

CHoRUS B2AI Standards Module Office Hours Transcript

December 14, 2023

0:0:0.0 --> 0:0:0.470

Houghtaling, Jared

Hey, Paulina.

0:0:0.70 --> 0:0:0.710

Talapova, Polina

And Jared?

0:0:3.310 --> 0:0:5.240

Talapova, Polina

Hi, Caleb, Andrew.

0:0:6.160 --> 0:0:6.550

Houghtaling, Jared

Andrew.

0:0:8.110 --> 0:0:8.450

Williams, Andrew E

Hello. Hello.

0:0:44.790 --> 0:0:45.270

Alvarez, Marta

Hi everyone.

0:0:48.200 --> 0:0:48.490

Williams, Andrew E

We.

0:0:48.280 --> 0:0:48.690

Talapova, Polina

14.

0:1:49.390 --> 0:1:51.180

Williams, Andrew E

Should we go ahead and get started?

0:1:51.190 --> 0:1:52.410

Williams, Andrew E

I know people are still arriving but.

0:1:57.130 --> 0:1:57.560

Williams, Andrew E

We'll go ahead.

0:1:59.260 --> 0:2:7.370

Williams, Andrew E

Marty, did you wanna set up the just in agenda that we're talking about before I introduced the main event?

0:2:10.340 --> 0:2:13.10

Alvarez, Marta

I think you might do a better job than me introducing the.

0:2:18.260 --> 0:2:18.500

Williams, Andrew E

OK.

0:2:13.60 --> 0:2:26.270

Alvarez, Marta

I mean that the agenda I I should say, but I do wanna just leave by by saying that we verbally as well that we're canceling the 28th meeting the week of the holiday.

0:2:26.280 --> 0:2:30.400

Alvarez, Marta

Just wanted to mention that I did send it up via email but just FYI.

0:2:34.140 --> 0:2:37.970

Williams, Andrew E

All right, now let's have a very dramatic drum roll.

0:2:38.90 --> 0:3:7.130

Williams, Andrew E

Now let's not there is, though, exciting anticipation that we are going to take the next step in the work that's been presented a few times already on getting Hoshi data that have been prioritized into a form that is trusted and reliable and can be used relatively easily as part of the ETL's at each data contributing site to get it into the standard form.

0:3:7.140 --> 0:3:14.950

Williams, Andrew E

And so you've heard Paulina especially talk about this a few times as she's done a tremendous amount of work.

0:3:15.260 --> 0:3:30.540

Williams, Andrew E

It's based not only on her uh understanding as a clinician, but as a medical oncologist, and this particular form of representing mappings that flowsheet data to standard concepts that's uses this structure called cesium.

0:3:30.830 --> 0:3:43.920

Williams, Andrew E

The simple standard for sharing ontology mappings that gives a precise semantics to things whether things are abroad at a narrow or exact match, et cetera, and allows it to be used in a particular way.

0:3:43.930 --> 0:3:46.340

Williams, Andrew E

She's done a tremendous amount of work on this.

0:3:46.490 --> 0:3:59.470

Williams, Andrew E

There's you've already been pointed and past calls to the folder on Google Drive for Chorus bridged AI, where the mappings that she has proposed for the couple top couple of tiers so far in the.

0:4:1.650 --> 0:4:8.800

Williams, Andrew E

The flow sheet and other data items that have identified through the Delphi processing chorus as being high priority things.

0:4:8.810 --> 0:4:10.510

Williams, Andrew E

We want to make sure all sites are contributing.

0:4:10.560 --> 0:4:11.760

Williams, Andrew E

Those are already there.

0:4:12.40 --> 0:4:28.840

Williams, Andrew E

There's going to be an additional process after all this great work that she's already done to get additional content experts as bridge to AI is really rich with wonderful uh clinician scientists who have additional expertise to bring to bear on the proposed mappings.

0:4:29.110 --> 0:4:57.270

Williams, Andrew E

We're going to go through today some examples of how to understand what it is that Paulina has done and have clinicians with the right expertise look at that and and for us to record it and show where a proposed mapping between a flow sheet item and a standard concept has had a particular kind of expert who has looked at what's been proposed and said, yeah, that makes sense or any questions about it have been recorded and need to be resolved and so on.

0:4:57.280 --> 0:5:13.180

Williams, Andrew E

So that's the process we're going to go through today for a few example items and we're hoping this sets up a general, umm pattern that we can follow for making sure that we're leveraging how leveraging both the.

0:5:14.940 --> 0:5:23.200

Williams, Andrew E

Symantec and ontology expertise and mapping expertise that we have, as well as the clinician scientists expertise to get all of this standardization done.

0:5:23.640 --> 0:5:24.50

Williams, Andrew E

Uh.

0:5:24.200 --> 0:5:28.130

Williams, Andrew E

Then, in a way, we agree is is the right way and that can be reused.

0:5:28.140 --> 0:5:31.50

Williams, Andrew E

And I'm very excited to see what's gonna happen.

0:5:31.420 --> 0:5:57.580

Williams, Andrew E

So we're going to be asking for anybody who has the relevant clinical expertise to kind of join in and prompting folks we have suchen, who is not only a Co lead for this whole standards module, but outstanding clinician scientist obviously and has all kinds of expertise in developing and understanding these common data elements in various spaces.

0:5:58.890 --> 0:6:9.480

Williams, Andrew E

And so, but everybody's with clinical expertise who's got the inclination is going to be welcome to join in and that's it.

0:6:9.490 --> 0:6:11.710

Williams, Andrew E

That's what we're going to be doing.

0:6:12.560 --> 0:6:15.800

Williams, Andrew E

And with that, I will let Paulina kick it off.

0:6:19.160 --> 0:6:23.810

Talapova, Polina

Andrew, thank you so much for this good such good intro.

0:6:24.570 --> 0:6:29.250

Talapova, Polina

So today's topic is clinical validation process of proposed flow ship mappings.

0:6:29.260 --> 0:6:38.820

Talapova, Polina

And let me just share my screen for some several slides and then we will go to the validation process as is.

0:7:0.970 --> 0:7:22.200

Talapova, Polina

Uh, so today I want to tell you about the value of our topic and explain the validation approach that we

would like to offer for the use and also share the space for our common work like collaborative workspace in a Google spreadsheet.

0:7:22.570 --> 0:7:31.970

Talapova, Polina

As for the beginning and some mapping scenarios, also will be there I will explain what can be in the mapping peoples.

0:7:33.220 --> 0:7:39.790

Talapova, Polina

What can be covered and how we should validate different types of mappings?

0:7:43.420 --> 0:7:53.830

Talapova, Polina

First of all, why it's important for us because validated mappings, they improve our harmonization or standardization process.

0:7:54.100 --> 0:8:10.470

Talapova, Polina

So we have precise mapping and greater accuracy and efficacy of our process and what is important that has great impact on analytics, data analytics, data science and all other AI driven methodologies that people will use in the future.

0:8:10.580 --> 0:8:14.480

Talapova, Polina

That's why this tab is crucial for us.

0:8:16.150 --> 0:8:19.540

Talapova, Polina

Uh, talking about validation approach?

0:8:19.610 --> 0:8:23.380

Talapova, Polina

Umm, there are three main point points, at least.

0:8:23.390 --> 0:8:27.940

Talapova, Polina

First one we have to discover the mapping table.

0:8:27.950 --> 0:8:32.720

Talapova, Polina

They can be different, they can have different source fields or columns.

0:8:33.570 --> 0:8:36.280

Talapova, Polina

They can have some.

0:8:36.330 --> 0:8:36.840

Talapova, Polina

I don't know.

0:8:37.410 --> 0:8:39.700

Talapova, Polina

Inside, but we shouldn't be ready for that.

0:8:39.710 --> 0:8:43.350

Talapova, Polina

We have to explore what is inside, so just.

0:8:45.200 --> 0:8:48.950

Talapova, Polina

First step is to understand the structure of the mapping table.

0:8:49.300 --> 0:8:51.110

Talapova, Polina

Understand the meaning of each field.

0:8:51.400 --> 0:9:0.740

Talapova, Polina

The second step here is brief source review, so we have to go deeper into the source codes and source descriptions.

0:9:0.800 --> 0:9:12.470

Talapova, Polina

We need to be aware of additional useful information such as synonymic all names or units of measure, or values of measurements and observations.

0:9:12.520 --> 0:9:24.670

Talapova, Polina

So all this information can be important for the validation process and the third, the last but not least, it's detailed comparative analysis of the mapping.

0:9:24.770 --> 0:9:34.450

Talapova, Polina

So we have to compare each source term with its target term row by row, especially during clinical validation.

0:9:34.550 --> 0:9:44.960

Talapova, Polina

It's about long process, about discussion about working together, so everything is flexible and everything can be changed according to your requirements.

0:9:44.970 --> 0:9:48.50

Talapova, Polina

That's why you can speak about it and we encourage.

0:9:48.120 --> 0:9:51.570

Talapova, Polina

Which such behavior so?

0:9:53.370 --> 0:10:5.780

Talapova, Polina

Also, during the analysis, we have to employ clinical expertise as we have and also reference materials from the Internet from the real life.

0:10:6.130 --> 0:10:18.860

Talapova, Polina

I'm not talking about library, but all reference materials, trustworthy materials can be used for the analysis as well to As for addition to our clinical expertise.

0:10:21.630 --> 0:10:22.560

Talapova, Polina

Let's go further.

0:10:22.570 --> 0:10:29.780

Talapova, Polina

So mapping table structure and this is a mapping table with what we are going to work to today.

0:10:29.790 --> 0:10:30.140

Talapova, Polina

Uh.

0:10:30.150 --> 0:10:30.820

Talapova, Polina

Bit later.

0:10:30.830 --> 0:10:34.960

Talapova, Polina

So there is a column names that you will see the error.

0:10:36.30 --> 0:10:40.980

Talapova, Polina

So and there are data type just for case and description of the meaning.

0:10:41.730 --> 0:10:47.240

Talapova, Polina

But name suggest what it does so source code is a source code, source code concept ID.

