Emails as is

Monday, November 26, 2012

11:19 AM

**From:** Martins, Susana

**Sent:** Thursday, June 07, 2012 9:35 AM

**To:** 'Samson Tu'; Wang, Dan Y.

**Cc:** Goldstein, Mary; Corley, Alyssa M.; Leung, Sylvia N.; Furman, Amy E. VHAPAL; Coleman, Bob; Oshiro, Connie M.

**Subject:** RE: [POSSIBLE VIRUS:###] Re: AutoPM Minutes and suggestion for a Tues Meeting?

They were implemented as messages related to drug recommendations. The first level would be ‘start hydrocodone’, the second level ‘relative contraindications…’ and the third level ‘formulation’ . These are not ‘true’ 3 level hierarchy messages. We did not find any messages that actually had 3 levels in athenaOT.

Please see screen shots in autopm\use cases\sample GUIs  folder.

Susana

**From:** Samson Tu [<mailto:swt@stanford.edu>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 06, 2012 5:27 PM

**To:** Wang, Dan Y.

**Cc:** Martins, Susana; Goldstein, Mary; Corley, Alyssa M.; Leung, Sylvia N.; Furman, Amy E. VHAPAL; Coleman, Bob; Oshiro, Connie M.

**Subject:** Re: [POSSIBLE VIRUS:###] Re: AutoPM Minutes and suggestion for a Tues Meeting?

Thanks Dan, for the analysis. Can you or Susana point me to the place in the Opioid KB where the 3 levels were implemented? I query for all detail bullet messages in Opioid KB and none of them has a detail message as its parent.

Samson

On 6/6/2012 4:14 PM, Wang, Dan Y. wrote:

All,

    These are my thoughts concerning use of the 3-level hierarchy

(summary, detail and detail bullet) of messages in Athena OT as it is

done now after reviewing some test cases with Susana.

1. We used the test cases created for the QUERI RRP project to evaluate the

   usability of AthenaOT. There were 4 simulated test cases only (902,903,905,906).

   While there are only 4 test cases, these are supposed to be "representative"

   and to showcase the range of Athena OT. (Susana took screenshots)

2. An example of a primary message with 3-levels:

   main message:      start hydrocodone

      detail:                    Relative contraindication for hydrocodone: anxiety

          detail bullet:   Formulation: hydrocodoen 5 mg $ acetaminophen 500 mg.

                                       Suggested schedule: 1 tid escalating to 2 quid as needed.......

   There are 2 things to note about this example:

   a. The content of the detail bullet does not serve to explain its parent, the

      detail concerning the contraindication, further.

      Rather it is additional information about how best to start the drug;

      this information could just as well be on the same level as the detail.

   b. For Athena OT, a separate section or table on drug recommendations was NOT

      done.  For AutoPM, using the separate tables for primary recommendations

      and drug recommendations, we could use these different sections to

      convey the same information, possibly as follows:

      I. primary recommendation section:

        message: start hydrocodone

      II. drug recommendation section:

        action/drug                indication/contraindication

      start hydrocodone         relative contraindication: anxiety

      and in the additional info table  for hydrocodone, optionally displayed,

     we could have:

         Formulation: hydrocodoen 5 mg $ acetaminophen 500 mg.

         Suggested schedule: 1 tid escalating to 2 quid as needed...

      Doing so, we would only need a 1-level hierarchy of primary

      recommendations for Athena OT; not even 2 level's are needed.

   I am also in general agreement with Samson. But now we know that even for

Athena OT, we can re-organize the advisories to convey the same information

without relying on a multi-level hierarchy for primary recommendations ( though this

will take some work on the present Athena OT KB )..

Dan

**From:** Martins, Susana

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 06, 2012 11:11 AM

**To:** 'Samson Tu'; Goldstein, Mary

**Cc:** Wang, Dan Y.; Corley, Alyssa M.; Leung, Sylvia N.; Furman, Amy E. VHAPAL; Coleman, Bob; Oshiro, Connie M.

**Subject:** RE: [POSSIBLE VIRUS:###] Re: AutoPM Minutes and suggestion for a Tues Meeting?

I agree with Samson, both me and Dan just went through the same exercise independently and came to the same conclusion.

Susana

**From:** Samson Tu [<mailto:swt@stanford.edu>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 06, 2012 11:07 AM

**To:** Goldstein, Mary

**Cc:** Wang, Dan Y.; Martins, Susana; Corley, Alyssa M.; Leung, Sylvia N.; Furman, Amy E. VHAPAL; Coleman, Bob; Oshiro, Connie M.

**Subject:** Re: [POSSIBLE VIRUS:###] Re: AutoPM Minutes and suggestion for a Tues Meeting?

Hi,

Yes, I am designing the ATHENA Advisory structures with the future in mind, not just for using the 5 guidelines in the AutoPM project.

The reasons I think a (> 2)-level message text display is not a good idea because

1. It's never used any ATHENA knowledge bases. (The Opioid KB has the Summary level and then Detail or DetailBullet. There is no instance of a third level -- I checked in the Opioid KB. DetailBullet are always linked to Summary level.)

2. A third-level message requires a user to make 2 clicks to access (if we display the main message and hide the detailed levels).

3. A multi-level hierarchy introduces additional complexity in generating, storing, and accessing them. A relational table is not good with hierarchies.

4. The curation effort to manage multi-level hierarchy is considerable. (In the Opioid KB, I found numerous instances of Detail and DetailBullet messages that are not linked to any summary message.)

Samson

On 6/6/2012 5:28 AM, Goldstein, Mary wrote:

My thoughts about what to support:

* Eventually we want to be broad, to accommodate as many different guideline/KB types as possible.
* We are starting with easier problems by restricting to the cardiovascular-related group of KBs but we do not want to limit ourselves to those for the entire project because that would be just too limiting
* As you think about how to arrange this, think about what we do in short-term to get something up there while keeping options open to do broader work in longer-term of project

Mary

**From:** Wang, Dan Y.

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 05, 2012 5:04 PM

**To:** 'Samson Tu'

**Cc:** Martins, Susana; Corley, Alyssa M.; Goldstein, Mary; Leung, Sylvia N.; Furman, Amy E. VHAPAL; Coleman, Bob; Oshiro, Connie M.

**Subject:** RE: [POSSIBLE VIRUS:###] Re: AutoPM Minutes and suggestion for a Tues Meeting?

Samson,

      Thanks.

      My understanding from Susana is that there already exists 1 clinical domain, Athena OT, that requires a 3-level hierarchy of

messages (on the other hand, AutoPM does not officially encompass Athena OT clinical domain).  What you show here with the list of subsidiary messages under a main message can at most accommodate a 2-level hierarchy.

      We shall have to decide whether to support a 3-level hierarchy or not.

Dan