

Computer decision support for cancer multi-disciplinary meetings: The Royal Free experience

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2011-000439
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	19-Jan-2012
Complete List of Authors:	Patkar, Vivek; University College London, ; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit Acosta, Dionisio; University College London, Davidson, Tim; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit Jones, Alison; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit Fox, John; Oxford University, Department of Engineering Science Keshtgar, Mohammed; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit; University College London,
Primary Subject Heading :	Health informatics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Oncology, Evidence-based practice, Health services research
Keywords:	Breast tumours < ONCOLOGY, ONCOLOGY, HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts



Figure 1. MATE in use at Royal Free breast MDT meeting. 454x165mm (300 x 300 DPI)

6											_
MDM Date	Ň	MRS. Forename00 Surna	ame00, 69 years old, FEMA	NLE.	[Print	Save	No			
2009-07-24	•	Investigations Decision	Prognostication Adminis	tration							
Patient Type					-			Endocrine			
Core Blopsy	-	MRS. Forename00 Sur	name00, 69 years old, FEM	ALE.		· `					
Patient		Presenting Symptoms	Lump.			~V-	-	FEC			
SumameOU, F.		Relevant History	rt nephrectomy, Hypothy	oid, HTN.	1		11			1948	
Sumame02, F. Sumame03, F.		Past Cancer Tx	Right Breast	Left Breast)	Ae		FEC + Endo			
Surname04, F.		Examination Findings	1 st Discrete Lump.	<u>b.</u>		N	-1	FEC + Tr			
		Investigations	R5 U5 B5		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	/ \	1	FEC +			_
		Treatment	Dreast Conservation, Wide Local Excision, Sentinel Node Biopsy.		Nipple discharg	e Incassed hold Paget like Retracted ni	pple	Endo + Tr	20 40	60 80	100
		Histopathology	Invasive Ductal Carcinoma, Size 18 mm, Grade High, 0 Nodes Positive, ER Positive, Her2 3.			10084	ArgumentN	lame	For	Symboli	cSupport
		Decision Summary	BEATRICE, Chemotherap	/, Breast radiotherapy.	7	Caption	Completely excise breast conservatio	d early breast cance n) and (Carly breas	er treated with bre t carcinoma stage	east conservation. (Be I to IIIA) and (not n	reast cani nargin inv
sion Detail Decision /	Ana	vsis Justification Trial	Analysis				Transected/Involve mm/Transected/In	ed NOS/Focally invo wolved NOS)	lved) and (not ma	irgin DCIS oneof Less	; than 1
Adding Theorem Adding		Cardo minos Theorem Cilled	and Tabal Changing Compatibu	nan ar Fallau yn			0				
uvanic merapy [Aujuv		endodine merapy [cimi	car mar Estagning Estavenia	nce or Pollow-up]		Justification	Improves OS, BCSS	and DFS. For wom	en who are treate	d with WLE, the mos	t common
ALTTO		OPTION	REACT	TARGIT	None None		20%) even in conf	irmed axillary lymph	node-negative v	romen. Thus, whole b	preast rad
BETTER CARE		POSH	SUPREMO	BEATRICE			breast conserving	surgery is recomme therapy have shown	nded. Although a biobly statistica	I trials assessing the IIv significant reduction	role of ra
GLACIER			TACT 2	PFT CT	=		no single trial has Early Breast Cance combined, 15-year radiation therapy (0.83: 95% CI, 0.7)	demonstrated a st er Trialists' Collabor breast cancer mort (absolute difference 5 0.91; P = .002). T	atistically signific ative Group's (EB) ality was reduced of 5.4%; 95% CI here was a simila	ant reduction in mort CTCG) update, when from 35.9% to 30.5% , 2.1% 8.7%; breast r effect on all cause	ality. How all relevan 6 in worn cancer de mortality.
nt Breast			Left Breast								
uvant Radiotherapy	Axil	ary Surgery	Adjuvant Radiother	apy Axillary Surgery							
Breast Treatment		Breast Imaging	Breast Treat	ment Breast	Imaging	Evidence					
Breast radiotherapy	¢	Chestwall + regiona	I RT	cicion 🔛 Mastectom	y +/- Recon		Guideline St	tudies			
Chestwall radiotherap	рy	No radiotherapy	Wide local exci	sion 🛛 🔲 Margin reex	cision		CC0, 2005				
			Primary chemot	herapy 🛛 🔛 No treatme	int		ETCN 84 2005	20100 2000 ERCT	CC 1005: ERCTO	2 2002: Malmatrom	D 2002
			Primary endocr	ne the			NCI, 2008 C	larke, M., 2005.	03, 1993, 00010	a, 2002, Mainstrom,	F., 2002
						Grade	1/A				
at Lesion Second Lesi	on	Third Lesion	First Lesion Secon	d Lesion Third Lesion					OK		

Figure 2. Composite screen-shot showing the user interface and some of the functionalities of MATE; Upper left: the summary screen for the patient. Upper right: one of the many prognostication tools available, Lower left: decision panel where system recommendations and eligible clinical trials are highlighted in blue. Lower right: the evidential justification for each recommended option.

1	
2	
3	
4	Computer decision support for cancer multi-disciplinary meetings:
5	The Royal Free experience
5	
0	Type- An analysis of new technique/ Quality improvement report
1	
8	
9	
10	
11	
10	
12	Vivek Patkar ', Dionisio Acosta ', Tim Davidson', Alison Jones', John Fox ',
13	Mohammed Keshtgar ^{1,2}
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	¹ The Depart Unit. Department of Seven and Depart Free User its 1
10	The Breast Unit, Department of Surgery, Royal Free Hospital
19	² University College London
20	³ Department of Engineering Science, Oxford University
21	Department of Engineering Science, Oxford Oniversity
22	
23	Author addresses
24	Vivek Patkar
24	Senior Research Fellow
20	Department of Oncology
26	Pond streat
27	London
28	NW3 20G
29	Dionisio Acosta
30	Senior Research Associate
21	Centre for Health Informatics & Multiprofessional Education (CHIME)
00	University College London
32	4th Floor Holborn Union Building
33	Highgate Hill
34	London N19 SLW
35	Initi Daviusoni Consultant braast surgeon
36	The Breast unit
37	Roval Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust
20	Pond street
30	London
39	NW3 2QG
40	Alison Jones
41	Consultant Medical Oncologist
42	Department of Oncology
43	Koyal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust.
10	London
 15	NW3 20G
45	John Fox
46	Professor
47	Department of Engineering Science, Oxford University.
48	Parks road
49	Oxford
50	OX1 3PJ
50	Mohammad Keshtgar (corresponding author)
51	Consultant Surgical Uncologist and Reader in Surgery
52	Ine Breast Unit Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust
53	University College London
54	Pond street
55	London
56	NW3 2QG
57	email: m.keshtgar@ucl.ac.uk
50	
00	

Article summary

Article focus:

-How to improve the conduct of a cancer MDT and standardize decision-making in accordance with best evidence

- Development and implementation of a novel clinical decision support (CDS) platform for cancer MDT

- Pilot evaluation results

Key messages:

- An advanced CDS platform could significantly improve the conduct of cancer MDT meetings.

- Further robust evaluations are necessary.