0:10:47.250 --> 0:11:22.0

Talapova, Polina

In this case it's Autogenerated concept ad for source codes to make them unique and to be able to incorporate them in our home obsidium instance, source vocabulary is just source vocabulary and usually we create names for the source vocabulary, we modify them, we just can develop the logic for the vocabulary source, vocabulary name and even it could depends on the number of the source tables in different schemas for instance and the next colony source description.

0:11:22.10 --> 0:11:23.380

Talapova, Polina

So it's a source term name.

0:11:24.350 --> 0:11:30.100

Talapova, Polina

Uh, the most important place of our focus is a source term.

0:11:30.570 --> 0:11:33.360

Talapova, Polina

And then source description synonym.

0:11:33.550 --> 0:11:40.420

Talapova, Polina

It's a synonym of the source storm predicate ID indicates relation between the source or subject.

0:11:40.550 --> 0:11:43.690

Talapova, Polina

Is called incessant and target that is.

0:11:44.130 --> 0:11:46.720

Talapova, Polina

But the whole object in session as well.

0:11:46.890 --> 0:12:2.80

Talapova, Polina

So it's a relationship between 2 concepts in OMOP CDM because we are converting our data in normal city which means that everything is inside the OMOP, CDM uh confidence field is about the level of our confidence.

0:12:2.850 --> 0:12:9.960

Talapova, Polina

Once mapping is done, so score can be between zero and one and one is a good good number.

0:12:9.970 --> 0:12:17.240

Talapova, Polina

It means that we totally confident in our mapping or person who did it was was totally confident in the mapping.

0:12:18.180 --> 0:12:28.910

Talapova, Polina

Umm 0 means that we these mapping wasn't checked for instance, so it's unchecked or it just fully unconfident?

0:12:28.960 --> 0:12:54.770

Talapova, Polina

It's also possible variations of confidence can be used when we have one to many mappings in different types of 1 to many mappings we can use confidence to filter the better options, better matches and also how to say see all possible terms that can be used and we can include them into our concept set.

0:12:54.780 --> 0:13:0.870

Talapova, Polina

For instance, a bit later, or we will know that there are more terms related to our mapping.

0:13:1.240 --> 0:13:9.600

Talapova, Polina

We will be able to create and enrich hierarchy of terms if you will would like to do that a lot of opportunities.

0:13:9.610 --> 0:13:11.790

Talapova, Polina

So then target concept ID.

0:13:12.200 --> 0:13:17.60

Talapova, Polina

It's our standard OMOP concept ID that we use as a target.

0:13:17.120 --> 0:13:20.320

Talapova, Polina

It should be full equivalent, but unfortunately it's not.

0:13:20.480 --> 0:13:23.720

Talapova, Polina

You know, in some cases target concept ID.

0:13:23.730 --> 0:13:25.690

Talapova, Polina

It's a name vocabulary ID.

0:13:25.700 --> 0:13:34.750

Talapova, Polina

It came with SNOMED LOINC ICD 10 PCs, for instance, 74 he picks or something like that target domain ID we.

0:13:34.830 --> 0:13:41.590

Talapova, Polina

So it's better to know what are these domain can be for, for instance from our previous sessions.

0:13:42.200 --> 0:13:49.440

Talapova, Polina

But I can tell you that it can be drug measurement, observation, procedure, condition device or some other domain.

0:13:49.490 --> 0:14:0.320

Talapova, Polina

And it's a typical domains of omok and also uh, we we just also add poems for our review information.

0:14:0.760 --> 0:14:4.820

Talapova, Polina

There is review date, review label and also one additional field.

0:14:4.830 --> 0:14:8.580

Talapova, Polina

I didn't add it to this table, but in fact I did it.

0:14:8.830 --> 0:14:15.170

Talapova, Polina

There is this decision field, so this is a place where can we put some flag to indicate our final decision?

0:14:15.870 --> 0:14:17.100

Talapova, Polina

Umm, that's it.

0:14:17.470 --> 0:14:23.830

Talapova, Polina

So next one it's about scenarios mapping scenarios in the mapping table.

0:14:25.60 --> 0:14:25.660

Talapova, Polina

Uh.

0:14:26.70 --> 0:14:26.680

Talapova, Polina

Uh.

0:14:26.960 --> 0:14:27.550

Talapova, Polina

Different.

0:14:27.560 --> 0:14:29.770

Talapova, Polina

As I said, there are eight of them.

0:14:29.780 --> 0:14:30.830

Talapova, Polina

Yeah, eight of them.

0:14:30.900 --> 0:14:33.510

Talapova, Polina

So let's go first one.

0:14:33.920 --> 0:14:40.300

Talapova, Polina

When everything is fine, single exact match and confidence is equal to 1.

0:14:40.680 --> 0:14:44.110

Talapova, Polina

It means that that mapping is expected to be fully equivalent.

0:14:44.230 --> 0:14:51.940

Talapova, Polina

Should be correct, but it's still needs to be validated, but by a reviewer and in our case it should be clinical expert.

0:14:52.810 --> 0:15:1.240

Talapova, Polina

Umm, the second scenario when we have several exact matches and various confident value.

0:15:1.690 --> 0:15:3.770

Talapova, Polina

For instance, exact match.

0:15:4.190 --> 0:15:4.620

Talapova, Polina

Uh.

0:15:5.390 --> 0:15:16.710

Talapova, Polina

Lost confidence one and separate row another mapping exact match confidence 0.9 or eight or five.

0:15:17.510 --> 0:15:21.530

Talapova, Polina

Whatever you want to put there, it depends on your feelings inside.

0:15:22.370 --> 0:15:22.960

Talapova, Polina

Umm.

0:15:23.550 --> 0:15:28.920

Talapova, Polina

In this case, we have several options for an exact mapping match.

0:15:29.170 --> 0:15:42.970

Talapova, Polina

It's a problem because we need to have one standard and in this case reviewer have to confirm the mapper choice, especially in terms of preferable term or preferable mapping.

0:15:43.740 --> 0:15:48.570

Talapova, Polina

So if you agree this is good, if not, you have to address the issue further.

0:15:49.180 --> 0:15:59.790

Talapova, Polina

The third scenario when we have one single or several multiple broad matches with confidence one, all of them have one.

0:16:0.300 --> 0:16:4.880

Talapova, Polina

It means that unfortunately there is no equivalent mapping in normal.

0:16:5.680 --> 0:16:9.810

Talapova, Polina

And there is only mappings to parent or parents.

0:16:9.990 --> 0:16:20.120

Talapova, Polina

It means less granular term, less details inside the term and in all cases we'll we'll lose details.

0:16:20.450 --> 0:16:22.260

Talapova, Polina

We lost the details and this is a problem.

0:16:22.270 --> 0:16:42.80

Talapova, Polina

It means that not all information from the source term will be transferred to the our mapping to our the target term, so it's not so good for scenario when we have one for several like narrow matches with confidence, one.

0:16:42.570 --> 0:16:45.70

Talapova, Polina

In this case, it means the same.

0:16:45.80 --> 0:16:45.710

Talapova, Polina

There is no work.

0:16:45.720 --> 0:16:50.620

Talapova, Polina

People aren't mapping, but there is mapping to children or child or children.

0:16:50.970 --> 0:16:53.240

Talapova, Polina

These terms usually more granular.

0:16:53.250 --> 0:17:5.510

Talapova, Polina

They have information about some details or anatomical parts, or some additional methods applied, or maybe devices used in the procedures, so some additional information.

0:17:6.200 --> 0:17:18.650

Talapova, Polina

And uh, this information adds unnecessary details to our mapping and violate or distort the reality that we form to the in our data standardized data.

0:17:18.660 --> 0:17:25.20

Talapova, Polina

It means that analytics will be performed on this full data at from the very beginning.

0:17:27.660 --> 0:17:28.890

Talapova, Polina

Views scenario.

0:17:29.260 --> 0:17:34.160

Talapova, Polina

We have several broad matches in the mapping table with different confidence value.

0:17:35.550 --> 0:17:53.290

Talapova, Polina

In this case, there is also no fine full equivalent concept, but also there are duplicates among parents and we can have the same situation among children like duplicates in normal among children.

0:17:53.580 --> 0:18:17.90

Talapova, Polina

And we notice that and we want to store this information, we want to be aware that that's why we can also take this mappings, put them and see such type of scenario when we have just scenario matches with different confidence value, the highest confidence indicates a preferable term parent or child respectively.

0:18:18.160 --> 0:18:21.530

Talapova, Polina

The 7th scenario likely it's related match.

0:18:21.540 --> 0:18:34.110

Talapova, Polina

It can be one or several of them, and also means that there is no equivalent mapping, but some related terms somehow related are exist without are exist in OMOP.

0:18:34.700 --> 0:18:44.770

Talapova, Polina

This is good in some terms, but it means that maybe we have to create new term in the OMOP or submit the new term to OMOP as a candidate.

0:18:44.990 --> 0:18:58.580

Talapova, Polina

And yeah, so this is the indicator of the potential submission and the ease 8 scenario is no match, no mapping, no equivalent, and no related terms.

0:18:58.590 --> 0:19:0.300

Talapova, Polina

Nothing in normal but that.

0:19:1.520 --> 0:19:6.500

Talapova, Polina

Ah, so this storm has to be for sure, a candidate on on Sept.

0:19:6.540 --> 0:19:10.990

Talapova, Polina

Of course, in the case has some semantics.

0:19:12.90 --> 0:19:13.490

Talapova, Polina

Has some information.

0:19:13.610 --> 0:19:16.340

Talapova, Polina

Uh, like valuable information.

0:19:16.350 --> 0:19:23.230

Talapova, Polina

Sometimes terms can be just some fragments of words and you also and I have to be careful with that.

0:19:28.570 --> 0:19:28.880

Williams, Andrew E

Effort.

0:19:25.460 --> 0:19:30.770

Talapova, Polina

So now we are ready to go to the exercise, even not exercise.

0:19:30.780 --> 0:19:34.770

Talapova, Polina

But yeah, please questions or any thoughts.

0:19:36.670 --> 0:19:37.480

Williams, Andrew E

This is wonderful.

