

Information Extraction of medical practice guidelines/protocols: review usage

review usage for the state of the art report for the course

188.948 Seminar for Medical Informatics

For the master studies

Medical Informatics (066 936)

Submitted by

Christian Hinterer

Matriculation-number 0927843

At the
Faculty of Informatics at the University of Technology Vienna

Supervision
Supervising tutor: Mag. Dr.rer.soc.oec. Katharina Kaiser

Vienna, November 29th, 2012

Review 1:

Used suggestions:

- “critical discussion, comparison of the different approaches and conclusion are missing” → missing sections were not finished due to time problems and are added for the final version
- “the paper misses a critical section” → also extended with the additional chapter of discussion in the final version
- “there is no discussion and no conclusion chapter” → added for the final version
- “the state of the art seems to be described without criticism and comparison” → addresses the same thing like the previous point and is included in the final version

Discarded suggestions:

- “paper does not specify the problem around which the corresponding master thesis is centered” → paper has no corresponding master thesis, because it is for the course “seminar”
- “The introduction section does not contain the information for the importance of CPG” → in my opinion it does contain that they are necessary to improve the clinical and diagnostic processes. It also includes why the extraction of the knowledge contained in CPG is necessary → to put it in a format that is able to be auto-processed
- “the related work should contain more detail of the related work’s results” → that would blast the extent of the paper: in my opinion the related work section should only contain links to the actual related work and a small description → to get the whole information out of it, the related work literature has to be read
- “the number of references should be at least tripled” → for a master thesis this would be true, then it would be at least four or five times more, but in this case I think it is necessary to read enough literature to get the most needed information

Review 2:

This review does not really contain much information, since most of the review form sections are only answered by choosing a grade number out of the review forms offer.

It seems that the author "filled" this review form in less than 5 minutes.

Used suggestions:

- "references were omitted" → references included in the chapters
- "no critical discussion" → this section was missing as a result of problems with the time schedule and is added to the final version
- "Asgard/Asbru is used in the paper, but not included in the references" → references extended
- "the results of the evaluation should be more mentioned and discussed" → like already mentioned a few times, the discussion section was not finished, respectively written at all and will be included in the final version
- "Instead of I use We" → change executed for better soundness

Discarded suggestions:

- "no figures": in my opinion there were no figures important enough to include it in the report