Strengths and limitations:

- We share our valuable experience of developing an advanced decision support system and implementing in a complex clinical environment of cancer MDT which is subsequently adopted as a breast MDT meetings management tool.

-The results reported here, however encouraging, are at this point indicative of the potential benefits but not yet conclusive. They should be treated with caution until further rigorous evaluations confirm the effectiveness and generalisability of the CDS system.

Data sharing statement:

There is no additional data available.

Research checklist:

Appropriate research checklist could not be found.



Abstract:

Problem The cancer multidisciplinary team (MDT) meeting is regarded as the best platform to reduce unwarranted variation in cancer care through evidence-compliant management. However, MDT meetings are often overburdened with many different agendas, and hence struggle to achieve their full potential.

Design We have developed an interactive computer system called MATE to facilitate explicit, evidence-based decision making in MDT meetings for breast cancer care. **Setting** We describe the system; share our experience of implementing MATE and report initial audit and survey results.

Key measures for improvement Compliance with evidence-based guidelines and the ability to identify patients for accrual into ongoing clinical trials.

Strategies for change The emphasis is on active user participation through audit, feedback and response, acknowledging the clinical needs and practical constraints of the MDT and fitting the system around the team's work-flow rather than the other way around.

Effects of change MATE identified 61% more patients who were eligible for recruitment into clinical trials than the MDT and its recommendations demonstrated high concordance with MDT decisions (93.2 %; N = 984). MATE is in routine use in breast MDT meetings at Royal Free hospital, London and deployment of the system in other NHS trusts is being explored.

Lessons learnt Sophisticated decision support systems can enhance the conduct of MDT meetings in a way that is acceptable to and valued by the clinical team. Further rigorous evaluations are required to examine cost-effectiveness, measure the impact on patient outcomes and test the generalisability of the system in different hospital setups and in different cancers.

Problem statement

Unwarranted practice variation across different medical domains has unfortunately become a pervasive finding in health service research and breast cancer care is no exception.[1] A recently published study reported significant differences in breast cancer survival across hospitals in the same geographical region in England.[2] The reasons for practice variation are multifactorial and standardisation of care has been attempted by the introduction of Regional Cancer Networks in England and the adoptions of the Multi Disciplinary Team (MDT) model to promote maximal adoption of evidence-based practice.

Many benefits of MDTs have been claimed, but few have been backed by strong evidence.[3] However, despite a significant lack of prospective evidence, MDTs are well accepted in clinical practice; they are regarded as a major advance in management of cancer patients and their use appears to be increasing.[4] As many health care systems have already committed to and invested in the MDT model, further reductions in unwarranted variation are likely to be best achieved by improving their conduct and standardizing their decision making processes.[5] Data collected by the UK national cancer peer review programme from over 1000 teams across six cancer types in England indicates that there is significant room for improvement in the conduct of MDT meetings. The analysis reported by Taylor et al, shows considerable variability in the performance of MDTs.[3] A recent national survey of more than 2000 members of cancer multidisciplinary teams, demonstrated agreement on the range of criteria necessary for effective MDT working.[3] A review of the literature by the authors identified many pragmatic challenges and shortcomings in the current conduct of cancer MDT meetings summarised in Table 1.[6]

Context

The Royal Free Hospital NHS Trust (RFH) serves a population of 2.6 million within the North London Cancer Network (NLCN) catchment area. The number of new patients (both benign and cancer) seen as outpatients by the breast unit in 2009-10 was 2,944.

The Breast Cancer Multidisciplinary team at RFH was established in 2005, in line with the recommendations of the NHS Cancer Plan. The MDT uses a set of NLCN-approved clinical guidelines and a standardized minimum data set.

MDT meetings (MDM) are held every week in a conventional conference format. The core members of a breast MDT include breast surgeons, radiologists, pathologists, medical and clinical oncologists, plastic surgeons and breast care nurses. A typical breast MDM discusses an average of 30 to 40 patients at various stages in their care pathways every week to decide further courses of action.

Prior to the introduction of our computer-based service into the MDT meetings, an entirely paper based record system was used to provide case summaries and to document the MDT's discussion and decisions. These records contained free (unstructured) text rather than the coded and structured data used by a modern electronic health record (EHR). The tradeoffs between structured and unstructured EHRs are well known.[7] The main drawbacks of an unstructured MDT record are that it hinders attempts to accurately measure the performance of the MDT and provision of automated data analysis processes and implementation of alerts and reminders, and decision support etc.

There are many commercially available information and communication systems such as EHR systems which can assist in the preparation, presentation and documentation of cases at the MDT meetings. However the objectives of our MDT service improvement exercise was to go beyond improvements in data management by providing active support for evidence-based decision making, improving recruitment into clinical trials and supporting prospective audit.[8]

Measures of improvement

Evidence compliant care: Adherence with clinical practice guidelines

With the increasing recognition of shortcomings in healthcare systems, there is a significant cultural and professional shift towards using evidence-based guidance. Evidence-based standards of care, such as published practice guidelines and technology assessment reports developed by authoritative organisations provide an objective

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

standard against which to assess MDT decisions. There is growing evidence that use of evidence-based guidelines can improve patient outcomes,[9, 10]-[11] and MDT meetings provide the best opportunity to actively promote an *appropriate* and *judicious* use of the guidelines at the point of care.

Promoting research: Identification of patients eligible for ongoing research trials

It is widely accepted that recruiting patients into clinical trials is an effective strategy for ensuring that cancer patients get the best care as well as providing important information about the efficacy of treatments. However, the literature continues to report low rates of accrual to cancer clinical trials,[12] and many organisations at national and international levels are investigating strategies for improving accrual rates. Cancer MDT meetings represent a major opportunity for identifying patients who are eligible for participation in clinical trials.[13]

Methods

In order to assess the performance of the breast MDT on the above mentioned measures we developed a computerised decision support system, MATE (Multidisciplinary meeting Assistant and Treatment sElector), that captures patient data, identifies eligible patients for clinical trials and suggests evidence-based treatment recommendations. MATE also captures MDT decisions and hence can automatically compare them with guideline recommendations.

System development

We followed a systematic, stepwise approach throughout the system development lifecycle. Requirements for MATE were identified through a systematic review of the literature and by working closely with members of the breast MDT at RFH. We adopted the CommonKADS methodology to develop a comprehensive process and knowledge model for breast cancer MDT meetings.[14] A controlled vocabulary was used to facilitate data standardisation. The evidence sources reviewed included Clinical Practice Guidelines, Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses and reports of Randomised

Controlled trials. Along with the guideline recommendations, the eligibility criteria of ongoing clinical trials in breast cancer that were open for the recruitment at our institution were also coded into the system. PRO*forma*,[15] a decision modelling language for formalising clinical decisions and care pathways, was used for the formal evidence representation in MATE. The PRO*forma* language and application development software Tallis used in this project were originally developed at Cancer Research UK; Tallis is now being developed at Oxford University. Tallis was used to implement a range of decision support and other services¹ as determined by the requirements development process outlined above, and is used to update recommendations and other components of the PRO*forma* knowledge base when new guidance is published. The user interface of MATE is illustrated in Fig 2. The detailed description of the knowledgebase, technology and architecture is published elsewhere².