0:19:37.490 --> 0:20:7.600

Williams, Andrew E

As always, it was a lot and I wonder if we should go back, maybe to just a mapping table and then the the just see if people understood it, because I think we're going to be asking people to kind of do things and you gave a always as always a beautiful description, but since it might be the first time for some people or things weren't clear, it's just a pause first on the table structure and it's definitions and then on the scenarios, just make sure people are following before we go there, if that's all right.

0:20:12.30 --> 0:20:12.460

Talapova, Polina

Yeah, just.

0:20:8.530 --> 0:20:14.630

Williams, Andrew E

So is that OK, Pauline, if we do that, I know you were probably gonna be checking on this anyhow, but O is.

0:20:14.640 --> 0:20:19.230

Williams, Andrew E

Are there any questions for Polina about the different elements of this table?

0:20:19.240 --> 0:20:20.490

Williams, Andrew E

What the things mean?

0:20:20.840 --> 0:20:30.430

Williams, Andrew E

How they might be used, I'm sure that will become clear as she goes through the examples, but any preliminary questions about things that just weren't people weren't sure about.

0:20:35.350 --> 0:20:36.10

Williams, Andrew E

Everybody got it.

0:20:39.300 --> 0:20:39.780

Williams, Andrew E

All right.

0:20:39.790 --> 0:20:51.810

Williams, Andrew E

And then maybe, uh, moving on to the scenarios just, are there things that people felt less clear about, like what, what some of these meant or where they would be applied?

0:20:56.470 --> 0:20:57.320

Williams, Andrew E

Outstanding.

0:20:57.50 --> 0:20:57.450

Talapova, Polina

Angles.

0:20:57.370 --> 0:20:58.210

Williams, Andrew E

This looks like nothing.

0:20:59.530 --> 0:21:1.0

Williams, Andrew E

OK, alright.

0:21:1.10 --> 0:21:2.960

Williams, Andrew E

Please go forward. Thanks.

0:21:0.390 --> 0:21:4.200

Talapova, Polina

This little bit alright. Thank you.

0:21:5.640 --> 0:21:5.970

Talapova, Polina

Umm.

0:21:6.130 --> 0:21:9.150

Talapova, Polina

So yeah, let me try to go there.

0:21:9.200 --> 0:21:11.180

Talapova, Polina

It's no problem.

0:21:12.540 --> 0:21:13.60

Talapova, Polina

The table?

0:21:14.140 --> 0:21:21.100

Talapova, Polina

Uh, the font can be small, but I have to ask, is it too small or medium?

0:21:21.110 --> 0:21:25.410

Talapova, Polina

Small, small or shouldn't make it bigger.

0:21:27.690 --> 0:21:28.440

Talapova, Polina

You also can.

0:21:28.500 --> 0:21:31.250

Talapova, Polina

Uh, yeah, you can go there, really.

0:21:31.510 --> 0:21:32.460

Houghtaling, Jared

It's OK for my side.

0:21:32.470 --> 0:21:33.450

Houghtaling, Jared

Polina, I could see it well.

0:21:33.640 --> 0:21:34.860

Talapova, Polina

Oh yeah. Thanks.

0:21:36.90 --> 0:21:36.250

Alvarez, Marta

So.

0:21:37.320 --> 0:21:42.570

Talapova, Polina

Ohh Marty, maybe you can be able to share the link to that table.

0:21:42.580 --> 0:21:45.700

Talapova, Polina

It's an inside the map in Delphi.

0:21:46.910 --> 0:21:49.700

Park, Soojin

Marty she she shared the link already in the.

0:21:49.480 --> 0:21:50.870

Talapova, Polina

Oh, thanks so much.

0:21:50.880 --> 0:21:51.750

Talapova, Polina

Thanks so much.

0:21:52.440 --> 0:21:54.690

Talapova, Polina

Yeah, I see some some people out there.

0:21:54.800 --> 0:21:58.430

Talapova, Polina

So I recommend to start from the very beginning.

0:21:59.60 --> 0:22:1.670

Talapova, Polina

Just feel free to look at the fields.

0:22:3.420 --> 0:22:6.190

Talapova, Polina

Look at them resource descriptions.

0:22:6.200 --> 0:22:10.40

Talapova, Polina

For instance, top ten first ten at least.

0:22:19.60 --> 0:22:22.570

Talapova, Polina

Uh, two minutes meditation on this table.

0:22:34.530 --> 0:22:36.750

Park, Soojin

Do we have an anesthesiologist on the call?

0:22:41.750 --> 0:23:0.760

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

You do and he is confused as to the relevance of having you know and title like Desflurane and other types of volatile and aesthetic gases for a ICU cohort among these Delphi core elements.

0:23:1.820 --> 0:23:3.440

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Ah, to my knowledge.

0:23:5.50 --> 0:23:9.110

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Umm, a very small number of ICU's in this country.

0:23:9.120 --> 0:23:17.690

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Country I using volatile anesthetics for sedation in the ICU, but that might be the rationale for this.

0:23:17.740 --> 0:23:18.150

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

I don't know.

0:23:27.110 --> 0:23:27.460

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Umm.

0:23:18.680 --> 0:23:31.580

Park, Soojin

We might have it in the neuro ICU for very rare refractory status and Leptis, but I can't remember the last time I used it and if we certainly wouldn't.

0:23:34.460 --> 0:23:34.680

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Yeah.

0:23:34.780 --> 0:23:36.550

Park, Soojin

Uh, you need this.

0:23:36.190 --> 0:23:39.30

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Anyway, happy to comment on.

0:23:43.60 --> 0:23:44.200

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

On any of the mapping.

0:23:47.460 --> 0:23:51.630

Park, Soojin

Do you wanna go through that line 2 just for us an example, right.

0:23:51.640 --> 0:23:59.130

Park, Soojin

This is really just to show the question and answer thinking about this mapping right?

0:23:59.140 --> 0:24:3.560

Park, Soojin

So the clinical relevance source description agents desflurane expired.

0:24:5.140 --> 0:24:10.940

Park, Soojin

Umm this column E is supposed to be Polina.

0:24:10.950 --> 0:24:12.220

Park, Soojin

What is this column again?

0:24:13.750 --> 0:24:14.830

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Synonym yeah.

0:24:12.230 --> 0:24:15.900

Park, Soojin

Source description synonym OK.

0:24:15.400 --> 0:24:21.490

Talapova, Polina

Synonym for column D source description is a source description and source description.

0:24:21.500 --> 0:24:23.570

Talapova, Polina

Synonym is another option.

0:24:23.680 --> 0:24:25.60

Talapova, Polina

Variant of this name.

0:24:25.660 --> 0:24:31.190

Park, Soojin

OK, I don't know what R&NAN mean, but I mean just from.

0:24:30.580 --> 0:24:37.390

Talapova, Polina

It just source source abbreviation source, abbreviation of subdepartments institutions.

0:24:37.400 --> 0:24:39.400

Talapova, Polina

So just that.

0:24:40.680 --> 0:24:42.40

Park, Soojin

Yeah, looks like an exact match.

0:24:43.260 --> 0:24:43.970

Park, Soojin

I've confidence.

0:24:45.120 --> 0:24:45.370

Park, Soojin

Uh.

0:24:47.360 --> 0:24:48.380

Park, Soojin

Is that is this correct?

0:24:48.390 --> 0:24:52.980

Park, Soojin

Then this behind the expired Desflurane concentration.

0:24:52.990 --> 0:24:53.630

Park, Soojin

Is that what this is?

0:24:55.330 --> 0:24:55.840

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Yes.

0:24:56.290 --> 0:24:56.550

Park, Soojin

OK.

0:24:55.850 --> 0:24:56.790

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Yeah.

0:24:57.250 --> 0:25:2.990

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

And again, think of that as as exhaled more than expired.

0:25:3.220 --> 0:25:5.940

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Uh, but yeah.

0:25:3.540 --> 0:25:9.160

Park, Soojin

Umm, so could we change that here Polina?

0:25:9.170 --> 0:25:10.770

Park, Soojin

Or would that be doing bad things?

0:25:10.480 --> 0:25:11.160

Talapova, Polina

Ohh.

0:25:11.570 --> 0:25:18.350

Talapova, Polina

Expired and and exhaled in the OMOP are seen an initial they use them interchangeably.

0:25:18.660 --> 0:25:18.860

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Yeah.

0:25:22.240 --> 0:25:22.420

Park, Soojin

Yeah.

0:25:18.980 --> 0:25:23.230

Talapova, Polina

That's why there is no need to change, but it seems to be a good matching.

0:25:23.850 --> 0:25:25.10

Park, Soojin

Yeah, it's unfortunate.

0:25:28.920 --> 0:25:29.380

Talapova, Polina

Ohh.

0:25:25.20 --> 0:25:32.990

Park, Soojin

Cause expired to me means patient died or medication is no longer, you know, able to be used but.

0:25:31.980 --> 0:25:34.430

Talapova, Polina

No of that.

0:25:35.330 --> 0:25:35.570

Park, Soojin

OK.

0:25:36.430 --> 0:25:37.220

Park, Soojin

But then here you.

0:25:36.610 --> 0:25:37.560

Talapova, Polina

So the this?

0:25:37.770 --> 0:25:38.460

Talapova, Polina

Yeah.

0:25:39.30 --> 0:25:40.880

Talapova, Polina

Please go ahead session.

0:25:39.970 --> 0:25:43.620

Park, Soojin

Because in is decision is what what are the options here for decision?

0:25:44.140 --> 0:25:49.790

Talapova, Polina

How big and read them right now, for instance, see like correct or W like a Roman.

0:25:49.800 --> 0:26:2.920

Talapova, Polina

Or maybe you can recommend something better, like one and 218 be numeric values with some data dictionary which is explains that one means that it's correct and two means that it's wrong or zero and one.

0:26:2.60 --> 0:26:3.170

Park, Soojin

To the data dictionary.

0:26:3.540 --> 0:26:6.880

Park, Soojin

The data dictionary says one is correct, it's not correct.

0:26:7.980 --> 0:26:8.600

Talapova, Polina

OK, good.

