Date: October 12, 2011

From: Jorge Herskovic
        David Kreda

To: Chris Chute, Carl Gunter, Stan Huff, Josh Mandel, Tony Michalos, Tom Oniki, Guergana
        Savova, Elmer Bernstam, Jay Doughty, Lacy Hart, Ken Mandl, Rachel Ramoni

Re: Pan-SHARP Medication Reconciliation Plan Proposal

This memorandum captures our Pan-SHARP discussions in Boston and via WebEx, occurring on October 10-11, 2011. This supersedes the draft *Notes from Pan-SHARP Mon 11Oct2011*

The target for a proposed medication reconciliation (Med Rec) demonstration would be by the next SHARP Fest on/about July 2012. Mid-course deliverables would be developed in the course of green-lighting this effort.

Pan-SHARP Success Criteria

How will the success of a Pan-SHARP project be judged?

- The resulting technology in whole or part becomes a role model or road map for industrial adoption, and/or
- The resulting technology is deployed in whole or part in actual clinical settings, and/or
- For researchers, the project generates compelling new research data

The Medication Reconciliation Opportunity

Justification: We believe that the driving clinical need is to prevent Adverse Drug Events (ADEs) and improper medication administration through the review and careful curating of medication lists.

Demo Use Case: To address the production of a reconciled medication list at the time of patient discharge.

User Story: An adult inpatient in an internal medicine service is ready for discharge. The resident needs to prepare a discharge summary and final orders for the patient to take home. The resident needs to review the medications the patient was taking upon admission to the hospital, understand the evolution of the patient throughout the hospital stay, review the patient's problem list, and produce a new list of medications for the patient to take home.

The resident runs a Med Rec Program that pulls information from the patient's admission information and his inpatient medication history inside the hospital. The Med Rec Program compares the admission medication list with the last known medication list and uses the results of the comparison to propose a final medication list.

The resident then edits this medication list and produces a print-out, including precise and visually clear instructions to aid compliance, for the patient and a secure email for the patient's Primary Care Provider (PCP).

User Story Variants:

1. The patient was referred to the hospital with a referral note containing medication information.
    a. Optionally, the patient has supplemented or contradicted some of this information. In this case, the resident's task is putting together this information with the new desired treatment to figure out the correct medication orders.
2. Perform reconciliation at the time of admission instead of discharge
3. The patient's PCP receives a discharge summary from the hospital and must reconcile it with the medication list in his/her own Electronic Health Record (EHR).

Goals For Proposed Med Rec Process: Improved patient safety through fewer medication errors and fewer ADEs. The reconciliation process becomes faster and more accurate, making for more effective use of clinicians' time.

Key Factors For Med Rec Success: As complete and accurate a medication history as possible, an accurate and updated problem list, and a clear and unambiguous hand-off medication document to the patient.

Desirable Factors For Med Rec Software: The end-user software: should be discoverable, i.e., the user should require little or no training to use it; it should provide all relevant information and no more – accurate medication history [and problem history]; it should label medications with provenance information when available and pass the original text through to the user interface for presentation to the user if necessary and/or desirable; it should provide task-related cognitive cues (which do not violate the proximity-compatibility principle); it should provide a high data to ink ratio, i.e., low/no decorative overhead (see the SMART Reynolds Risk Score for an example). The user should be in control, i.e. every decision should be made by the clinician. The application should be resilient, i.e. degrade gracefully because data can be incorrect, misleading, contain typos or unfamiliar terms, units, etc. The back-end should pass-through unadulterated if it does not recognize medications or information. The application should be predictable, i.e. given same two inputs, then same output.

Technical Considerations

The proposed Pan-SHARP Med Rec project focuses on three core needs:

1. sources of medication data
2. reconciliation assistance algorithms
3. a user application for viewing and completing the reconciliation process

Medication lists may come from patient interview at admission, interview with family members, a PCP via a reference letter, other e-documents, actual physical medications presented by the patient, structured data from an e-pharmacy benefit manager or pharmacy fulfillment lists.

For the demonstration project, we initially assume admissions medication lists will be obtained from a referral letter from the patient's PCP. We will extract medication information using NLP from letters which may be realistic mockups. Eventually, we want such lists to be obtained from diverse sources, for example:

- Manual input into the MR App for patient self-reporting
- Direct (structured) sourcing from the current EMR list of medications
- Other EMR-sourced lists of medications
- HL7 Feeds
- Other structured source data such as pharmacy benefits managers
- NLP of machine readable clinical notes

The front-end of the Med Rec Program, hereinafter the **MR App**, will operate as follows:

- It will permit the clinician to select among known medication lists identified by a title and date, for example, "Admission on October 10, 2011" or "Medications Dispensed in the last 24 hours." For the demo, the dispensing could be in-hospital or outpatient fulfillments; we will leverage any readily-available source of data.
- It will load medication lists and compute the overlap between them and propose a potential reconciliation strategy, e.g. identical medications should be continued, suggest potential matches based upon formulation, brand names, and treatment intent, etc.
- It will present the proposed reconciliation in an attractive way to the clinician who will make a final selection, including dosages
- It will produce an attractive, legible, easy to understand print-out from the reconciliation.
- It will produce machine-readable output to conform to one or more machine-readable output specifications, one of which will be the SHARP.N medication Clinical Element Model (CEM) and medication list CEM (when developed) (and may also include free text data as permitted by the extant specifications).
- It <u>may</u> provide certain additional services:
  - o Sending a Med Rec medication list via Direct (e-mail) to a clinician and/or patient
  - o Posting a Med Rec medication list result to the EHR

Pan-SHARP Bill-of-Materials

Subject to considerable change after discussion and contribution from all the SHARP teams.

We identify two deliverables: the first is the proof-of concept, which leverages a lot of existing assets; the second entails turning the proof-of-concept into a full-featured solution. The required components for each follow:

July 2012 Proof-of-Concept Demonstration

- 2 SHARP.C (SMART) MR Apps [same data, different front-end user paradigms]
- 1 SMART Medication List Object
- 1 SHARP.C Med Rec back-end reconciliation algorithm
- 1 SMART Container populated by 30 patient records from SHARP.N Pipeline
- 1 SHARP.N Software component to translate CEM XML to SMART RDF

- *Optional*: 1 SMART Direct App Implementation

Post-July 2012 Full-Featured Demonstration

- 1 SMART Medication List Write API [writes Med Rec results out to host EMR]
- 1 SMART Application Internal State Write API [persists MR Apps user preferences]
- 1 SHARP.N Pipeline that accepts clinical note text to produce medication CEMs
- 1 SHARP.N Normalization process to translate HL7 messages into medication CEMs
- 1 SHARP.S security configuration for vouchsafing services, storage, messaging

Preferred IP Framework For Deliverables: Apache 2.0 license.

Challenges/Gap Analysis For Proof-of-Concept

We list known or suspected challenges for realizing the proof-of-concept demonstration:

- MR Apps' UX are too limited today, e.g. no manual data entry, only two lists at a time
- MR Apps support for variable data entry, e.g. turning "Tylenol" alone into a full CEM
- MR algorithm risk averseness may be considered unhelpful
- Evaluation of NLP via SHARP.N Pipeline using real-world data from multiple institutions
- Missing medication data model mapping CEM to SMART
- Missing component to expose CEMs via the SMART API
- Lack of a well-defined "Medication List" data type in CEM and SMART
- Lack of SMART write-support
- Lack of real world EMR support for medication lists
- Lack of real world access to machine-readable admission notes
- Distributed SHARP workforce and competing/pre-existing plans

Proof-of-Concept Alternatives for Data Integration

Integrating data (SHARP.N) for the proof-of-concept could be pursued in several ways:

1. **SHARP.N Standalone Pipeline (On-Demand Processing)**

   - MR App gets a list of available clinical notes from the container
   - MR App or user chooses a note
   - MR passes note text to an independent installation of Pipeline
   - MR App obtains a SMART-formatted Medication List object with med results

2. **SHARP.N Pipeline Data Pre-Population**

   - Pipeline pre-processes notes via NLP and HL7 meds + problems messages
   - Pipeline generates 1 static file generated per patient converted into SMART RDF
   - Sample SMART container loads the data (including multiple explicit med lists)
   - MR App can query the sample container for the samples

3. **SMART API Layering on Top of SHARP.N Pipeline CEM Store**

   The SHARP.N pipeline currently feeds a "CEM store" that holds data.

Could the SMART API be layered on top of this kind of CEM store, exposing the underlying data as SMART RDF?

Team Specific Questions

- SHARP.N
  - What are the semantics of mapping HL7 messages (and other discrete medication administration data) to produce a medication list?
  - What technologies do we have available for Pan-SHARP consumption now, and over the next six months, i.e., NLP Pipeline and SHARP.N Pipeline?
  - What corpus of Mayo clinical notes (real source, wholly de-identified) would SHARP.N be willing to share with the Pan-SHARP project?
  - What subset of Tracer Shot data (from Mayo or Intermountain Health) would be potentially available in the near-term to Pan-SHARP?
  - What are the characteristics – fields in the CEM, med list, doses, units, routing, etc. – of these data in the real world?
- SHARP.C
  - How do users respond to the UX/UI designs?
  - Are there other interaction models worth exploring (besides drag-drop and columnar lists)?
- SMART
  - What does the SMART container vs. the SMART App do, i.e., what are the limits of the API that may or may not require other, non-SMART service calls
  - What is required for app storage to store medical data of App setting in the absence of a Write API?
  - What are the CEM to SMART data model mapping issues?
  - How to define a Med List object?
  - How to refine a Medication object or declare this out of scope, e.g. it may be over-fitting to support NLP-specific references to "original text", certainty, etc.