We used the following processes to understand and analyse the design issues and to feed back clinical experience into the MATE development lifecycle.

Evaluation phase

MATE was used to prospectively record the proceedings of breast MDT meetings between April 2008 and July 2009 to gather 1,295 cases discussed in the MDMs during this period. Appropriate ethics and R & D approvals were obtained before starting the study, and data-security measures such as encryption were put in place. MATE allows us to capture both patient data and MDT decisions in a structured form. MATE records were cross-checked with the official MDM record sheets and, in case of any discrepancies, the MATE record was corrected to reflect the official MDM record.

One of the key distinctive features of MATE compared to a traditional electronic health record is the clinical decision support (CDS) element. MATE is able to evaluate patient data and to *actively* offer guideline-based recommendations in real time which are specific for each individual patient. We used MATE to compare *the actual MDT decisions* to that of *guideline recommendations*.

¹ http://mate.cossac.org/

² Acosta, D. et al., 2010. Challenges in Delivering Decision Support Systems: The MATE Experience. In *Knowledge Representation for Health-Care. Data, Processes and Guidelines*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, pp. 124-140. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-11808-1_11.

The discordant cases (where MATE recommendations differed from those of MDT decisions) were further investigated by a panel who reviewed the patient's clinical notes.

MATE also automatically flags patients who meet eligibility criteria for ongoing clinical trials.

Structured feedback

The MATE development team was invited to conduct a workshop at the England Cancer Networks' Development Programme conference in March 2010, The conference was attended by key members from all cancer networks, who are instrumental in governing and improving MDT conduct in their respective cancer networks. MATE was demonstrated in the workshop and a questionnaire survey was conducted at the end of the presentation and discussion session.

Results

Evaluation phase results

A total of 1,295 breast cases were recorded on MATE between April 2008 and July 2009 (each time a patient was discussed in the MDT meeting was counted as a separate encounter). The case mix included cancers and benign pathologies. Table 2 shows the overall distribution of cases recorded on the MATE system during the study system. Metastatic, recurrent and non epithelial malignancies were excluded from the guideline concordance analysis as the guidelines and evidence-base for those subsets were not initially coded in MATE. In 239 cases of recurrent, metastatic or non-epithelial malignancies, MATE therefore provided data capture services but no decision support. The remaining 1056 cases were analysed for concordance between management recommendations made by MATE and the actual MDT decisions and the level of concordance was encouragingly high (93.2 %; N = 984). When the discordant cases were further analysed it was found that 3.2% of MDT deviant decisions were corrected by the treating clinician in the results clinic.

BMJ Open

MATE also identified 61% more patients who were eligible for the recruitment into clinical trials than the MDT.

Structured Feedback

The MATE workshop at the Cancer Networks' Development Programme conference was attended by 54 people, of whom 48 completed the questionnaire. Most respondents (95.8%) agreed that clinical decision support has a useful role in cancer MDMs. The majority of respondents found the services provided by MATE useful for the breast MDM (93.47) and potentially for other types of cancer MDMs (92.6%).

The survey also identified important barriers to large-scale deployment of MATE. The main perceived obstacle to adoption was double data entry (50%) in situations where existing data capture systems are in place and it was suggested that MATE should be able to interface with existing data capture systems. Other barriers identified were costs and resources, clinical buy-in, scalability and the need for practical knowledge validation and maintenance mechanisms.

Strategies for change and effects

The encouraging performance of MATE in this initial phase established the confidence of the breast team at RFH, and MATE was subsequently introduced as the standard breast MDM management tool. Introducing a new technology into as complex a setting as the cancer MDM was a challenging task and our implementation strategy was guided by the experiences of others reported in the literature.[16, 17]

The principles of the implementation strategy for MATE are summarised as follows.

- *Building around the existing clinical work-flow:* In order to ensure the clinical acceptability of MATE, a key design objective was to fit the system around the existing work-flow of the breast MDM and not the other way round.
- *Anticipating clinical needs and pragmatic constraints:* As well as obvious requirements such as access to detailed patient data, a number of other useful

services were identified during the modelling phase (e.g quick access to past MDT decisions)..

Active involvement of users throughout audit, feedback and implementation: As
described in previous sections active participation of the users in the design
process was encouraged through audit and feedback, and wider inputs from
workshops and surveys.

Challenges and Next steps

We would emphasize that the role of MATE or any similar IT system is purely supportive and the MDT meeting continues to be led by the clinical team. Advanced IT systems can only complement an effective and functional multidisciplinary team,[18] and cannot compensate for inherent weaknesses in team composition, organisation or operation. The preliminary audit results and the qualitative assessment data reported in this study, however encouraging, are at this point indicative of the potential benefits but not yet conclusive. They should be treated with caution until further rigorous evaluations confirm the effectiveness and generalisability of MATE or similar services.

Generalisability:

It is has been reported that clinical decision support systems are often at their best when the developing team is involved in the trial of the system. One review reported for example that the success rate for clinical decision support systems dropped from 74% to 28% when the systems were tested by independent teams.[19] The team involved in the development of MATE was also involved in testing and the deployment of the system so replication of our results on other sites is a key objective. Demonstrating that MATE can confer significant benefits for other cancer MDTs is also a high priority. MATE has attracted the attention of the UK Department of Health's National Cancer Action Team and deployment of the system in other NHS trusts is being explored.

Effectiveness trials:

Page 14 of 19

BMJ Open

Definitive evidence of the value of complex (multifaceted) interventions such as MATE requires a multi-centre trial in which a cluster randomised design is likely to be the preferred methodology.[20] The trial should look into all important impacts of the intervention including quantitative measures of cost, patient outcomes and process measures as well as qualitative measures.

Patient empowerment:

Patient involvement in decisions about their treatment is widely considered to be crucial to improving outcomes and many cancer patients wish to play a more active role in their care. The current structure of the cancer MDT meeting makes patient participation very difficult to achieve.[21] We are therefore exploring ways in which MATE could facilitate patient engagement, by extending access to certain of its functions by the patients, in a variety of settings, including consultations in results clinic and from home, allowing the patients to review their clinical history, and the MDT recommendations and explanations for the recommendations.

Ethics approval

 Ethics approval was not required for the submitted work however for the subsequent randomised controlled trial, which is ongoing, ethics approval was taken from the Moorfields & Whittington Research Ethics Committee.

Competing interest

All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form and declare that (1) None of the authors have support from any company for the submitted work; (2) All authors have no relationships with any company that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years; (3) their spouses, partners, or children have no financial relationships that may be relevant to the submitted work; and (4) [VP, DA, JF, MK] have following specified non-financial interests that may be relevant to the submitted work.

UCL(B): a subsidiary of University College London and ISIS innovation: a subsidiary of the University of Oxford, are actively looking to commercialise aspects of this project in the form of a spin-out company.

Funding

The development and subsequent trial of MATE decision support system was funded by Cancer Research UK extramural grant to Prof John Fox and the Royal Free Charity.

Acknowledgement:

We acknowledge the Cancer Research UK for funding the development and the trial of the system and we acknowledge all members of the breast multidisciplinary team at Royal Free for their support.

