement time: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i>	
Stamp coordinate: <i>[Solor Module] , [Release Path] , 2007-04-05T14:30Z, Statement id: [UUID]</i>	
Subject of record ID: <i>[UUID]</i>	

Table D.11. Ibuprofen Order Request Clinical Statement

Narrative: Request for administration of nitroglycerin 0.4 mg tablet sub-lingual every 5 minutes as needed for chest pain; maximum 3 tablets (routine).	
Statement type: <i>[Request]</i>	
Subject of info: <i>[Subject of record]</i>	
Authors: <i>[Healthcare professional]</i>	
Topic: <i>[Procedure]</i> -	
<i>(Method) [Administration - action] (Direct substance) [Nitroglycerin 400micrograms tablet]</i>	
<i>(Route of administration) [Oral]</i>	
<i>(Method) [Administration - action] (Direct substance) [Ibuprofen 400 MG Oral Tablet]</i>	
<i>(Route of administration) [Oral]</i>	
Circumstance:	Request Circumstance

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timing: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i> Purpose: <i>[Chest pain]</i> Priority: <i>[Routine]</i> <p>Frequency</p> <p>eventFrequency: <i>[5,15] min</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> resolution: 5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> requestedResult: <i>[1,1] Conventional release sublingual tablet</i> resolution: 1
<p>Associations: \emptyset</p> <p>Statement time: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i></p> <p>Stamp coordinate: <i>[Solor Module]</i> , <i>[Release Path]</i> , 2007-04-05T14:30Z, Statement id: <i>[UUID]</i></p> <p>Subject of record ID:<i>[UUID]</i></p>	

Table D.12. Nitroglycerin Order Request Clinical Statement

D.2.2. Radiology Order

<p>Narrative: <i>Request for x-ray chest to evaluate chest pain (routine)</i></p> <p>Statement type:<i>[Request]</i></p> <p>Subject of info:<i>[Subject of record]</i></p> <p>Authors: <i>[Healthcare professional]</i></p> <p>Topic: <i>[Plain chest X-ray]</i></p>	
Circumstance:	Request Circumstance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> timing: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i> purpose: <i>[Assessment of chest pain]</i> requestedParticipant: <i>[Subject of record]</i> priority: <i>[Routine]</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> requestedResult
<p>Associations: \emptyset</p> <p>Statement time: <i>[ISO 8601 date/time format]</i></p> <p>Stamp coordinate: <i>[Solor Module]</i> , <i>[Release Path]</i> , 2007-04-05T14:30Z, Statement id: <i>[UUID]</i></p>	

Subject of record ID: [UUID]

Table D.13. Radiology Order Request Clinical Statement

D.3. Examples of Modeling C-CDA Entries Based on ANF

D.3.1. Summary of Care

C-CDA Category/Entry	Modeling
Reason for referral	Statement type: <i>[Request]</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pulmonary Function Tests 	Topic: <i>[23426006 Measurement of respiratory function]-</i> <i>(260686004 Method) [129266000 Measurement – action]</i>
Allergies, Adverse Reactions and Alerts	Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allergen: Penicillin G Reaction: Hives Reaction severity: Severe 	Topic: <i>[5751000205109 Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(363702006 Has focus) [294499007 Allergy to benzylpenicillin]</i> Associated statement: Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Topic: <i>[5751000205109 Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(363702006 Has focus) [247472004 Weal]-</i> <i>(42752001 Due to) [294499007 Allergy to benzylpenicillin]-</i> <i>(246112005 Severity) [24484000 Severe (severity modifier)]</i>
Problem list	Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costal Chondritis Asthma 	Topic: <i>[5751000205109 Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(363702006 Has focus) [64109004 Costal chondritis]</i> Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Topic: <i>[5751000205109 Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(363702006 Has focus) [195967001 Asthma]</i>
Social History	Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Never smoked 	Topic: <i>[5751000205109 Observation procedure]-</i>