0:26:8.650 --> 0:26:9.250

Park, Soojin

Then this will be.

0:26:14.710 --> 0:26:15.120

Park, Soojin

And I.

0:26:14.480 --> 0:26:56.780

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

And I think you know you've explained before very well how measurement, drug observation and column K could you know very for uh different things as you can see here on the on the in the various rows you have a number of inhaled gases, some that have, you know, annex anesthetic, uh effects, others that have ohm life saving effects and the target domain ID could be quite different between them.

0:26:58.230 --> 0:27:16.560

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

So nitrous oxide, again, something extremely rarely used in practice in general and in in the ICU in particular, is listed as a drug, whereas the uh desflurane is listed as a measurement.

0:27:19.990 --> 0:27:23.200

Talapova, Polina

Umm yeah.

0:27:23.250 --> 0:27:31.320

Talapova, Polina

So as you can see here, there is a related match to drug domain and exact match to measurement observation domain.

0:27:31.330 --> 0:27:34.620

Talapova, Polina

In here is the 2 billion custom concept.

0:27:35.90 --> 0:27:43.420

Talapova, Polina

It's new concept to cover the gap in OMOP, so there is no such measurement to or observation.

0:27:46.470 --> 0:27:52.100

Talapova, Polina

To this store, yes, some values that should be there.

0:27:52.360 --> 0:28:14.110

Talapova, Polina

This can be not so useful, and the priority of such type of terms also can be how to say decreased so we can also mark that for instance that this substance is not used and we can exclude that from the high priority terms that we are formulate for themselves.

0:28:35.110 --> 0:28:39.620

Talapova, Polina

But we can look at that one for instance like 1 by 1.

0:28:40.110 --> 0:28:45.810

Talapova, Polina

In this case, it should be concentration of the substance.

0:28:46.20 --> 0:28:48.620

Talapova, Polina

But again, do we use it?

0:28:48.630 --> 0:28:51.210

Talapova, Polina

Do we need that that type of term?

0:28:58.580 --> 0:29:13.140

Talapova, Polina

Because there is no standard equivalent in normal, there is term from our own vocabulary and if it's useful we can submit this term to OMOP vocabulary team.

0:29:13.190 --> 0:29:15.340

Talapova, Polina

If it's not, there is no need to do that.

0:29:16.920 --> 0:29:17.260

Park, Soojin

I think.

0:29:19.340 --> 0:29:20.70

Park, Soojin

Maybe not.

0:29:20.800 --> 0:29:25.570

Park, Soojin

If it was just for Heliox, I don't know that you would meet.

0:29:25.620 --> 0:29:27.790

Park, Soojin

You would, but it might be relevant for other.

0:29:30.410 --> 0:29:30.680

Park, Soojin

Uh.

0:29:32.830 --> 0:29:33.210

Park, Soojin

I don't know.

0:29:30.590 --> 0:29:34.950

Talapova, Polina

So I yeah, for people who those who.

0:29:34.570 --> 0:29:37.540

Park, Soojin

Wouldn't have chosen this in in the Delphi, so I can't speak to this.

0:29:38.910 --> 0:29:39.190

Talapova, Polina

In.

0:29:38.920 --> 0:29:39.290

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Yeah.

0:29:39.0 --> 0:29:39.340

Park, Soojin

This is a.

0:29:39.300 --> 0:29:48.700

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

And I and again, not that the bold statement is that I'm surprised that these have priority one uh as a result of any Delphi.

0:29:48.710 --> 0:29:56.480

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

And I know that I have personally down prioritized them to a four or something, but sounds like they they uh, they're up there.

0:29:56.490 --> 0:30:27.990

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

I I suspect that that will be a lot of missingness for this because it's extremely infrequently used across the sides heliox just for for the non clinical folks on the on the call is, UM is used when there are significant airway narrowings uh tracheal stenosis or sometimes in pediatric because the the mixture of of helium and oxygen produces less turbulence.

0:30:28.50 --> 0:30:28.760

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

I will not.

0:30:28.850 --> 0:30:30.850

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

I mean, it's extremely rarely used.

0:30:31.130 --> 0:30:31.780

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Certainly.

0:30:31.900 --> 0:30:36.180

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

You know, in in the adult population, I don't, I don't see it.

0:30:38.30 --> 0:30:44.420

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Some of these other like nitrous, uh as the the ones that you have highlighted are frankly quite obsolete.

0:30:44.480 --> 0:30:46.360

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

I think they're used in the dental office.

0:30:46.370 --> 0:30:48.190

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Maybe at the most, that's the laughing gas.

0:30:50.550 --> 0:30:59.960

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

So anyway, these are not necessarily the best examples to go through, but happy to happy to continue if you feel.

0:31:0.930 --> 0:31:3.100

Talapova, Polina

While we young, no, we can continue.

0:31:3.110 --> 0:31:5.80

Talapova, Polina

For instance, let's go to another section.

0:31:5.130 --> 0:31:7.60

Talapova, Polina

Let's keep this terrible agents.

0:31:7.230 --> 0:31:10.550

Talapova, Polina

Maybe something from yeah, Andrew.

0:31:8.200 --> 0:31:15.50

Williams, Andrew E

And before we go, I agree it's it's good to move on to to things that are where there's a clearer sense of priority.

0:31:15.60 --> 0:31:25.290

Williams, Andrew E

I think as an example though, we want to have a way of taking the input we're getting now and feeding it into the right workflows.

0:31:25.300 --> 0:31:29.200

Williams, Andrew E

One of those workflows is probably feedback to the Delphi.

0:31:29.480 --> 0:31:43.690

Williams, Andrew E

Any like there's a paper coming out about it or any anybody who's working on that that says there was at least inconsistent agreement about the priority of some of the sheer one things and those are marked in a certain way.

0:31:43.700 --> 0:31:45.660

Williams, Andrew E

So we should figure out how to mark that.

0:31:45.810 --> 0:32:2.530

Williams, Andrew E

I think there are other relevance is as you were saying Polina, whether or not things are either populated often enough or important enough to warrant inclusion in the standard OMOP vocabulary is a part of a standard build of terms for things and building a gap.

0:32:2.540 --> 0:32:8.250

Williams, Andrew E

And so I think we need ways to understand that that we're recording from these conversations as we go forward.

0:32:8.770 --> 0:32:9.470

Williams, Andrew E

That's the only thing.

0:32:9.480 --> 0:32:15.400

Williams, Andrew E

It's like somebody can be adding a maybe two separate columns, 1 feedback, two Delphi the other.

0:32:18.530 --> 0:32:19.240

Williams, Andrew E

Determined.

0:32:20.460 --> 0:32:23.10

Williams, Andrew E

Uh OMOP need.

0:32:23.140 --> 0:32:28.150

Williams, Andrew E

And then like for these, it would be equivocal or something like that, like some term that says we're not.

0:32:28.560 --> 0:32:41.350

Williams, Andrew E

We're not sure about the need for it and the unlawful capillary, so I didn't mean to slow us down, but I just want to make sure it was getting really valuable input that we have a way of capturing it and feeding it to the relevant parties.

0:32:41.470 --> 0:32:43.10

Williams, Andrew E

So please go forward.

0:32:43.240 --> 0:32:44.440

Williams, Andrew E

Just want to pause for that.

0:32:47.200 --> 0:32:48.80

Talapova, Polina

Install it.

0:32:48.190 --> 0:32:57.230

Talapova, Polina

Added additional field priority, but feel free to add any additional field that you consider useful here, but ages.

0:32:57.240 --> 0:32:58.200

Talapova, Polina

Yeah, something else.

0:33:0.80 --> 0:33:5.540

Talapova, Polina

So there is a term like this like patient behavior smooth.

0:33:5.550 --> 0:33:14.640

Talapova, Polina

It's a whole section for the assessment and also some concrete assessment instruments, for instance, this one were me.

0:33:14.690 --> 0:33:21.730

Talapova, Polina

This one is absent in the OMOP, but also the question is uh, does anyone use it?

0:33:29.560 --> 0:33:30.260

Talapova, Polina

Eat.

0:33:24.420 --> 0:33:30.290

Park, Soojin

The pediatric diagnosis more than one for traditionally for adult.

0:33:31.50 --> 0:33:31.840

Talapova, Polina

Yeah.

0:33:31.850 --> 0:33:34.130

Talapova, Polina

And there are Pediatrics as well.

0:33:33.850 --> 0:33:34.300

Park, Soojin

Yep.

0:33:34.710 --> 0:33:36.980

Park, Soojin

There any pediatric intensivists on the call?

0:33:44.310 --> 0:33:45.60

Park, Soojin

But there are none.

0:33:45.70 --> 0:33:45.830

Park, Soojin

Or they are shy.

0:33:48.460 --> 0:33:51.0

Park, Soojin

I'm not familiar with this warm assessment.

0:33:55.290 --> 0:33:58.900

Park, Soojin

Should we just find one that we are the familiar with and that we agree?

0:33:58.50 --> 0:34:0.440

Talapova, Polina

Oh, oh, yeah, of course.

0:34:0.450 --> 0:34:9.400

Talapova, Polina

Of course, the only one comment that I can make here is that if you have some free time, of course I'm sure that all of it all have this free time.

0:34:9.410 --> 0:34:18.300

Talapova, Polina

But if you have some, you can just investigate what is the assessment skill and maybe it is used really at your site.

0:34:18.730 --> 0:34:32.330

Talapova, Polina

Maybe so please if you can analyze this together with with us, but we can take this one Columbia suicide severity rating skill if you would like.

0:34:33.610 --> 0:34:33.830

Park, Soojin

Umm.

0:34:33.530 --> 0:34:34.540

Talapova, Polina

So, Jenny, what's the thing?

0:34:36.80 --> 0:34:37.220

Park, Soojin

Yeah, I think.

0:34:43.950 --> 0:34:46.220

Park, Soojin

I'm looking down, down, down on line 400.

0:34:46.230 --> 0:34:47.130

Park, Soojin

Something at this point?

0:34:51.570 --> 0:34:53.770

Park, Soojin

Was it like say 408-9408?