Contributorship statement:

All authors have made substantial contributions as follow VP, JF and MK: conception and design; VP, DA, TD, AJ and MK: Conducting the pilot study VP and DA: developing the system, acquisition of data, VP and MK: analysis and interpretation of data; VP, DA, JF, MK: drafting the article; All authors: revising it critically for important intellectual content; All authors: final approval of the version to be published.

BMJ Open

References

1. Westert GP, Faber M. Commentary: the Dutch approach to unwarranted medical practice variation. BMJ. 2011;342:d1429.

2. Wishart GC, Greenberg DC, Chou P, et al. Treatment and survival in breast cancer in the Eastern Region of England. Ann Oncol. 2010 Feb;21(2):291-6.

3. Taylor C, Munro AJ, Glynne-Jones R, et al. Multidisciplinary team working in cancer: what is the evidence? BMJ. 2010;340:c951.

4. Mazzaferro V, Majno P. Principles for the best multidisciplinary meetings. Lancet Oncol. Apr;12(4):323-5.

5. Lamb B, Green JS, Vincent C, et al. Decision making in surgical oncology. Surg Oncol. 2011 Sep;20(3):163-8.

6. Patkar V, Acosta D, Davidson T, et al. Cancer Multidisciplinary Team Meetings: Evidence, Challenges, and the Role of Clinical Decision Support Technology. International Journal of Breast Cancer. 2011.

7. Rosenbloom ST, Denny JC, Xu H, et al. Data from clinical notes: a perspective on the tension between structure and flexible documentation. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2011 Mar 1;18(2):181-6.

8. Webb SB, Jr., Bracken MB, Wagner FC, Jr. Retrospective versus prospective audit: a trial of two methods. Hosp Med Staff. 1978 Jan;7(1):13-7.

9. Scott IA, Harper CM. Guideline-discordant care in acute myocardial infarction: predictors and outcomes. Med J Aust. 2002 Jul 1;177(1):26-31.

10. Peterson ED, Roe MT, Mulgund J, et al. Association between hospital process performance and outcomes among patients with acute coronary syndromes. JAMA. 2006 Apr 26;295(16):1912-20.

11. Bahtsevani C, Uden G, Willman A. Outcomes of evidence-based clinical practice guidelines: a systematic review. Int J Technol Assess Health Care. 2004 Fall;20(4):427-33.

12. Lara PN, Jr., Higdon R, Lim N, et al. Prospective evaluation of cancer clinical trial accrual patterns: identifying potential barriers to enrollment. J Clin Oncol. 2001 Mar 15;19(6):1728-33.

13. Bouvier AM, Bauvin E, Danzon A, et al. Place of multidisciplinary consulting meetings and clinical trials in the management of colorectal cancer in France in 2000. Gastroenterol Clin Biol. 2007 Mar;31(3):286-91.

14. Schreiber G, Akkermans H, Anjewierden A, et al. Knowledge Engineering and Management: The CommonKADS Methodology.: The MIT Press; 1999.

15. Sutton DR, Fox J. The syntax and semantics of the PROforma guideline modeling language. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2003 Sep-Oct;10(5):433-43.

16. Grimshaw JM, Eccles MP, Walker AE, et al. Changing physicians' behavior: what works and thoughts on getting more things to work. J Contin Educ Health Prof. 2002 Fall;22(4):237-43.

17. Bates DW, Kuperman GJ, Wang S, et al. Ten commandments for effective clinical decision support: making the practice of evidence-based medicine a reality. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2003 Nov-Dec;10(6):523-30.

18. Lemieux-Charles L MW. What do we know about health care team effectiveness? A review of the literature. Medical Care Research and Review. 2006;63:263-300.

19. Garg AX, Adhikari NK, McDonald H, et al. Effects of computerized clinical decision support systems on practitioner performance and patient outcomes: a systematic review. JAMA. 2005 Mar 9;293(10):1223-38.

20. Campbell NC, Murray E, Darbyshire J, et al. Designing and evaluating complex interventions to improve health care. BMJ. 2007 Mar 3;334(7591):455-9.

21. Choy ET, Chiu A, Butow P, et al. A pilot study to evaluate the impact of involving breast cancer patients in the multidisciplinary discussion of their disease and treatment plan. Breast. 2007 Apr;16(2):178-89.

Table 1. Pragmatic challenges for cancer MDT meetings

								_
- 1		1 1 4	11					۰.
	Linguring on	d dooiimonting	odharanaa	with atondorda	100	avidance becad	audalinaa	۱.
	E HNULLING ALL	α αιοι ππεππηγ		WITH STATICATUS		UICIILC=DASCU	VIIIUEIIIIEN	
-	. Linguing any	a accumenting	uunoronoo	with standards	10.5		Guidelines	

- 2. Identifying patients who are eligible for recruitment into clinical trials
- 3. Ensuring the consistent collection of crucial data such as disease staging and outcomes
- 4. Establishing robust mechanisms for prospective assessment of MDT performance
- 5. Ensuring MDT recommendations are followed in practice
- 6. Achieving the right balance of educational and care delivery objectives of this forum
- 7. Establishing reliable interfaces with primary care to ensure continuity of care



Figure 1. MATE in use at Royal Free breast MDT meeting.