	(363702006 Has focus) [266919005 Never smoked tobacco]
Immunizations	Statement type: [Performance]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Influenza virus vaccine: completed 	Topic: [86198006 Influenza vaccination]- Result status: [255594003 Complete]
Medications	Statement type: [Performance]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Albuterol 0.09 mg ACTUAT 	Topic: [416118004 Administration]- (260686004 Method) [129445006 Administration – action]- (363701004 Direct substance) [Rx; 329498 Albuterol 0.09 MG/ACTUAT]
Functional and Cognitive Status	Statement type: [Performance]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functional status: No impairment Cognitive status: No impairment 	Topic: [5751000205109 Observation procedure]- (363702006 Has focus) [118228005 Functional finding]- (363714003 Interprets) [246464006 Function]- (363713009 Has interpretation) [17621005 Normal]; Statement type: [Performance] Topic: [5751000205109 Observation procedure]- (363702006 Has focus) [373930000 Cognitive function]- (363714003 Interprets) [311465003 Cognitive functions]- (363713009 Has interpretation) [17621005 Normal];
Vital signs	Statement type: [Performance]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Height: 70 in Weight: 195 lb. Body Mass Index (calculated): 28 BP systolic: 155 mmHg BP diastolic: 92 mmHg 	Topic: [14456009 Measuring height of patient]- (260686004 Method) [129266000 Measurement - action] Result: 70 [258677007 Inch] Statement type: [Performance] Topic: [39857003 Weighing patient]- (260686004 Method) [129266000 Measurement - action]

	Result: 195 [258693003 pounds]
	Statement type: [Performance]
	Topic: [698094009 Measurement of body mass index]- (260686004 Method) [129266000 Measurement - action]
	Result: 28
	Statement type: [Performance]
	Topic: [5751000205109 Observation procedure]- (260686004 Method) [302199004 Examination - action]- (363702006 Has focus) [163030003 On examination - Systolic blood pressure reading];
	Result: 155 [259018001 Millimeter of mercury]
	Statement type: [Performance]
	Topic: [5751000205109 Observation procedure]- (260686004 Method) [302199004 Examination - action]- (363702006 Has focus) [163031004 On examination - Diastolic blood pressure reading]
	Circumstance:
	Result: 92 [259018001 Millimeter of mercury]
Results	Statement type: [Performance]
• CO2 27 mmol/L	Topic: [38007001 Carbon dioxide measurement]
	Circumstance:
	Result: 27 [258813002 Millimole/liter]
Plan of Care	Statement type: [Performance]
• Goal: Weight loss: Patient education: Diet counseling	Topic: [266724001 Weight-reducing diet education]
	Statement type: [Performance]
• Asthma management: Patient education: Resources and instructions	Topic: [698605001 Education about asthma self management]

Table D.14. Summary of Care

D.3.2. Patient Chart Summary (Excerpt)

C-CDA Category/Entry	Modeling
Advance Directives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not resuscitate 	Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Topic: <i>[5751000205109 Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(363702006 Has focus) [304253006 Not for resuscitation]</i>
Allergies, Adverse Reactions and Alerts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allergen: Penicillin <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reaction: Nausea 	Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Topic: <i>[5751000205109 Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(363702006 Has focus) [91936005 Allergy to penicillin]</i> Associated statement: Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Topic: <i>[5751000205109 Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(363702006 Has focus) [422587007 Nausea]-</i> <i>(42752001 Due to) [91936005 Allergy to penicillin];</i>
Problem list <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chest pain Angina 	Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Topic: <i>[5751000205109 Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(363702006 Has focus) [29857009 Chest pain]</i> Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Topic: <i>[5751000205109 Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(363702006 Has focus) [194828000 Angina]</i>
Social History <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Former smoker Consumes 12 alcoholic drinks/day 	Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Topic: <i>[5751000205109 Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(363702006 Has focus) [8517006 Ex-smoker]</i> Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Topic: <i>[5751000205109 Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(363702006 Has focus) [228319007 Drinks alcohol daily]-</i> <i>(363714003 Interprets) [160573003 Alcohol intake];</i> Result: <i>12 [258950000 Unit/day]</i>
Results	Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hemoglobin 13.2 g/dl • Hematocrit 33.5% 	Topic: [104718002 Hemoglobin, free measurement]-
	Result: 13.2 [258795003 Gram/deciliter]
	Statement type: [Performance]
	Topic: [28317006 Hematocrit determination]-
	Result: 33.5 [118582008 Percent (property)]

