**Seas MacAvancy **Arman Cohan **Nazil Goharian **Nazil Goharian **Nazil Goharian **Ross Flice  **Ittle **Ranking Significant Discrepancies in Clinical Reports  **publication_date **pu	doc_1		doc_2		decision
Publication_date   2020-01-18 00:000:000   SupportedSources.INTERNET_ARCHIVE   SupportedSources.INTERNET_ARCHIVE   SupportedSources.INTERNET_ARCHIVE   SupportedSources.INTERNET_ARCHIVE   SupportedSources.INTERNET_ARCHIVE   SupportedSources.CORH		<ul> <li>Arman Cohan</li> <li>Nazli Goharian</li> <li>Ross Filice</li> </ul>	authors	<ul> <li>AD Kalaria</li> <li>AT Ruutiainen</li> <li>J Walls</li> <li>MA Makary</li> </ul>	
source   SupportedSources.INTERNET_ARCHIVE   journal			title	Ranking Significant Discrepancies in Clinical Reports	
Journal   Volume   SupportedSources.CORE   Journal   Volume   Journa			publication da	te 2020-01-18 00:00:00	
Journal		SupportedSources.INTERNET_ARCHIVE			
doi  uris  • https://web.archive.org/web/20200321055517/https://arxiv.org/pdf/2001.06674v1.pdf  id  id6308769325681900883  Medical errors are a major public health concern and a leading cause of death worldwide. Many healthcare centers and hospitals use reporting systems where medical practitioners write a preliminary medical report and the report is later reviewed, reviewed, reviewed, and finalized by a more experienced physician. The revisions range from stylistic to corrections of critical errors or misinterpretations of the case. Due to the large quantity of reports written daily, it is often difficult to manually and thoroughly review all the finalized reports to find such errors and learn from them. To address this challenge, we propose a novel ranking approach, consisting of textual and ontological overlaps between the versions. This allows medical practitioners to easily identify and learn from the reports in which their interpretation most substantially differed from that of the attending physician (who finalized the report). This is a crucial step towards uncovering potential errors and helping medical practitioners to learn from by 4.5% to 15.4%.    doi   10.1007/978-3-030-45442-5_30     urls   http://arxiv.org/abs/2001.06674     urls   http://arxiv.org/abs/2001.06674     did 304576695284149652     did 30457695284149652     Medical errors are a major public health concern and a leading cause of death worldwide. Many healthcare centers and hospitals use reporting systems where medical practitioners write a preliminary medical report and the report is later reviewed, revised, and finalized by a more experienced physician. The revisions range from stylistic to corrections of critical errors or misinterpretation most understored in the report is later reviewed, revised, and finalized by a more experienced physician. The revisions range from stylistic to corrections of critical errors and helping medical practitioners to easily identify of prost written daily, it is often difficult to manually and thoroug			journal		
doi  urls  • https://web.archive.org/web/20200321055517/https://arxiv.org/pdf/2001.06674v1.pdf  id id6308769325681900883  Medical errors are a major public health concern and a leading cause of death worldwide. Many healthcare centers and hospitals use reporting systems where medical practitioners write a preliminary medical report and the report is later reviewed, revised, and finalized by a more experienced physician. The revisions range from stylistic to corrections of critical errors or misinterpretations of the case. Due to the large quantity of reports written daily, it is often difficult to manually and thoroughly review all the finalized reports to find such errors and learn from them. To address this challenge, we propose a novel ranking approach, consisting of textual and ontological overlaps between the versions. This allows medical practitioners to easily identify and learn from the reports in which their interpretation most substantially differed from that of the attending physician (who finalized the report). This is a crucial step towards uncovering potential errors and helping medical practitioners to learn from the reports and show that our approach outperforms both previously-proposed approaches and more recent language models by 4.5% to 15.4%.    doi   10.1007/978-3-303-45442-5_30     urls   http://arxiv.org/abs/2001.06674     urls   http://arxiv.org/abs/2001.06674     urls   id7304576695284149652     did7304576695284149652     did7304576695284149652     Medical errors are a major public health concern and a leading cause of death worldwide. Many healthcare centers and hospitals use reporting systems where medical practitioners write a preliminary medical report and the report is alter reviewed, revised, and finalized by a more experienced physician. The revisions range from stylistic to corrections of critical errors or misinterpretation of the case. Due to the large quantity of reports written daily, it is often difficult to manually and thoroughly review all the finalized reports. The appr	volume		volume		
* https://web.archive.org/web/20200321055517/https://arxiv.org/pdf/2001.06674v1.pdf  id id6308769325681900883  Medical errors are a major public health concern and a leading cause of death worldwide. Many healthcare centers and hospitals use reporting systems where medical practitioners write a preliminary medical report and the report is later reviewed, revised, and finalized by a more experienced physician. The revisions range from stylistic to corrections of critical errors or misinterpretations of the case. Due to the large quantity of reports written daily, it is often difficult to manually and thoroughly review all the finalized reports and learn from them. To address this challenge, we propose a novel ranking approach, consisting of textual and ontological overlaps between the preliminary and final versions. This allows medical practitioners to learn from such errors, thus improving patient-care in the long run. We evaluate our model on a dataset of radiology reports and show that our approach outperforms both previously-proposed approaches and more recent language models by 4.5% to 15.4%.  * https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.06674  id id3304576695284149652    Medical errors are a major public health concern and a leading cause of death worldwide. Many healthcare centers and hospitals use reporting systems where medical practitioners write a preliminary medical errors are a major public health concern and a leading cause of death worldwide. Many healthcare centers and hospitals use reporting systems where medical practitioners write a preliminary medical errors are a major public health concern and a leading cause of death worldwide. Many healthcare centers and hospitals use reporting systems where medical practitioners write a preliminary medical errors are a major public health concern and a leading cause of death worldwide. Many healthcare centers and hospitals use reporting systems where medical practitioners write a preliminary medical report and hereoff the teros of the case. Due to the large quantity of	doi		doi	10.1007/978-3-030-45442-5 30	