	MRS. FOI Enamedo Suma	ame00, 69 years old, FEM/	ALE.		Print	save		Tractmont					
2009-07-24 🗸	Investigations Decisions	Prognostication Adminis	stration					Treatment					- 1
Patient Type	1			21				Endocrine					
Core Biopsy 🗸 🗸	MRS. Forename00 Sun	name00, 69 years old, FEM	ALE.										- I
Patient	Presenting Symptoms	Lump.			$\sim \lor -$	-		FEC					
Surname00, F.	Relevant History	rt nephrectomy, Hypothy	roid, HTN.		1	1.							
Sumame02, F.		Right Breast	Left Breast	11.	Λ			FEC + Endo					
Sumame03, F.	Past Cancer Tx												
Sumame04, F.	Examination Findings	t et Discrete Lump			\sim	~		FEC + Tr					
	Investigations	DS LIS DS	<u>k</u>		/ \	1							
	Treatment	Breast Conservation	<u>k</u>	discrete lump	o 🔆 localised nod	fularity		Endo + Tr					
		Wide Local Excision, Sentinel Node Biopsy.	<u>k</u>	Nipple discha	arge 🍦 Paget like Retracted nip	pple		0	20	40	60	80	100
	Histopathology	Invasive Ductal				Argum	entName					SymbolicSu	upport
		Grade High, 0 Nodes			10084				For				
		Positive, ER Positive,											
		I nerz s.		-	Caption	Completely ex	ised early l	preast cance	er treated wi	th breast c	onservat	ion. (Brei	ast ca
	Decision Summary	BEATRICE, Chemotherap	 Breast radiotherapy. 			breest encourt	ation) and	Early breast	t carcinoma	ctago I to	UIA) and	(not mar	rain in
						Theast conserv	L Luga	carry breas	L Carcinoma	stage 1 to	IIIA) di lu	C1 11	gnill
sion Detail Decision An	alvsis Justification Trial	Analysis				Transected/Inv mm/Transected	olved NOS/	Focally invo	lved) and (n	ot margin l	DCIS one	of Less th	han 1
sion Detail Decision An	alysis Justification Trial	Analysis				Transected/Inv mm/Transected	olved NOS/ d/Involved I	Focally invo NOS)	Ived) and (n	ot margin l	DCIS one	of Less ti	than 1
sion Detail Decision An uvant Therapy Adjuvan	alysis Justification Trial	Analysis cal Trial Staging Surveilla	nce or Follow-up		Justification	Improves OS,B	CSS and DF	Focally invo	lved) and (n	reated with	DCIS one	of Less ti	ban 1
i sion Detail Decision An Iuvant Therapy Adjuvan ALTTO	alysis Justification Trial t Endocrine Therapy Clinic OPTION	Analysis cal Trial Staging Surveilla	Ince or Follow-up	None	Justification	Improves OS,B recurrence is th 20%) even in c	CSS and DF conserve	S. For wome d breast its	lved) and (n en who are t elf. The risk n node-nega	reated with of recurrentive women	n WLE, the	ie most c conserve vhole bre	ban 1
sion Detail Decision An uvant Therapy Adjuvan ALTTO BETTER CARE	alysis Justification Trial t Endocrine Therapy Clinic OPTION POSH	Analysis cal Trial Staging Surveilla REACT SUPREMO	Ince or Follow-up	None	Justification	Improves OS,B recurrence is th 20%) even in of breast conservi-	CSS and DF conserve confirmed a ing surgery	S. For wome d breast its killary lymph is recomme bave shown	en who are t en who are t n node-nega nded. Althou	reated with of recurrentive women ugh all trial	n WLE, th ice in the . Thus, v s assess	e most c conserve vhole bre ing the ro	commi ed bre ast ra
slon Detail Decision An uvant Therapy Adjuvan ALTTO BETTER CARE I GLACIER	alysis Dustification Trial t Endocrine Therapy Clinit OPTION POSH POETIC	Analysis cal Trial Staging Surveilla REACT SUPREMO TACT 2	Ince or Follow-up	None	Justification	Improves OS,B recurrence is th 20%) even in o breast conserv no single trial	CSS and DF conserve confirmed a ing surgery ing therapy has demons	S. For wome d breast its killary lymph is recomme have shown	en who are t elf. The risk node-nega nded. Althou highly stat	reated with of recurrer tive womer ugh all trial istically sig gnificant re	n WLE, th ice in the n. Thus, v 's assess inificant i duction in	ne most c conserve whole bre ing the ro reduction	commi ed bre east ra ole of ty. Lic
Sion Detail Decision An Iuvant Therapy Adjuvan ALTTO BETTER CARE) GLACIER	alysis Dustification Trial t Endocrine Therapy Clinic OPTION POSH POETIC	Analysis cal Trial Staging Surveilla REACT SUPREMO TACT 2	Ince or Follow-up	None	Justification	Improves OS,B mm/Transected/Inv mm/Transected Improves OS,B recurrence is th 20%) even in c breast conserv breast-conserv no single trial Early Breast Ca combined, 15	CSS and DF conserve confirmed a ing surgery ing therapy has demons ancer Trialis	S. For wome d breast its xillary lymph is recomme have shown strated a sto its' Collabor: cancer mort	en who are t elf. The risk n node-nega nded. Althou n highly stat ative Group' altive was re	reated with of recurren tive women ugh all trial gnificant re s (EBCTCG) duced from	n WLE, the ice in the n Thus, v is assess inificant in duction in update, 35.9% to	the most of conserve whole bre reduction o mortality when all o 30.5%	commo ed bre east ra ole of ty. Ho relev In wo
Jon Detail Decision An Juvant Therapy Adjuvan ALTTO BETTER CARE J GLACIER	alysis Dustification Trial Endocrine Therapy Clink OPTION POSH POETIC	Analysis cal Trial Staging Surveilla REACT SUPREMO TACT 2	Ince or Follow-up	None	Justification	Improves OS,B mm/Transected/Inv mm/Transected/Inv mm/Transected Improves OS,B recurrence is the 20% even in of breast conserv to single trial Early Breast Cd combined, 15 radiation thera one of cf	CSS and DF conserve confirmed a ing surgery ing therapy has demon ancer Trialis year breast py (absolut	S. For wome d breast its xillary lymph ls recomme have shown strated a sta tts' Collabor cancer mort e difference	en who are t elf. The risk n node-nega nded. Althou n highly stat tistically si attive Group ⁵ altity was re of 5.4%; 9	reated with of recurrer tive womer ugh all trial istically sig gnificant re s (EBCTCG) duced from 5% CT, 2.19	n WLE, th noe in the n Thus, v s assess gnificant i duction in update, 35.9% t % 8.7%;	the most of conserve whole bre ing the ro reduction n mortall when all o 30.5% breast co	commo ed bre sast ra ole of is in lo ity. I lo in wor ancer in
I Decision Annu Decision Annu Annu Annu Annu Annu Annu Annu An	alysis Dustification Trial t Endocrine Therapy Clinic OPTION POSH POETIC	Analysis cal Trial Staging Surveilla REACT SUPPEMO TACT 2	Ince or Follow-up	None	Justification	Improves OS,B Improves OS,B recurrence is the 20%) even in of breast conserv he stright trial Early Breast Co. combined, 15- radiation thera 0.83; 95% CI,	CSS and DF conserve confirmed a ing surgery ing therapy has demons ancer Trialis year breast py (absolut 0.75 0.91;	S. For wome d breast its villary lymph is recomme have shown strated a stor ts' Collabor cancer mort e difference P = .002). T	en who are t eff. The risk n node-nega nded. Althou n highly stat atistice Group' ality was re of 5.4%; 9 here was a	reated with of recurrer tive womer ugh all trial istically sig gnificant re s (EBCTCG) duced from 5% CI, 2.14 similar effe	n WLE, th ice in the h. Thus, v is assess gnificant i duction ii) update, 35.9% tr % 8.7%; ct on all	viole breast of Less the most of conserve whole breast or reduction n mortalli when all o 30.5% breast ce cause mortal cause mortal conserved to the mortal of the mortal	commo ed bre ast ra ole of is in lo ity. Lic l relev in wo ancer o ortalit
I Decision An Iuvant Therapy Adjuvan JALTTO JBETTER CARE J GLACIEP	alysis Justification Trial t Endocrine Therapy Clink OPTION POSH POSH POETIC Ilary Surgery	Lanalysis cal Trial Staging Surveilla REACT SUPPEMO TACT 2 Left Breast Adjuvent Redicther	Ince or Follow-up TARGIT MEATRICE PET CT Tapy Asillary Surgery	None	Justification	Transected/Inv mm/Transected/Inv mm/Transected Improves OS,B recurrence is th 20%) even in o breast conserv breast-conserv breast-conserv or single trial Early Breast C- combined, 15 radiation thera 0.83; 95% CL,	CSS and DP CSS and DP the conserve conserve ing surgery ing therapy has demons ancer Trialis year breast py (absolut 0.75 0.91;	S. For wome d breast its killary lymph is recomme have shown strated a sta ts' Collabor cancer mort e difference P = .002). T	en who are t eff. The risk n node-rega nded. Althou n highly stat attistically sit attistically sit attistic	reated with of recurrer tive womer ugh all trial istically sig gnificant re s (EBCTCG) duced from 5% CI, 2.14 similar effe	n WLE, th ice in the h. Thus, v is assess juificant i uduction in update, 35.9% t % 8.7%; ct on all	the most of conservery whole bre ing the ro reduction n mortalli when all o 30.5% breast co cause mo	commo ed bre east ra ole of is in lo ity. Ho I relev in wo ancer o ortalit
ALTTO BETTER CARE IGLACIER ALTTO BETTER CARE IGLACIER AND ALTO BETTER CARE IGLACIER BETER CARE IGLACIER BERGAT BROAST	alysis Justification Trial alysis Justification Trial Control Therapy Clink OPTION POETIC POETIC	Analysis cal Trial Staging Surveilla REACT SUPPEND TACT 2 Left Breast Adjuvant Radiothe Breast Treat	nce or Follow-up TARGIT BEATRICE PET CT rapy Avillary Surgery ment Evest	None Imaging	Justification	Transected/Inv mm/Transected/Inv mm/Transected Improves OS,B recurrence is th 20%) even in o breast conserv breast-conserv breast-conserv breast-conserv on single trial Early Breast Cr combined, 15 radiation thera 0.83; 95% CI,	CSS and DF CSS and DF he conserve confirmed a ing surgery ing therapy has demons ancer Trialis eer breast py (absolut 0.75 0.91;	S. For wome d breast its killary lymph Is recomme have shown strated a sto its' Collabor; cancer mort e difference P = .002). T	en who are t elf. The risk n node-nega nded. Althoi n highly stat ative Group' ative Group' ihere was a	reated with of recurrer tive womer ugh all trial istically significant re s (EBCTCG) duced from 5% CI, 2.11	n WLE, th ice in the n Thus, v is assess gnificant i duction ii) update, 35.9% tr 6.8.7%; ct on all	ne most c conserve whole bre ing the rc reduction n mortali when all o 30,5% breast ca cause mo	commo ed bre east ra ole of is in lo i relevi in wor ancer o ortalit