Table D.15. Patient Chart Summary

D.4. Examples of Modeling KNARTs Based on ANF

D.4.1. Atrial Fibrillation / Atrial Flutter Order Set (Excerpt)

Orderable Procedure/Narrative	Modeling
Referral to cardiology to evaluate atrial fibrillation/atrial flutter	Statement type: [Request] Topic: [183519002 Referral to cardiology service] Purpose: [386053000 Evaluation procedure]- (363702006 Has focus) [195080001 Atrial fibrillation and flutter]
Resting 12-lead electrocardiogram to evaluate arrhythmia	Statement type: [Request] Topic: [447113005 12 lead electrocardiogram at rest] Purpose: [386053000 Evaluation procedure]- (363702006 Has focus) [698247007 Cardiac arrhythmia]
Echocardiogram to evaluate left ventricular function	Statement type: [Request] Topic: [40701008 Echocardiography] Purpose: [386053000 Evaluation procedure]- (363702006 Has focus) [366188009 Finding of left ventricular function]
X-ray chest to evaluate heart failure STAT	Statement type: [Request] Topic: [399208008 Plain chest X-ray] Purpose: [386053000 Evaluation procedure]- (363702006 Has focus) [84114007 Heart failure] Priority: [49499008 Stat]
Basic metabolic panel	Statement type: [Request]

	Topic: [1421000205106 Basic metabolic panel]
Complete blood count ROUTINE	Statement type: [Request] Topic: [26604007 Complete blood count] Priority: [50811001 Routine]
Metoprolol tartrate 50 mg tablet oral daily 2 times	Statement type: [Request] Topic: [416118004 Administration]- (260686004 Method) [[129445006 Administration – action]- (363701004 Direct substance) [318475005 Product containing precisely metoprolol tartrate 50 milligram/1 each conventional release oral tablet]- (410675002 Route of administration) [[260548002 Oral]; Requested Result: 1 [421026006 Oral tablet] Frequency: 2 [258703001 day]

Table D.16. Atrial Fibrillation

D.4.2. Diagnostic Breast Imaging Documentation Template (Excerpt)

Observation/Narrative	Modeling
Screening Mammogram	Statement type: [Performance] Topic: [24623002 Screening mammography]
Mammogram Interpretation Normal	Statement type: [Performance] Topic: [370851004 Evaluation of diagnostic study results]- (363702006 Has focus) [71651007 Mammography] Result Status: [17621005 Normal]
Nipple discharge	Statement type: [Performance] Topic: [5751000205109 Observation procedure]- (363702006 Has focus) [54302000 Discharge from nipple]
Nipple discharge is normal lactation	Statement type: [Performance] Topic: [5751000205109 Observation procedure]-

	<i>(363702006 Has focus) [54302000 Discharge from nipple]</i> <i>(42752001 Due to) [82374005 Lactation normal]</i>
Breast Skin Changes	Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Topic: <i>[5751000205109 Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(363702006 Has focus) [115951000119105 Breast symptom of change in skin]</i>
First degree relative is a BRCA mutation carrier	Statement type: <i>[Performance]</i> Subject of Information: <i>[125678001 First degree blood relative]</i> Topic: <i>[5751000205109 Observation procedure]-</i> <i>(363702006 Has focus) [445333001 Breast cancer genetic marker of susceptibility positive]</i>

Table D.17. Diagnostic Breast Imaging Documentation Template