0:34:58.820 --> 0:35:1.380

Park, Soojin

This light hundred 408.

0:34:58.640 --> 0:35:4.520

Talapova, Polina

Sorry did I ohh for 408.

0:35:4.530 --> 0:35:4.730

Talapova, Polina

OK.

0:35:5.440 --> 0:35:7.330

Park, Soojin

Yeah, for example.

0:35:6.680 --> 0:35:8.530

Talapova, Polina

Yeah, I I know the trick.

0:35:8.540 --> 0:35:9.510

Talapova, Polina

Yeah, I'm here.

0:35:9.690 --> 0:35:10.70

Talapova, Polina

Yeah, I'm here.

0:35:10.570 --> 0:35:11.280

Park, Soojin

So.

0:35:14.340 --> 0:35:21.100

Park, Soojin

This so 408 and four nine are this same up until column H.

0:35:24.330 --> 0:35:24.710

Talapova, Polina

Yeah.

0:35:24.270 --> 0:35:30.960

Park, Soojin

So the source, the source would be HENTHENT means a flow sheet.

0:35:31.410 --> 0:35:33.520

Park, Soojin

Like ahead I earner.

0:35:32.90 --> 0:35:33.680

Talapova, Polina

And no, it means.

0:35:34.230 --> 0:35:39.950

Talapova, Polina

Ohh yeah, yeah yeah, it's had eyes, ears, nose, throat and yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

0:35:39.960 --> 0:35:40.400

Talapova, Polina

This one?

0:35:41.0 --> 0:35:41.650

Talapova, Polina

Yeah, this one.

0:35:37.830 --> 0:35:41.910

Park, Soojin

Nose and throat flow sheet explore sheet. Yeah.

0:35:43.80 --> 0:35:43.480

Park, Soojin

So then.

0:35:45.600 --> 0:35:50.610

Park, Soojin

You could see that 408 and 409 is an exact match.

0:35:52.430 --> 0:35:54.760

Park, Soojin

The target concept ID, I guess there are two of them.

0:35:55.700 --> 0:35:58.640

Talapova, Polina

Yeah, there are two of them and one of them exact match.

0:35:58.650 --> 0:36:2.260

Talapova, Polina

It means left eye pupil diameter manual.

0:36:2.690 --> 0:36:12.360

Talapova, Polina

In this case, we had left popular metric size and popular metry it's manual procedure and this size is usually is about diameter.

0:36:12.840 --> 0:36:13.60

Park, Soojin

Umm.

0:36:12.530 --> 0:36:29.860

Talapova, Polina

So it's really looks like an exact match, but the 2nd row is about broad match to some parent in the OMOP like pupil observable, because in OMOP there is no connection to such type of measurement and there is a gap in in the hierarchy.

0:36:40.630 --> 0:36:40.810

Talapova, Polina

Yeah.

0:36:27.740 --> 0:36:47.680

Park, Soojin

Still here, I would say I'm I'm concerned about this match because keep Alanna tree uh implies it's a quantitative measurement from a device and so it wouldn't be an observable pupil that has more to do with the example above.

0:36:52.910 --> 0:36:53.240

Talapova, Polina

Correct.

0:36:48.190 --> 0:36:53.240

Park, Soojin

Pupil size left, which would be everything from.

0:36:54.630 --> 0:36:54.860

Talapova, Polina

Hmm.

0:36:54.350 --> 0:36:59.730

Park, Soojin

398 to 402 for the left side, right?

0:36:59.740 --> 0:37:2.270

Park, Soojin

So that is more, that's an observable people.

0:37:2.440 --> 0:37:3.460

Park, Soojin

So for this one I would be.

0:37:3.250 --> 0:37:3.560

Talapova, Polina

Umm.

0:37:6.60 --> 0:37:8.780

Park, Soojin

So what would you call that decision will be wrong, so 2.

0:37:9.640 --> 0:37:9.820

Talapova, Polina

Yeah.

0:37:14.820 --> 0:37:16.650

Park, Soojin

It's interesting without you here.

0:37:16.700 --> 0:37:18.130

Park, Soojin

I don't know that I would be able to.

0:37:18.140 --> 0:37:25.20

Park, Soojin

I would wanna confirm pupil observable is what I read it to be as a you know as a layperson.

0:37:27.860 --> 0:37:28.240

Park, Soojin

What?

0:37:28.250 --> 0:37:29.390

Park, Soojin

You know where this come from.

0:37:29.400 --> 0:37:34.160

Park, Soojin

So I'm saying that that's more of a qualitative observation.

0:37:34.170 --> 0:37:35.180

Park, Soojin

So it's wrong.

0:37:35.230 --> 0:37:36.730

Park, Soojin

And then I guess my name is Kiera.

0:37:39.440 --> 0:37:40.480

Park, Soojin

To write a comment here.

0:37:43.200 --> 0:37:43.890

Park, Soojin

UM.

0:37:41.500 --> 0:37:46.870

Talapova, Polina

Yeah, if you want to comment, please feel free.

0:37:47.300 --> 0:37:52.250

Park, Soojin

The people on the tree umm, suggests quantitative.

0:37:54.810 --> 0:37:59.290

Park, Soojin

Measurement rather than qualitative.

0:38:1.740 --> 0:38:2.180

Park, Soojin

Shipment.

0:38:7.40 --> 0:38:7.490

Park, Soojin

Observed.

0:38:14.160 --> 0:38:14.320

Park, Soojin

Yeah.

0:38:16.390 --> 0:38:17.670

Park, Soojin

This one I will call correct.

0:38:27.310 --> 0:38:30.690

Park, Soojin

Umm Andrew, this priority for chorus called Column.

0:38:30.780 --> 0:38:41.420

Park, Soojin

Do we have to fill that out or is it assumed that this is a priority for Goris, or we're we're we're doing a second gut check of the Delphi result and say we agree that this is a priority for chorus?

0:38:49.980 --> 0:38:50.930

Park, Soojin

You'll be offspring.

0:38:44.430 --> 0:38:57.570

Williams, Andrew E

I intended it as a place to capture the comments that made earlier about some of the anesthesiology specific things that were of questionable priority for a chorus.

0:39:1.430 --> 0:39:1.560

Park, Soojin

Yeah.

0:38:57.580 --> 0:39:6.350

Williams, Andrew E

So I think there was a way we want to capture and feed that information back and that the I also added a column at the all the way to the right.

0:39:6.360 --> 0:39:10.240

Williams, Andrew E

That's about if there isn't a a match or there's only a related match.

0:39:20.580 --> 0:39:20.740

Park, Soojin

Yeah.

0:39:13.770 --> 0:39:22.140

Williams, Andrew E

Understanding a priority might impact whether we wanna go to the OHDSI vocabulary group and say we need this right, at least for the critical care.

0:39:25.960 --> 0:39:26.150

Park, Soojin

Umm.

0:39:34.180 --> 0:39:34.380

Park, Soojin

Yeah.

0:39:22.150 --> 0:39:37.440

Williams, Andrew E

There might be other priority areas outside of critical care where it is really important, but you know, at least as far as we're aware and we're getting clinical input on it, it doesn't, you know it does or it doesn't have an obvious priority and that's those are those meetings, yeah.

0:39:38.430 --> 0:39:41.530

Park, Soojin

I wonder so I am not familiar with this case.

0:39:41.540 --> 0:39:44.410

Park, Soojin

I haven't tried to extract people hometree data from the EHR.

0:39:45.370 --> 0:39:53.670

Park, Soojin

The quantitative it's a mechanical it's a it's a device, a handheld device that has its data logged through.

0:39:54.230 --> 0:40:1.660

Park, Soojin

Umm, I don't know if it's RFID or if it's from a docking station or like a Bluetooth or something, but it goes through the lens.

0:40:1.670 --> 0:40:7.110

Park, Soojin

The lab information and dramatics medical system LIMS.

0:40:7.120 --> 0:40:10.40

Park, Soojin

There's like two different kinds, but it goes through the.

0:40:12.90 --> 0:40:12.490

Park, Soojin

Sort of.

0:40:12.500 --> 0:40:17.900

Park, Soojin

The point of care measurement system and then gets inserted into the EHR.

0:40:19.0 --> 0:40:27.330

Park, Soojin

That's one way of getting this quantitative data and the other way is the nurse measures it and goes and enters it into the flow sheet.

0:40:27.700 --> 0:40:29.240

Park, Soojin

Is there something in this line?

0:40:30.450 --> 0:40:33.720

Park, Soojin

Like uh, are pH.

0:40:33.730 --> 0:40:38.370

Park, Soojin

Us that implies with source, or each ENT.

0:40:38.380 --> 0:40:42.430

Park, Soojin

Does that imply that it's a nurse entered data?

0:40:42.680 --> 0:40:46.290

Park, Soojin

Or is it, you know directly from the measurement of the device?

0:40:46.640 --> 0:40:47.200

Park, Soojin

And does it matter?

0:40:48.290 --> 0:40:49.440

Park, Soojin

Should there be two different lines?

0:40:50.730 --> 0:41:1.360

Talapova, Polina

You can matter in the in this case it doesn't matter because we it just like synthetic data to represent, not kind the synthetic data.

0:41:1.370 --> 0:41:5.580

Talapova, Polina

But yeah, it's a source data of particular source at your site.

0:41:10.790 --> 0:41:11.20

Park, Soojin

Right.

0:41:5.590 --> 0:41:12.810

Talapova, Polina

It can be other markers of the need to create additional role here, so you're correct, you're correct for sure.

0:41:13.410 --> 0:41:16.880

Park, Soojin

This implies manual implies it's the the latter.

0:41:16.890 --> 0:41:26.430

Park, Soojin

It's the nurse observes, types it in, and this is a uh, you know, flowsheet data point.

0:41:31.460 --> 0:41:31.760

Williams, Andrew E

I mean I.

0:41:30.840 --> 0:41:33.230

Park, Soojin

If it came from a device, would it also be called measurement?

0:41:34.760 --> 0:41:34.980

Talapova, Polina

Yeah.

0:41:36.850 --> 0:41:37.190

Talapova, Polina

Is it?