ALTTO ALTTO BETTER CAPE (GLACIEP ALTRO BETTER CAPE (GLACIEP ALTRO Breast Tredictherapy) Axy Breast Treatment Breast redictherapy	Illery Surgery Illery Surgery Child Chesteral Freedom	Analysis cal Trial Staging Surveilla REACT SUPREMO TACT 2 Left Breast Adjuvent Endother Breast Treat	nce or Follow-up TARGIT MEATRICE PET CT rapy Aullary Surgery ment Breast cision Mestectom	None Imaging +/- Recon	Justification	Intersected/Inv mm/Transected/Inv mm/Transected/Inv mm/Transected/Inv recurrence is the 20% even in c breast conserv no single trial 20% even in c breast conserv no single trial Early Breast Cr combined, 15 radiation thera 0.83; 95% CI, Guideline	CSS and DF CSS and DF e conserve confirmed a ing surgery ing therapy has demons ancer Trialis year breast py (absolut 0.75 0.91; Studies	S. For wome d breast its killary lymph Is recomme have shown strated a str t's' Collabor, cancer mort e difference P = .002). T	en who are t en who are t elf. The risk n node-nega nded. Althou highly stat atistically si ative Group' failty was re of 5.4%; 9 here was a	reated with of recurrer tive womer ugh all trial istically sig unifloant re s (EBCTCG) duced from 5% CI, 2.11	n WLE, th ice in the Thus, v is assess inificant i duction in update, 35.9% t kct on all	the most of i conserve whole bre ing the ro reduction n mortality when all o 30.5% breast co cause mo	commo ed bre east re east re e
ALTTO ALTTO BETTER CAPE (GLACIEP at Breast uvant Radiotherapy) Axi Breast Treatment Breast radiotherapy	Alaysis Justification Trial alaysis Justification Trial office POSH POSH POSTIC Illary Surgery Breast Imaging Chestwall + regiona No radiotherapy	Analysis cal Trial Staging Surveilla REACT SUPPEMO TACT 2 Left Breast Adjuvant Radiother Breast Tradi	Ince or Follow-up TARGIT BEATRICE PET CT Tapy Axillery Surgery ment Breast dision Mastectomy sion Mastectomy	None Imaging +/- Recon cision	Justification	Dreast, Colledy Transected/Inv mm/Transecter Improves OS,B recurrence is th 20%) even in c breast conserv no single trial Early Breast CC combined, 15 radiation thera 0.83; 95% CI, Guideline CCO _ 2005	CSS and DF CSS and DF e conserve confirmed a ing surgery ing therapy has demonsa ancer Trialis year breast py (absolut 0.75 0.91; Studies	S. For women d breast its killary lymph is recommen have shown strated a st cancer mort e difference P = .002). T	en who are t elf. The risk n node-nega nded. Althou h highly stat statistically si ative Group' here was a	reated with of recurrer tive womer tive womer ugh all trial istically sistically sistically sistically so (EBCTCG) duced from 5% CI, 2.11 similar effe	w/LE, th ice in the b. Thus, v is assess gnificant i duction i update, 35.9% t % 8.7%; ict on all	the most of i conserve whole bre ing the ro reduction in mortall when all o 30.5% breast co cause mo	commo ed bre ed bre is in lo ity. Ho i relev in wor ortalit
I Decision An Invant Therapy Adjuvan ALITO BETTER CARE GLACIEP ALACIEP ALACIEP ALACIEP ALACIEP ALACIEP ALACIEP ALACIEP ALACIEP ALACIEP ALA	Alaysis Justification Trial t Endocrine Therapy Clink OPTION POSH POETIC Illary Surgery Breast Imaging Chestwall + regions No radiotherapy	Analysis Cal Trial Staging Surveilla REACT SUPPENO TACT 2 Left Breast Adjuvant Radiothe Breast Treat UT Therspeutic ex Util Th	me or Follow-up TARGIT TARGIT MEATRICE PET CT rapy Auillary Surgery ment Ecsion Mastectomy ision Magin reast	None Imaging +/- Recon cision	Justification	Dreast, Colliedy Transected/Inv mm/Transecter Improves OS,B recurrence is th 20% jeven in c breast conserv no single trial Early Breast Cc combined, 15–7 radiation thera 0.83; 95% CI, Guideline CCC2005 NCCH_2008	Studies No. 2015 Studies No. 2015 Studies Studies	S. For woms d breast its d breast its is recomme have shown strated a st ts' Collabor, cancer mort e difference P = .002). T	en who are t elf. The risk n node-nega nded. Althou h highly stat ative Group? here was a	reated with of recurrer tive womer ugh all trial istically sistically sistically sistically sistically sistically so (EBCTCG) duced from 5% CI, 2.11 similar effe	wLE, there is a second	ne most c to conserve whole bre ing the ro reduction n mortali when all o 30.5% breast cc cause mo	common ed bre aast ra ole of rs in li ity. I je in wor ancer r ortalit
ALTTO JALTTO JALTTO JALTTO JETTER CARE J CLACIEP At Breast the Breast Breast Treatment Breast Treatment Breast readiotherapy Attack and the approximation of the appro	Illary Surgery Breast Imaging Checkwall + regiona No radiotherapy	Analysis Cal Trial Staging Surveilla Cal Trial Staging Surveilla REACT SUPPEMO TACT 2 Left Breast Adjuvant Radiothes Factors Tract Unterspectic ex Unide local exc Unide local exc Unitersy demo	nce or Follow-up TARGIT BEATRICE PET CT ment dsion Mastectomy ision Margin reex therapy No treatment ine the	Imaging +/- Recon cision it	Justification	Diess Collegy Transected/Inv mm/Transected/Inv mm/Transected/Inv mm/Transected/Inv recurrence is th 20%) even in o breast conserv breast-conserv breast-conserv breast-conserv on single trial Early Breast CC combined, 15- radiation thera 0.83; 95% CL CC0_2005 NCCN_2005 SIGN.84, 2007	Studies Notes	S. For women by the second sec	an who are t elf. The risk n ode-nega nded. Althon highly stat ative Group' ative Group' ative Group' ative Group' ative Group' here was a	reated with of recurrer tive womer gan all trial istically significant re s (EBCTCG) duced from 5% C1, 2.1 similar effe	n WLE, th noce in the n Hule, th see in the n sesses grificant i duction in update, 35.9% t kt on all 22; Malm	tof Less ti me most c e conserve whole bre ing the reduction n mortali o 30.5% breast ce cause mo	commo ed bre ast ra ole of l relev in woo ancer ancer , 2003
ALTTO ALTTO BETTER CARE (GLACIEP AL Breast Uriont Rodictherapy) Ack Breast Treatment Breast Treatment Deresst radiotherapy (Chestwall radiotherapy	Illary Surgery Chest Madorine Therapy Clink POSH POSH POETIC Illary Surgery Ereast Imaging Chestwell + regiona No radiotherapy	Analysis Col Trial Staging Surveilla REACT SUPREMO TACT 2 Left Breast Adjuvent Bedichter Breast Treat IRT INT Primary demo Primary demo	nce or Follow-up TARGIT BEATRICE PET CT rapy Asillary Surgery ment Breast dision Margin reek therapy No treatment ine the	Mone Imaging +/- Pecon cision it	Justification	Dress: Object Transected/intransectel Improves OS, B. recurrence is the 20% jewen in the 20% jewen in the 20% jewen in the 20% jewen in the rest conserver breast conserver brea	CSS and DF CSS and DF re conserve confirmed a ing surgery ing surgery ing strengy has demoni- py (absolut 0.75 0.91; Studies 5 EBCTCCG, Clarke, M	S. For women d breast its d breast its ullary lymp have show have show tsrated a start ts' Collabor cancer mort e difference P = .002). T	an who are t elf. The risk n node-nega nded. Althou n highly stat stative Group' ative Group' ative Group' ative Group' tative Group' co 5 .4%; 9: here was a	reated with of recurrer tive womer ugh all trial istically sig anifoant re s (EBCTCG, duced from 5% CI, 2.11 similar effe	n WLE, th noce in the n Hule, th see in the n seeses grificant i duction in update, 35.9% t to n all 22; Malm	tof Less ti he most c conservi- whole bre- ing the rc reduction n mortality when all o 30.5% breast cc cause mo	common ed bre aast ra ole of ity. Ho I relev: in wor ancer o ortalit
ALTTO ALTTO ALTTO BETTER CAPE (QLACIEP AL Breast Uwant Radiotherapy) Axi Breast Treatment Breast radiotherapy (Chestwall radiotherapy	Illary Surgery Chestwall + regiona Chestwall + regiona No radiotherapy	Analysis Col Trial Staging Surveilla REACT SUPPEMO TACT 2 Left Breast Adjuvant Radiothe Breast Treat Treat Interspeutic ex Primary demo Primary demo Primary endor	Ince or Follow-up TARGIT BEATRICE PET CT Tapy Axillary Surgery ment Becest cision Mastectom, ision Margin reex horary No treatment ine the	Imaging +/- Pecon cision It	Justification	Dreas, collady Transected/manuficience. Improves Os,B, recurrence is it 20%) even in a transected/manuficience. Collade Early Breast C. Collade CCO_2005 NCGL.2008 SIGH 84, 200 IvG_208	Studies (SS and DF) CSS and DF) conserve confirmed a ing surgery ing therapy ing therapy ing therapy (absolut) 0.75 0.91; Studies EBCTCG, Clarke, M	Focally invo NOS) S. For wome d breast its illiary lympi is recomme have shown strated a st ts' collabor cancer mort e difference e difference e difference e difference 2000; EBCTI 2005.	en who are t en who are t elf. The risk n node-nega nded. Althou h highly stat atistically si ative Group? (allty was re- a of 5.48; g) here was a	reated with of recurrer tive womer ugh all trial istically sig mificant re s (EBCTCG, duced from 5% CI, 2.11 similar effe	n WLE, th noe in the n Thus, vision the sassess prificant i outcron i outcron i sassess prificant i outcron i outcron i sassess prificant i sassess prifican	er fLess ti he most c conservi- whole bre ing the rc reduction n mortality when all o 30.5% breast cc cause mo	commo ed bre east ra ole of tty. Ho in word ancer (ortalit

