# Change request log

# Team

Team #8 – Chelsea Swan and Leena Varghese

# Change Request

FEMR 138 - don't let a user submit on Pharmacy unless they check the disclaimer

# Concept Location

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Step # | Description | Rationale |
| 1 | Logged into the GUI | To visually understand what the change requests refer to |
| 2 | Went to Pharmacy tab to search prescriptions | Because the change request refers to the Pharmacy |
| 3 | Created knew patient with Check-In Triage | Realized that I need to know who the patient ID first to complete their pharmacy search and if we know the information of a patient we created, we can better track what information is passed. |
| 4 | Searched in medical tab | Because they are now a checked in patient that has been evaluated and can be prescribed medication. |
| 5 | Clicked on Treatment tab | This is where we can add treatments including prescriptions. |
| 6 | Added prescription for new patient | We needed to populate this information to assess where else prescription data is populated. |
| 6 | Click on pharmacy tab and searched our new patient | To see the new mediation we just prescribed. |
| 7 | We find the disclaimer check box that the change request is referring to |  |
| 8 | Looked for the pharmacy UI and found the files edit.scala.html and index.scala.html | The issue was on the Pharmacy tab |
| 9 | Search code for “The patient was counseled on the risks” in edit.scala.html | We needed to find the check box with the same text that was found on the UI.  The button that is clicked is called “submit” and we needed to identify the event is associated with the submit button. |
| 10 | Searched through the UI file EditViewModelPost.java and realized that getDisclaimer() is the flag that is associated to the disclaimer checkbox | Compared to the other code, we saw that viewModel was the object used to access post characteristics. |
| 11 | Found the JS file associated with making the client side changes to the checkbox | This code was called by the UI to validate the client side requirements that were abstracted from the data layer |

**Time spent (in minutes):** 40 mins

# Impact Analysis

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Step # | Description | Rationale |
| 1 | Searched GUI pages for this same prescriptions disclaimer and ran code inspection by name | To see if any other classes would also use this disclaimer flag |
| 2 | There was no impact to any other classes | This checkbox is not present on any other GUI page and the change request only specifies the one instance before submitting the prescriptions. |

**Time spent (in minutes):** 33

**Actualization**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Step # | Description | Rationale |
| 1 | New code was to be added in file location /femr\_138/public/js/medical/medicalClientValidation.js | When the submit button is clicked, whether or not these actions can happen depends on the disclaimer checkbox state |
| 2 | Added the code :   |  | | --- | | if(!$("input:checkbox[name='disclaimer']").is(':checked')) { | | alert("To proceed with the submission, please sign the disclaimer :: The patient was counseled on the risks and side effects of the medications dispensed:: "); | | event.preventDefault(); | | } | | This would prompt the user to change the state of the disclaimer checkbox before proceeding. |

**Time spent (in minutes):** 20

**Validation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Step # | Description | Rationale |
| 1 | The disclaimer checkbox change was a UI change. | There was no other code that was impacted due to this change other than the submit button on the UI:  /pharmacy.html |
| 2 | Checked for dependencies using dependency mapping. | No dependencies found |
| 3 | UI validation- by submitting the Pharmacy- Prescription by first not signing the checkbox. | The alert prompts user to check/ sign the disclaimer before proceeding with the form submission. |
| 4 | UI validation- by submitting the Pharmacy- Prescription by signing the checkbox. | No alert displayed and user proceeds with the form submission. |
| 5 | UI validation- all features retested after the implementation for ensuring no issues with implementation. This was done while the debugger tracked any changes/errors. | All the 3 tabs worked with no issues found. |

**Time spent (in minutes):** 25

# Timing

Summarize the time spent on each phase.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Phase Name | Time (in minutes) |
| Concept location | 40 |
| Impact Analysis | 33 |
| Prefactoring | 0 |
| Actualization | 20 |
| Postfactoring | 0 |
| Verification | 25 |
| Total | 115 |

# Reverse engineering

# Conclusions

The Impact Analysis took much longer because this was the first change request (CR) that we implemented. A lot of time was spent searching for the disclaimer referred to in the CR.