Hi Chris

Jonathan’s vessel rationalising utility creates retrieval jobs/tasks/exercises for the Retrieval Assistant to work through.  At the end of the exercise, having moved all the cryovials into new boxes, the user may end up with empty boxes.  You should ask them if they want to discard those boxes (and update the database accordingly).  If they don’t, the assumption is that they’ll put the boxes back where they came from.

The other thing about vessel rationalisation is that it might turn out that the source information isn’t entirely accurate – cryovials might have got swapped around or gone missing if a retrieval job hasn’t been properly recorded, or there might be more than you were expecting.  It’s worth checking that the Retrieval Assistant can handle these situations

Hi Nick

All of these samples have been through a retrieval exercise, I suspect we may have missed setting the first one up though?

Would it be easier to skip the workaround and just use Add Specimens?

Martin

-----Original Message-----

From: Nicholas Goodwin

Sent: 08 October 2013 13:19

To: Martin Radley

Cc: Chris Bird

Subject: RE: 119000044

Hi Martin

I'm afraid there's no way round this one. Like Storage Sync, the release version of Sample Reception doesn't check cryovial.status or cryovial\_store.status. Unlike Storage Sync, it's using the barcode and aliquot type, so the 2.7.2 bodge won't work. If you retrieve a cryovial and then put it away again, you cannot then auto-generate an entry for it in Sample Reception.

I'll record this as a bug but I'm not sure how serious it is:

- until we're using StoreMan, we can record the retrieval in two stages: update the old cryovial\_store record when the cryovial has been retrieved but don't add the new one until after it has been analysed

- once StoreMan's been released, that workaround is not available to use but we can use StoreMan to create the specimen records from the retrieval list

I'll add a Bugzilla entry. Can you add a comment?

--

Nick

Hi Martin

Have some of the STICS cryovials been through a retrieval exercise?

I looked at 119000044 and it has two cryovial\_store records.  119003231, which worked OK last time, only has one.  I tried 119000045, only one, and bingo: cryovial match.  It looks as if Sample Reception suffers from a similar problem to Storage Sync.

I had a look at the source code and it looks OK - unlike Storage Sync, it does check the status of the cryovial\_store record.  However, that may never have made it into the release version.  I'll double-check this afternoon.

You could say it was a good thing you found the problem when you did.  I can make sure the fix we're planning for 2.7.2 will handle Sample Reception as well as Storage Sync

--

Nick

Hi Martin

If this works as it should, StorageSync will pick up the troublesome boxes correctly once we've upgraded the live system to 2.7.2. We haven't asked you for a date for that yet but I'm hoping we'll be able to check the existing software works OK later this month

--

Nick

-----Original Message-----

From: Martin Bowes

Sent: 07 October 2013 13:58

To: Nicholas Goodwin; Andrew Munday; Jonathan Price; Chris Bird

Cc: Martin Radley

Subject: RE: Bodge alert

OK,

I've included the code changes in the next 2.7.2 rebuild.

I've put in quicky changes to the tables on test and mirror systems. The new RFPs are loaded. Tables have been reregistered in all the project\_ddbs.

Marty

-----Original Message-----

From: Nicholas Goodwin

Sent: 07 October 2013 13:15

To: Martin Bowes; Andrew Munday; Jonathan Price; Chris Bird

Cc: Martin Radley

Subject: RE: Bodge alert

No further response, so:

Marty, please include this in the scripts for the (next) 2.7.2 upgrade. If at all possible, please apply the same changes to the test and mirror systems.

Chris/Andrew/Jonathan, please modify your code to use cryovial\_store.tube\_position in place of cryovial\_position. From now on, cryovial\_position will only be valid until the cryovial is marked for removal from a box. Your new code won't be able to update the live system while it's still at 2.7.1 but you can read it by checking which fields exist:

Select \* from cryovial, cryovial\_store where . The position of each cryovial is given by: if tube\_position exists then tube\_position else cryovial\_position

Thanks

--

Nick

From: Nicholas Goodwin

Sent: 04 October 2013 12:40

To: 'Alan Young'; Andrew Munday; Chris Bird; Jonathan Price; Geraint Jones; Martin Bowes; Martin Radley

Subject: RE: Bodge alert

The best I can come up with:

Alter cryovial\_store:

add new column tube\_position, int2, default -1; modify old column cryovial\_position, int2, default -1

with an RFP on insert that checks tube\_position **\*or\*** cryovial\_position has been set and stores that value in both fields Update cryovial\_store:

set tube\_position = cryovial\_position

set cryovial\_position = 50 where retrieval\_cid <> 0 Add an RFP that throws an error if anyone tries to update tube\_position or cryovial\_position but sets cryovial\_position = 50 if retrieval\_cid <> 0

New code would use tube\_position; cryovial\_position would be dropped in 2.7.4

Comments?

--

Nick

From: Nicholas Goodwin

Sent: 04 October 2013 11:09

To: Alan Young ([ayoung@nexus.ox.ac.uk](mailto:ayoung@nexus.ox.ac.uk)); Andrew Munday ([Andrew.Munday@ctsu.ox.ac.uk](mailto:Andrew.Munday@ctsu.ox.ac.uk)); Chris Bird; Jonathan Price ([jonathan.price@ctsu.ox.ac.uk](mailto:jonathan.price@ctsu.ox.ac.uk)); Geraint Jones; Martin Bowes

Cc: Martin Radley

Subject: Bodge alert

Hi folks

We have a slight problem: the LIMS databases allow for the possibility that cryovials can be taken out of their boxes but some of the old software doesn't - it ignores the status in the cryovial and cryovial\_store tables and assumes a 1:1 relationship between them.  This becomes a problem when it works out the first and last barcode in a box.

We need a workaround for this problem, otherwise we will not be able to record sample retrieval task until StoreMan and the new Box Reception are released.  Although we have copies of the old programs in CVS, rebuilding them, changing the relevant line of code and proving that it hasn't changed the programs work would be quite a lot of work.

The best idea so far is that we temporarily change the way we record retrievals: set the cryovial position for every record in a retrieval job to 50, so it wouldn't appear as first or last, and store the old position as a negative number in the status field or add another column to the cryovial\_store table to store the old position.

The programs we are working on at the moment would have to be adjusted to recognise the same convention.  The bodged update could be carried out behind the scenes by an RFP which could be switched off once BoxReception and StoreMan were released, the bodged data could be corrected and the extra field removed as part of the transition to 2.7.4.

I'm fairly confident that this approach would work and it may not be too much extra work, since we're working on the code already, but it still feels like a bodge.  Does anyone have a better idea?

--

Nick