Figure 2. Composite screen-shot showing the user interface and some of the functionalities of MATE; Upper left: the summary screen for the patient. Upper right: one of the many prognostication tools available, Lower left: decision panel where system recommendations and eligible clinical trials are highlighted in blue. Lower right: the evidential justification for each recommended option.

Pathology	Number
Benign breast disease	413
Operable breast cancer (in situ and invasive)	511
No final diagnosis reached (e.g. C1/C3/C4 on cytology or B1/B3/B4 on core biopsy)	132
at the time of MDT meeting	
Metastatic and or recurrent cancers	198
Other than breast epithelial malignancies	41
Total cases	1295

Table 2. Distribution of breast cases discussed at MDM according to type



Improving cancer multi-disciplinary meetings: A pilot study of advanced clinical decision support technology

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2011-000439.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Mar-2012
Complete List of Authors:	Patkar, Vivek; University College London, ; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit Acosta, Dionisio; University College London, Davidson, Tim; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit Jones, Alison; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit Fox, John; Oxford University, Department of Engineering Science Keshtgar, Mohammed; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit; University College London,
Primary Subject Heading :	Health informatics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Oncology, Evidence-based practice, Health services research
Keywords:	Breast tumours < ONCOLOGY, ONCOLOGY, HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Computer decision support for cancer multi-disciplinary meetings: The Royal Free experience Type- An analysis of new technique/ Quality improvement reportImproving cancer multi-disciplinary meetings: A pilot study of an advanced clinical decision support technology.

