Robert Jenders' response to my question about the usefulness of citations and the detailed maintenance slot

> 1) For Citations, you indicate whether the citation refutes or supports the
> MLM. How useful is that information to people? Do people also want other
> possible values besides support or refute. For example, some decisions are
> made between options have pros and cons for them, and some of the citations
> can, in a sense, both support and refute an option.

Some people use the slot for "infobuttons", i.e., links that provide additional
explanatory material. Many don't use it this way; it merely serves as internal
documentation (e.g., which version of USPSTF was referenced). I don't find it
all that useful, but other systems make this distinction.

The fact that a single citation may partially support and partially refute the
conclusion or recommendation of a MLM was a matter of some discussion when the
key words were proposed. When this occurs, the terms should be omitted.
[Perhaps we should add a new reserved word: WHO-KNOWS? :-)]

> 2) A similar question about the maintenance slot: which are the most
> important attributes there? Which are usually not used often? Do you need
> more possible values for the validation slot?

The answer to your question depends on what you mean by "use". Many sites use
filename or title in the header of an alert. The typical system permits
versioning, so that slot is important. The author/specialist slots are
typically not incorporated into an alert but are useful for documentation
purposes.

I'm sure that various sites have felt limited by the current possible values of
the validation slot. One possible addition is "administrative", e.g., MLMs
written to do QA/QI instead of actual scientific research but which do not
generate clinical alerts. (Example: a MLM that alerts admissions department
in case a patient requiring isolation is admitted to a non-isolation room.)