0:41:36.560 --> 0:41:38.150

Williams, Andrew E

And it could also be in a flow sheet.

0:41:38.160 --> 0:41:41.960

Williams, Andrew E

So the fact that it's a flow sheet does not automatically imply that it's manual some.

0:41:41.750 --> 0:41:42.920

Park, Soojin

Well, so this, yeah.

0:41:47.740 --> 0:41:48.920

Talapova, Polina

Umm.

0:41:52.270 --> 0:41:53.40

Talapova, Polina

Yeah, I agree.

0:41:53.250 --> 0:41:53.690

Talapova, Polina

I agree.

0:41:42.970 --> 0:41:57.300

Park, Soojin

So then the manual maybe is a affects the confidence that in terms of that matching the one through 8, whereas that here confidence so would it be more like what is it the matching it has it could have two meanings.

0:41:59.400 --> 0:42:3.710

Park, Soojin

Or maybe, uh, it's actually that the. Yeah.

0:42:3.750 --> 0:42:4.70

Park, Soojin

Let's go ahead.

0:42:0.900 --> 0:42:11.170

Talapova, Polina

No, no, not 2 from 1 to so 0 from 0.1 to 0.9 and so between zero and one.

0:42:12.860 --> 0:42:14.70

Talapova, Polina

It's like, yeah.

0:42:12.550 --> 0:42:14.380

Park, Soojin

So it could be OK.

0:42:14.430 --> 0:42:18.790

Park, Soojin

Well, so then what I would say here is that the source can have two targets.

0:42:19.950 --> 0:42:38.980

Talapova, Polina

Uh, so look, in this case I would recommend to change predicate ID to for instance narrow match because our target is more granular than source and it would be better option to mark it as a child of the people metry in.

0:42:40.210 --> 0:42:40.330

Park, Soojin

Yes.

0:42:39.40 --> 0:42:43.640

Talapova, Polina

In general, it can include different options and this is great.

0:42:43.650 --> 0:42:44.860

Talapova, Polina

Really, really great.

0:42:44.870 --> 0:42:45.520

Talapova, Polina

Variously.

0:42:44.90 --> 0:42:46.220

Park, Soojin

Through the narrow match, not an exact match.

0:42:45.890 --> 0:42:46.320

Talapova, Polina

Oops.

0:42:48.280 --> 0:42:48.390

Park, Soojin

Yeah.

0:42:46.810 --> 0:42:49.20

Talapova, Polina

Yes, yes.

0:42:49.420 --> 0:42:49.740

Park, Soojin

All right.

0:42:49.620 --> 0:42:51.590

Talapova, Polina

OK, let's forget.

0:42:54.30 --> 0:42:54.640

Park, Soojin

Do others agree?

0:42:57.200 --> 0:42:58.410

Park, Soojin

On the call conditions.

0:43:1.350 --> 0:43:1.890

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Agree.

0:43:8.180 --> 0:43:8.610

Park, Soojin

No, there.

0:43:8.700 --> 0:43:9.310

Park, Soojin

Yeah, here.

0:43:1.900 --> 0:43:14.300

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

And then looking at the rows above, there appears to be, you know, synonyms if you will of of pupil size that then defined manual versus auto.

0:43:15.550 --> 0:43:17.760

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Uh in non neuro ICU's.

0:43:25.950 --> 0:43:26.290

Park, Soojin

Right.

0:43:31.610 --> 0:43:31.840

Park, Soojin

Umm.

0:43:17.770 --> 0:43:38.940

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

As you probably know, Sujin Pupillometry is highly infrequently utilized and you rely on bedside nurses assessments of the people, estimation of pupil size and by default obviously that will be a manual documentation, a flow sheet.

0:43:40.110 --> 0:43:40.290

Park, Soojin

Yeah.

0:43:41.180 --> 0:43:43.530

Park, Soojin

And so this right people size.

0:43:43.580 --> 0:43:52.80

Park, Soojin

As an example, Mihai would be this is not incorrect, but it would also be like people observable that would also match, so that's a.

0:43:54.900 --> 0:43:56.180

Park, Soojin

Is right, would you agree?

0:43:56.90 --> 0:43:56.940

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Yeah, yeah.

0:44:0.990 --> 0:44:7.160

Park, Soojin

And interestingly, there is nothing here that matches pupil observable.

0:44:8.350 --> 0:44:8.870

Park, Soojin

None of these.

0:44:10.230 --> 0:44:11.50

Talapova, Polina

Yeah.

0:44:11.150 --> 0:44:11.640

Talapova, Polina

Yeah.

0:44:11.650 --> 0:44:16.820

Talapova, Polina

So it can be added and I got your point and I agree with you.

0:44:17.970 --> 0:44:28.490

Talapova, Polina

It's better to place it here to connect pupil durable and separate it from the people mentary device generated or driven measurement.

0:44:36.220 --> 0:44:45.760

Talapova, Polina

I'm just not sure whether you agree or not on that narrow match, so size and diameter.

0:44:47.810 --> 0:44:48.700

Talapova, Polina

So diameter.

0:44:48.710 --> 0:44:52.660

Talapova, Polina

It's like groceries at this size of the pupil, but.

0:44:54.890 --> 0:44:56.410

Talapova, Polina

What would you recommend to?

0:44:57.590 --> 0:44:58.890

Park, Soojin

That is A.

0:45:1.420 --> 0:45:2.680

Park, Soojin

It's an exact match.

0:45:6.520 --> 0:45:7.990

Talapova, Polina

But menu.

0:45:6.260 --> 0:45:8.720

Park, Soojin

I'm trying to imagine what is exactly after meeting again.

0:45:9.200 --> 0:45:9.350

Talapova, Polina

Yeah.

0:45:9.560 --> 0:45:11.250

Talapova, Polina

Yes, so manual it's not a.

0:45:11.300 --> 0:45:20.70

Talapova, Polina

It's like a additional details which are missing in the source, so it's a child or or not.

0:45:20.80 --> 0:45:22.520

Talapova, Polina

It depends on the decision we've made.

0:45:24.530 --> 0:45:24.860

Talapova, Polina

Are we?

0:45:24.870 --> 0:45:26.700

Talapova, Polina

Will be made.

0:45:28.590 --> 0:45:30.770

Park, Soojin

It is a child.

0:45:33.320 --> 0:45:33.830

Park, Soojin

That's right.

0:45:33.840 --> 0:45:35.690

Park, Soojin

It's a child because there's additional information.

0:45:35.700 --> 0:45:36.110

Park, Soojin

I got it.

0:45:36.120 --> 0:45:36.990

Park, Soojin

So it's a child.

0:45:37.880 --> 0:45:43.770

Park, Soojin

What does that mean for narrow, broad, exact the narrow? OK.

0:45:42.650 --> 0:45:44.510

Talapova, Polina

Hmm, narrow feature.

0:45:42.860 --> 0:45:47.440

Williams, Andrew E

Narrow and Polina should we write that down somewhere?

0:45:54.700 --> 0:45:55.170

Talapova, Polina

OK.

0:45:47.450 --> 0:46:2.630

Williams, Andrew E

I think that kind of process because it's similar to what happened earlier when we changed something from a an exact to a narrow for the same reason because the additional information about the manual acquisition was seemed to be like a it could happen one of two ways and this is one one way.

0:46:2.640 --> 0:46:10.370

Williams, Andrew E

So it's a child that is that logic, something that should be kind of pulled out and written as a heuristic.

0:46:19.370 --> 0:46:19.580

Talapova, Polina

Yeah.

0:46:10.380 --> 0:46:24.500

Williams, Andrew E

Like if you're trying to decide whether something is an exact match or not, you look and you see if the concept name includes specifying information that makes the concept a subtype or some rule like that, or heuristic that people can use.

0:46:25.310 --> 0:46:27.120

Williams, Andrew E

Is that a good thing to live?

0:46:31.610 --> 0:46:32.230

Talapova, Polina

Yeah, it is.

0:46:27.130 --> 0:46:32.340

Williams, Andrew E

And maybe a separate sheet like heuristics that people can look for, how do I know if something's a narrow match or something?

0:46:36.540 --> 0:46:38.710

Talapova, Polina

So we will do that for sure.

0:46:42.10 --> 0:46:43.930

Park, Soojin

This one, this one is wrong.

0:46:41.0 --> 0:46:44.580

Talapova, Polina

And so we can also, yeah.

0:46:45.610 --> 0:46:51.360

Park, Soojin

This uh right pupil diameter auto this is wrong I think.

0:46:53.530 --> 0:46:54.710

Park, Soojin

Well, it's wrong.

0:46:56.450 --> 0:46:57.420

Park, Soojin

It's a child.

0:46:53.820 --> 0:46:58.140

Talapova, Polina

But it's also like a child, because it's also there.

0:46:58.150 --> 0:46:59.460

Talapova, Polina

Metric, yeah.

0:46:57.430 --> 0:47:2.630

Park, Soojin

It's a child and it could be people hometree it doesn't exclude the possibility.

0:47:7.710 --> 0:47:7.910

Park, Soojin

Yeah.

0:47:10.760 --> 0:47:13.240

Talapova, Polina

But once we have our elementary separately so.

0:47:17.20 --> 0:47:17.150

Park, Soojin

Yes.

0:47:11.750 --> 0:47:18.310

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

I think that if it's, if it's auto in my mind, it implies people are mitry or some of device.

0:47:18.320 --> 0:47:26.980

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Since the nurses are not quite yet brain wired to the EHR the their, their brains are not connected.

0:47:27.30 --> 0:47:28.190

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

But we're working on it.

0:47:28.800 --> 0:47:29.260

Park, Soojin

Right.

0:47:30.40 --> 0:47:32.50

Talapova, Polina

Right. Umm.

0:47:31.830 --> 0:47:39.720

Park, Soojin

So it's maybe a simpler way of thinking it of this as saying like the source description synonym is the is the.

0:47:42.30 --> 0:47:54.20

Park, Soojin

Uh, harmonized data point that people want to map things to and do the do the items in I match to it correct or no?