Medical errors are a major public health concern and a leading cause of death worldwide. Many healthcare centers and hospitals use reporting systems where medical practitioners write a preliminary medical report and the report is later reviewed, revised, and finalized by a more experienced physician. The revisions range from stylistic to corrections of critical errors or misinterpretations of the case. Due to the large quantity of reports written daily, it is often difficult to manually and thoroughly review all the finalized reports to find such errors and learn from them. To address this challenge, we propose a novel ranking approach, consisting of textual and ontological overlaps between the preliminary and final versions of reports. The approach learns to rank the reports based on the degree of discrepancy between the versions. This allows medical practitioners to easily identify and learn from the reports in which their interpretation most substantially differed from that of the attending physician (who finalized the report). This is a crucial step towards uncovering potential errors and helping medical practitioners to learn from such errors, thus improving patient-care in the long run. We evaluate our model on a dataset of radiology reports and show that our approach outperforms both previously-proposed approaches and more recent language models by 4.5% to 15.4%.	ses urls			_	DUPLICATES 29
Medical errors are a major public health concern and a leading cause of death worldwide. Many healthcare centers and hospitals use reporting systems where medical practitioners write a preliminary medical report and the report is later reviewed, revised, and finalized by a more experienced physician. The revisions range from stylistic to corrections of critical errors or misinterpretations of the case. Due to the large quantity of reports written daily, it is often difficult to manually and thoroughly review all the finalized reports to find such errors and learn from them. To address this challenge, we propose a novel ranking approach, consisting of textual and ontological overlaps between the preliminary and final versions of reports. The approach learns to rank the reports based on the degree of discrepancy between the versions. This allows medical practitioners to easily identify and learn from the reports in which their interpretation most substantially differed from that of the attending physician (who finalized the report). This is a crucial step towards uncovering potential errors and helping medical practitioners to learn from the reports. The approach learns to rank the reports based on the degree of interpretation most substantially differed from that of the attending physician (who finalized the report). This is a crucial step towards uncovering potential errors and helping medical practitioners to learn from the reports. The approach learns to rank the reports based on the degree of discrepancy between the versions. This allows medical practitioners to easily identify and learn from the reports. The approach learns to rank the reports based on the degree of reports. The approach learns to rank the reports between the versions. This allows medical practitioners to easily identify and learn from the reports. The approach learns to rank the reports and show that our approach outperforms both previously-proposed approaches and more recent language models by 4.5% to 15.4%.	id		id	id7304576695284149652	
		and hospitals use reporting systems where medical practitioners write a preliminary medical report and the report is later reviewed, revised, and finalized by a more experienced physician. The revisions range from stylistic to corrections of critical errors or misinterpretations of the case. Due to the large quantity of reports written daily, it is often difficult to manually and thoroughly review all the finalized reports to find such errors and learn from them. To address this challenge, we propose a novel ranking approach, consisting of textual and ontological overlaps between the preliminary and final versions of reports. The approach learns to rank the reports based on the degree of discrepancy between the versions. This allows medical practitioners to easily identify and learn from the reports in which their interpretation most substantially differed from that of the attending physician (who finalized the report). This is a crucial step towards uncovering potential errors and helping medical practitioners to learn from such errors, thus improving patient-care in the long run. We evaluate our model on a dataset of radiology reports and show that our approach outperforms both previously-proposed approaches and more recent language models		Medical errors are a major public health concern and a leading cause of death worldwide. Many healthcare centers and hospitals use reporting systems where medical practitioners write a preliminary medical report and the report is later reviewed, revised, and finalized by a more experienced physician. The revisions range from stylistic to corrections of critical errors or misinterpretations of the case. Due to the large quantity of reports written daily, it is often difficult to manually and thoroughly review all the finalized reports to find such errors and learn from them. To address this challenge, we propose a novel ranking approach, consisting of textual and ontological overlaps between the preliminary and final versions of reports. The approach learns to rank the reports based on the degree of discrepancy between the versions. This allows medical practitioners to easily identify and learn from the reports in which their interpretation most substantially differed from that of the attending physician (who finalized the report). This is a crucial step towards uncovering potential errors and helping medical practitioners to learn from such errors, thus improving patient-care in the long run. We evaluate our model on a dataset of radiology reports and show that our approach outperforms both previously-proposed approaches and more recent	