0:47:54.90 --> 0:47:55.100

Park, Soojin

That's the answer.

0:47:55.530 --> 0:47:59.710

Park, Soojin

And then if it's a perfect match, it's exact match and anything less is probably an arrow.

0:48:2.320 --> 0:48:2.580

Talapova, Polina

Mm-hmm.

0:48:3.490 --> 0:48:3.820

Park, Soojin

OK.

0:48:4.900 --> 0:48:5.100

Talapova, Polina

Yeah.

0:48:4.770 --> 0:48:6.760

Park, Soojin

And it's all you can see here to think about so then.

0:48:9.450 --> 0:48:11.480

Park, Soojin

403 mm-hmm.

0:48:21.940 --> 0:48:22.140

Park, Soojin

Yeah.

0:48:24.610 --> 0:48:24.910

Park, Soojin

Umm.

0:48:9.700 --> 0:48:43.750

Williams, Andrew E

I wonder if we should figure out how much time we want to reserve at the end to talk about how to continue this process outside of this meeting because we're mostly kind of demonstrating how to do this and for people who've been participating or watching who might have an inclination to spend some time contributing to this outside of the call, we want to let them know how they can do that and how much time Polina do you think we should reserve for that part of the call?

0:48:43.920 --> 0:48:45.380

Williams, Andrew E

We've got about 11 minutes left now.

0:48:47.770 --> 0:48:50.0

Talapova, Polina

Well, we can already start to discuss that.

0:48:50.370 --> 0:48:55.260

Talapova, Polina

We can stop here because I'm not sure we can continue this.

0:48:55.790 --> 0:49:8.250

Talapova, Polina

It's very interesting exercise or we can also repeat these sessions maybe a bit later in January, like one session per month for 30 minutes or 15 minutes per session.

0:49:9.60 --> 0:49:9.570

Talapova, Polina

Umm.

0:49:9.980 --> 0:49:13.350

Talapova, Polina

Or maybe, yeah, we want to have it earlier than January.

0:49:13.360 --> 0:49:21.550

Talapova, Polina

But anyway, please feel free to revise these mappings and leave a comment.

0:49:21.860 --> 0:49:22.490

Talapova, Polina

I don't know.

0:49:22.560 --> 0:49:24.110

Talapova, Polina

Feel free to do everything you want.

0:49:24.120 --> 0:49:28.990

Talapova, Polina

You feel you can add additional fields if you need them.

0:49:29.240 --> 0:49:31.590

Talapova, Polina

Add comments using these button.

0:49:32.190 --> 0:49:38.500

Talapova, Polina

Uh, so please, we we are very grateful for that.

0:49:38.600 --> 0:49:40.650

Talapova, Polina

So it can help.

0:49:40.220 --> 0:49:44.980

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Just that quick, uh quick point of clarification for Polina or maybe for Marty.

0:49:45.730 --> 0:49:52.890

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

UM, the the various files that are part of that of that shared drive.

0:49:53.970 --> 0:49:57.320

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Uh, could you Orient us to them?

0:49:57.330 --> 0:50:1.220

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

A real quick and I guess a more specific question.

0:50:1.230 --> 0:50:5.230

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Is this collaborative workspace file?

0:50:6.330 --> 0:50:21.280

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Are are these, uh, 1300 or so all rows a sort of a a sample of of data elements that we want to to validate or ohm?

0:50:21.830 --> 0:50:22.730

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Is this the list?

0:50:24.500 --> 0:50:28.580

Talapova, Polina

Is that this is the list of tier one and two.

0:50:30.420 --> 0:50:30.720

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

OK.

0:50:31.990 --> 0:50:32.310

Williams, Andrew E

There's.

0:50:32.350 --> 0:50:38.330

Williams, Andrew E

So there's a there's a Tier 3 and four that would eventually come, so it's not necessarily complete list right now it is the most.

0:50:38.390 --> 0:50:43.430

Williams, Andrew E

To it is the things that the Delphi process resulted in prioritizing.

0:50:43.440 --> 0:50:46.950

Williams, Andrew E

Obviously there's some feedback about that prioritization process.

0:50:47.320 --> 0:51:9.530

Williams, Andrew E

So I think the anyhow to your first point, somebody could go through and just sort of show or or did that question about does that answer your question about these things that now that you know that these are the tier one and Tier 2 in a complete form me hires they're more orientation.

0:51:8.660 --> 0:51:12.840

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Is there is there any point in or or what is the the meaning of?

0:51:13.720 --> 0:51:19.110

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Well, there's a hierarchy, one with the hierarchy extension and the other one that has an STCM extension.

0:51:19.260 --> 0:51:19.550

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

What?

0:51:19.560 --> 0:51:22.0

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

What are those or how are they different?

0:51:24.710 --> 0:51:27.510

Park, Soojin

STCM the where do you see that?

0:51:31.660 --> 0:51:32.420

Park, Soojin

Oh, in the in.

0:51:33.980 --> 0:51:34.230

Park, Soojin

Ohh.

0:51:28.320 --> 0:51:34.340

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

As I'm Delphi mapping round two dash in the in the in the dry.

0:51:35.130 --> 0:51:35.330

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Yeah.

0:51:34.240 --> 0:51:35.410

Park, Soojin

In the folder in the folder.

0:51:35.420 --> 0:51:35.780

Park, Soojin

Oh, got it.

0:51:36.820 --> 0:51:39.500

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Do they have any meaning to us?

0:51:38.80 --> 0:51:41.890

Talapova, Polina

Oh, oh, oh, yeah, yeah, yeah.

0:51:41.940 --> 0:51:45.610

Talapova, Polina

I I for sure I have to create README file in this folder.

0:51:45.800 --> 0:51:47.250

Talapova, Polina

Sorry for missing that.

0:51:47.360 --> 0:52:12.480

Talapova, Polina

So, as DCN, it's source to concept map table with tier one and two this table was created for testing and I hope that we will see the results of such tests and soon and also we will be able to update the source to concept map table after clinical validation of mappings hierarchy.

0:52:12.950 --> 0:52:14.620

Talapova, Polina

Let me look what is it that?

0:52:18.100 --> 0:52:18.850

Talapova, Polina

Hi rocky.

0:52:18.860 --> 0:52:26.290

Talapova, Polina

So this is the Delphi uh to arms hierarchy.

0:52:26.300 --> 0:52:38.500

Talapova, Polina

So they have like domain sub domain, different categories of the terms and all these categories can be connected into the hierarchy and we started to.

0:52:39.980 --> 0:52:51.410

Talapova, Polina

Recreate this hierarchy using the methods that we usually use for that during ontology engineering in OMOP or or from OMOP perspective.

0:52:51.780 --> 0:52:57.780

Talapova, Polina

It just for the reference, so if you're interested you can take a look and see for instance, that.

0:52:57.870 --> 0:53:5.950

Talapova, Polina

Uh, what are the data sources in the Delphi Delphi data for flowsheet data?

0:53:6.480 --> 0:53:15.970

Talapova, Polina

Also, Flowsheet modality, hospital data elements and you can go through that, maybe this can be helpful for your data prioritization process as well.

0:53:16.450 --> 0:53:19.150

Talapova, Polina

Also, there is classifiers mapping.

0:53:19.320 --> 0:53:28.590

Talapova, Polina

It's a test version of this mapping of this compartments of the Delphi data, so also on the testing.

0:53:28.680 --> 0:53:32.100

Talapova, Polina

But we are going to finish that as well.

0:53:32.730 --> 0:53:38.340

Talapova, Polina

Umm Delphi mapping round two, just without any additional information.

0:53:38.350 --> 0:53:52.440

Talapova, Polina

It's source data as is, so if you want to to look at the row source data, you can click on that file and map and clinical validation named properly.

0:53:52.450 --> 0:53:54.600

Talapova, Polina

So it's clear what is the meaning of that file.

0:53:57.90 --> 0:53:57.340

Williams, Andrew E

At.

0:53:56.170 --> 0:53:58.460

Talapova, Polina

This is a story about this folder.

0:53:59.630 --> 0:53:59.960

Williams, Andrew E

Thanks.

0:53:59.970 --> 0:54:1.440

Williams, Andrew E

And you said you're going to add a read me.

0:54:2.420 --> 0:54:3.480

Talapova, Polina

Yeah, yeah.

0:54:1.450 --> 0:54:8.710

Williams, Andrew E

So I think that'll that'll clarify things for posterity and that's that's thank you so much for so tremendous amount of work at Polina has done.

0:54:8.720 --> 0:54:10.820

Williams, Andrew E

I think it's, you know, really amazing.

0:54:10.830 --> 0:54:23.420

Williams, Andrew E

I think the brief interactions we just you know went through made it obvious that the having additional clinical experts look at it is gonna add value and understanding.

0:54:23.430 --> 0:54:34.930

Williams, Andrew E

And so I would love to have the rest of the five minutes that we have talk about, what do we think is feasible to do and how best to try and facilitate input of this type going forward.

0:54:34.940 --> 0:54:48.430

Williams, Andrew E

I think the idea of a meeting dedicated to it is good, but I think there's still probably need for asynchronous contributions depending on how much we want to have, you know, appropriate eyes laid on each and every row.

0:54:48.660 --> 0:54:50.470

Williams, Andrew E

I think there's there's a lot here.

0:54:50.480 --> 0:55:4.10

Williams, Andrew E

There was obviously a useful discussion about it and clinician time is very valuable and expensive to do and so I don't think we can expect to get everything done through a couple of intense meetings.

0:55:4.60 --> 0:55:25.850

Williams, Andrew E

I think that's probably infeasible, but I'm like to open up maybe soojin if you have a tourist thoughts about how to facilitate, well, I guess both the scope what it is we might want to accomplish in terms of the, you know, completeness of having this kind of process on each thing that's been proposed and then how to facilitate it given that scope.

0:55:27.970 --> 0:55:28.430

Park, Soojin

I think.

0:55:30.440 --> 0:55:33.370

Park, Soojin

Yeah, a couple of thoughts jumped to mind.

0:55:33.600 --> 0:55:36.320

Park, Soojin

It was very helpful to have you all.

0:55:37.720 --> 0:55:38.240

Park, Soojin

Uh.

0:55:39.0 --> 0:55:49.580

Park, Soojin

Ask questions of as I kind of formulated my own framework of it and then having that internal framework was so important because you can't do this for every 1400 lines.

0:55:50.510 --> 0:55:57.940

Park, Soojin

But then you don't want to have 50 people that you'd have to, you know, to really go through 1400.

0:55:58.230 --> 0:56:1.370

Park, Soojin

You'd have to train 50 people, so that's 50 hours of your time.

0:56:1.670 --> 0:56:6.380

Park, Soojin

So the and they're sustained interest in focus as hard.

0:56:6.390 --> 0:56:23.890

Park, Soojin

So I wonder if it's something where you choose less than 50, but more than five and train them or do it as a work group and then assign assign, you know rows one through 50 for, you know you do 50 lines.

0:56:24.480 --> 0:56:28.730

Park, Soojin

I also think like when you're doing a systematic review, it's really important also for your own confidence.

0:56:28.740 --> 0:56:34.830

Park, Soojin

It's somebody else's laying eyes on it who have the same kind of knowledge, that kind of thing.

0:56:34.840 --> 0:56:42.600

Park, Soojin

So maybe assigning a bigger number of people, but a manageable for training and and assigning each line twice.

0:56:45.170 --> 0:56:48.920

Park, Soojin

And then, if there's disagreement, we don't get to see who the other, what the other person's doing.

0:56:48.930 --> 0:56:50.900

Park, Soojin

If there's disagreement, those are the ones Polina.

0:56:50.910 --> 0:56:55.180

Park, Soojin

Then you could focus on with a single adjudicator.

0:56:55.610 --> 0:56:55.970

Park, Soojin

I don't know.

0:56:55.980 --> 0:56:58.220

Park, Soojin

That's just sort of a process from a process perspective.

0:56:58.230 --> 0:57:1.530

Park, Soojin

I'm thinking we'd have to have engaged people.

0:57:1.540 --> 0:57:2.680

Park, Soojin

I'm volunteering myself.

0:57:2.690 --> 0:57:3.940

Park, Soojin

I'll do 50 or whatever.

0:57:6.70 --> 0:57:7.10

Talapova, Polina

Sounds great.

0:57:7.150 --> 0:57:18.360

Talapova, Polina

It yes, fantastic plan, but I'm not sure that it it's real because is I I can train people but where I can find them?

0:57:18.370 --> 0:57:18.770

Talapova, Polina

I don't know.

0:57:20.430 --> 0:57:20.970

Park, Soojin

History.

0:57:20.980 --> 0:57:24.350

Park, Soojin

Balakrishnan is am raising his his or her hand cause during.

0:57:24.430 --> 0:57:24.670

Talapova, Polina

Yeah.

0:57:27.140 --> 0:57:40.90

Balakrishnan, Kasturi

Hey, Polina and Andrew, I was just thinking when I looked at the spreadsheet, I was because I have been doing something similar and my plan was to send it out to Eddie who was at Pi.

0:57:40.640 --> 0:57:51.530

Balakrishnan, Kasturi

So I was going to review like the overlap of you know what you have already mapped with with what I have with what we have in the data.

0:57:51.700 --> 0:57:54.890

Balakrishnan, Kasturi

And then provide that subset to Eddy as well.

0:57:55.320 --> 0:58:5.610

Balakrishnan, Kasturi

Just saying that you know, these were mapped by your group and then I know that we have this, these these concepts in our flow sheet data as well.

0:58:6.480 --> 0:58:15.60

Balakrishnan, Kasturi

Umm, because I I I can I do recognize some of the source code descriptions structurally from what I've been doing.

0:58:15.540 --> 0:58:22.220

Balakrishnan, Kasturi

I just wanted to, you know, chime in and say that that was something I was thinking in my head as you were presenting this.

0:58:25.700 --> 0:58:26.150

Williams, Andrew E

Wonderful.

0:58:25.930 --> 0:58:26.590

Balakrishnan, Kasturi

I don't know if.

0:58:26.160 --> 0:58:33.490

Williams, Andrew E

Yeah, having Eddie's input on things that are, you know, where he's got the right expertise seems like a a fantastic addition.

0:58:33.500 --> 0:58:40.890

Williams, Andrew E

And I know he's been contributing a lot in a lot of areas and it would be wonderful to be able to tap him for part of this.

0:58:41.320 --> 0:58:49.290

Williams, Andrew E

Also, I think very quickly soojin the having some measure of interrater reliability seems important.

0:58:49.370 --> 0:59:5.230

Williams, Andrew E

I think having it for each item is might be like the the Cadillac version of what we want to do a lot of times when you're doing interrater reliability on things, you take a sample and say interrelated reliability was X on you know 20% sample of the things that you were that were done.

0:59:5.240 --> 0:59:10.50

Williams, Andrew E

And this is the process of adjudicating them and I, but we could do it on each and everything.

0:59:10.640 --> 0:59:11.50

Williams, Andrew E

I just.

0:59:11.60 --> 0:59:19.920

Williams, Andrew E

I'm worried that having just even a single person review each of these, you know more than 1000 things is going to be hard to do.

0:59:19.930 --> 0:59:32.630

Williams, Andrew E

Having multiple ones do it will end someone judicial process for resolving conflicts when when there is lack of agreement is a something that could be challenging to do feasibly.

0:59:44.130 --> 0:59:44.990

Park, Soojin

I think that there are.

0:59:32.900 --> 0:59:46.160

Williams, Andrew E

So I don't know, we might, we might need options I guess in terms of the interrater reliability part of

what you sketched is my suggestion we think about umm, we're almost at time where we are at time.

0:59:46.210 --> 0:59:46.650

Williams, Andrew E

Sorry, go ahead.

0:59:46.440 --> 0:59:52.250

Park, Soojin

Your time, I think there are lots of physicians in this group, of course for chorus.

0:59:52.740 --> 0:59:59.490

Park, Soojin

And if you assigned each clinician a certain number to do, I don't think it's not infeasible.

0:59:59.500 --> 1:0:3.360

Park, Soojin

And I think interrater reliability scores not what we're trying to achieve.

1:0:3.410 --> 1:0:17.530

Park, Soojin

I think like 80% of these are going to be easy, but like 20% or not and you don't wanna rely upon the one person uh to be the be all and end all that you know cause then you propagate that this is supposed to be.

1:0:19.500 --> 1:0:20.240

Park, Soojin

You know standard.

1:0:24.400 --> 1:0:25.710

Williams, Andrew E

I think it's a great idea.

1:0:22.540 --> 1:0:26.110

Park, Soojin

It's just an idea 11 way of just making this into a workflow.

1:0:25.720 --> 1:0:27.450

Williams, Andrew E

I and yeah.

1:0:28.480 --> 1:0:28.840

Talapova, Polina

I think.

1:0:27.460 --> 1:0:29.770

Williams, Andrew E

And what you replied makes sense to me.

1:0:29.780 --> 1:1:9.480

Williams, Andrew E

I think it corrected my misunderstanding of what you were originally proposing, and I think we maybe we can take as A to do a standards group will come up with a proposal for how to leverage the wonderful clinician expertise in bridge to AI, perhaps in related projects are also using clinical data that might benefit from from this, that would also use OMOP for it to come up with a strategy that's I'm gonna be feasible and would get these things recorded in the in this space and and we'll come back in a future call with clear instructions about what it is we come up with is that seem like a reasonable to do because it sounds like some good ideas.

1:1:13.710 --> 1:1:13.910

Park, Soojin

Yeah.

1:1:9.530 --> 1:1:14.700

Williams, Andrew E

But we're not 100% sure about exactly how to implement them, so that right, OK.

1:1:31.640 --> 1:1:31.910

Park, Soojin

Umm.

1:1:33.640 --> 1:1:33.840

Williams, Andrew E

Yeah.

1:1:15.440 --> 1:1:45.210

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

The the only other thing I would add in three seconds is that perhaps that within the the range of clinician scientists on this uh consortium that we also identify some domain experts, be it for neurocritical care, be in for mechanical circulatory support etcetera, etcetera for the more left front wheel data elements all.

1:1:45.200 --> 1:1:45.560

Park, Soojin

Agree.

1:1:45.940 --> 1:1:46.970

Williams, Andrew E

Great idea, yes.

1:1:46.690 --> 1:1:50.610

Park, Soojin

Like if you sign 50 ECMO things to me would not be a good idea.

1:1:54.570 --> 1:1:54.740

Williams, Andrew E

Hey.

1:1:56.80 --> 1:1:56.340

Park, Soojin

OK.

1:1:56.770 --> 1:1:57.530

Williams, Andrew E

Fantastic.

1:1:57.540 --> 1:2:1.780

Williams, Andrew E

This was really amazing to to watch and see how it's happening.

1:2:1.790 --> 1:2:8.340

Williams, Andrew E

I can, you know, both appreciate the tremendous effort that went into it originally and tremendous value that's being added by having additional eyes on it.

1:2:8.350 --> 1:2:10.460

Williams, Andrew E

And I'm excited about where it's heading.

1:2:10.470 --> 1:2:15.600

Williams, Andrew E

I think we're going to have an extremely valuable product at the end and at that's coming soon.

1:2:15.610 --> 1:2:18.300

Williams, Andrew E

So we look forward to seeing you all soon.

1:2:18.310 --> 1:2:20.360

Williams, Andrew E

Thanks for everybody who led and participated.

1:2:20.60 --> 1:2:20.870

Talapova, Polina

Thank you so much.

1:2:22.270 --> 1:2:22.510

Talapova, Polina

Bye bye.

1:2:21.890 --> 1:2:22.670

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Thanks everybody.

1:2:22.530 --> 1:2:22.950

Houghtaling, Jared

Thanks all.

1:2:23.130 --> 1:2:23.730

Mihai Podgoreanu, M.D.

Appreciate it.

1:2:23.940 --> 1:2:24.800

Park, Soojin

Thank you. Bye.

1:2:24.530 --> 1:2:24.870

Talapova, Polina

Thank you.