Vivek Patkar^{1,2}, Dionisio Acosta², Tim Davidson¹, Alison Jones¹, John Fox³, Mohammed Keshtgar^{1,2}

¹ The Breast Unit, Department of Surgery, Royal Free Hospital
 ² University College London
 ³ Department of Engineering Science, Oxford University

Author addresses

Vivek Pat	kar
	Senior Research Fellow
	Department of Oncology
	Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust.
	Pond street
	London
	NW3 2QG
Dionisio A	Acosta
	Senior Research Associate
	Centre for Health Informatics & Multiprofessional Education (CHIME)
	University College London
	4th Floor Holborn Union Building
	Highgate Hill
	London N19 5LW
Tim David	dson
	Consultant breast surgeon
	The Breast unit
	Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust.
	Pond street
	London
Aliana Tar	NW3 200
Allson Joi	ICS
	Devia Free Hornital Hampsteed NHS Trust
	Dond etcert
	London
	NW3 20G
John Fox	1.115 2.20
voini i on	Professor
	Department of Engineering Science, Oxford University.
	Parks road
	Oxford
	OX1 3PJ
Mohamma	ad Keshtgar (corresponding author)
	Consultant Surgical Oncologist and Reader in Surgery
	The Breast Unit
	Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust
	University College London
	Pond street
	London

for beer terrier on email: m.keshtgar@ucl.ac.uk

Article summary

Article focus:

-How to improve the conduct of a cancer MDT and standardize decision-making in accordance with best evidence

- Development and implementation of a novel clinical decision support (CDS) platform for cancer MDT

- Pilot evaluation results

Key messages:

- An advanced CDS platform could significantly improve the conduct of cancer MDT meetings.

- Further robust evaluations are necessary.

Strengths and limitations:

- We share our valuable experience of developing an advanced decision support system and implementing in a complex clinical environment of cancer MDT which is subsequently adopted as a breast MDT meetings management tool.

-The results reported here, however encouraging, are at this point indicative of the potential benefits but not yet conclusive. They should be treated with caution until further rigorous evaluations confirm the effectiveness and generalisability of the CDS system.

Data sharing statement:

There is no additional data available.

Research checklist:

Appropriate research checklist could not be found.

Abstract:

Objectives: The cancer multidisciplinary team (MDT) meeting is regarded as the best platform to reduce unwarranted variation in cancer care through evidence-compliant management. However, MDT meetings are often overburdened with many different agendas, and hence struggle to achieve their full potential. We developed an interactive clinical decision support system called MATE (Multidisciplinary meeting Assistant and Treatment sElector), to facilitate explicit, evidence-based decision making in the breast MDT meetings and to improve the overall conduct. **Design:** Audit study and a questionnaire survey. Setting: Breast multidisciplinary unit in a large secondary care teaching hospital. **Participants:** The participants included all members of the breast MDT at the Royal Free Hospital, London. The emphasis was on active user participation through audit, feedback and response, acknowledging the clinical needs and practical constraints of the MDT and fitting the system around the team's work-flow rather than the other way around. **Outcome measures:** The measures included evidence compliant care; measured by adherence to clinical practice guidelines (CPGs) and promoting research; measured by the patient identification rate for ongoing clinical trials. Results: MATE identified 61% more patients who were eligible for recruitment into clinical trials than the MDT and MATE recommendations demonstrated better concordance with CPG than MDT recommendations (97 of MATE vs 93.2 % of MDT; N = 984). MATE is in routine use in breast MDT meetings at Royal Free hospital, London and wider evaluations are being explored. **Conclusions:** Sophisticated decision support systems can enhance the conduct of MDT meetings in a way that is acceptable to and valued by the clinical team. Further rigorous evaluations are required to examine cost-effectiveness and measure the impact on patient outcomes. The decision support technology used in MATE is generic and if found useful can be applied across the medicine.

Problem The cancer multidisciplinary team (MDT) meeting is regarded as the best platform to reduce unwarranted variation in cancer care through evidence compliant

Comment [vivek1]: R2: The authors may wish to expand the acronym MATE in the abstract – as this is what many readers will be able to read on the front page of BMJ

BMJ Open

∠ २
4
6
7
, 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
40 40
49 50
0U ⊑1
51
0Z 52
03 54
04 55
00
50
52
50
79

60

management. However, MDT meetings are often overburdened with many different agendas, and hence struggle to achieve their full potential. Design We have developed an interactive computer system called MATE to facilitate explicit, evidence-based decision making in MDT meetings for breast cancer care. Setting We describe the system; share our experience of implementing MATE and report initial audit and survey results. Key measures for improvement Compliance with evidence based guidelines and the ability to identify patients for accrual into ongoing clinical trials. Strategies for change The emphasis is on active user participation through audit, feedback and response, acknowledging the clinical needs and practical constraints of the MDT and fitting the system around the team's work flow rather than the other way around. Effects of change MATE identified 61% more patients who were eligible for recruitment into clinical trials than the MDT and its recommendations demonstrated high concordance with MDT decisions (93.2 %; N = 984). MATE is in routine use in breast MDT meetings at Royal Free hospital, London and deployment of the system in other NHS trusts is being explored. Lessons learnt Sophisticated decision support systems can enhance the conduct of MDT meetings in a way that is acceptable to and valued by the clinical team. Further rigorous evaluations are required to examine cost effectiveness, measure the impact on patient

Problem statement

different cancers.

Unwarranted practice variation across different medical domains has unfortunately become a pervasive finding in health service research and breast cancer care is no exception.[1] A recently published study reported significant differences in breast cancer survival across hospitals in the same geographical region in England.[2] The reasons for

outcomes and test the generalisability of the system in different hospital setups and in

practice variation are multifactorial and standardisation of care has been attempted by the introduction of Regional Cancer Networks in England and the adoptions of the Multi Disciplinary Team (MDT) model to promote maximal adoption of evidence-based practice. The MDT model is increasingly being adopted in other non-cancer medical domains such as stroke, cardiovascular diseases and diabetes.

Many benefits of MDTs have been claimed, but few have been backed by strong evidence.[3.4] However, despite a significant lack of prospective evidence, MDTs are well accepted in clinical practice; they are regarded as a major advance in management of cancer patients and their use appears to be increasing.[5] As many health care systems have already committed to and invested in the MDT model, further reductions in unwarranted variation are likely to be best achieved by improving their conduct and standardizing their decision making processes.[6] Data collected by the UK national cancer peer review programme from over 1000 teams across six cancer types in England indicates that there is significant room for improvement in the conduct of MDT meetings. The analysis reported by Taylor et al, and shows considerable variability in the performance of MDTs.[7] A recent national survey of more than 2000 members of cancer multidisciplinary teams, demonstrated agreement on the range of criteria necessary for effective MDT working.[3] A review of the literature by the authors identified many pragmatic challenges and shortcomings in the current conduct of cancer MDT meetings summarised in Table 1.[8]

Context

The Royal Free Hospital NHS Trust (RFH) serves a population of 2.6 million within the North London Cancer Network (NLCN) catchment area. The number of new patients (both benign and cancer) seen as outpatients by the breast unit in 2009-10 was 2,944. The Breast Cancer Multidisciplinary team at RFH was established in 2005, in line with the recommendations of the NHS Cancer Plan. The MDT uses a set of NLCN-approved clinical guidelines and a standardized minimum data set.

MDT meetings (MDM) are held every week in a conventional conference format. The core members of a breast MDT include breast surgeons, radiologists, pathologists, **Comment [vivek2]:** R2: In the problem statement you may wish to mention that MDT meetings are no longer solely seen in cancer patients and they are becoming much more common in complex surgical care, cardiovascular disease, transplant and other clinical domains

BMJ Open

medical and clinical oncologists, plastic surgeons and breast care nurses. A typical breast MDM discusses an average of 30 to 40 patients at various stages in their care pathways every week to decide further courses of action.

Prior to the introduction of our computer-based service into the MDT meetings, an entirely paper based record system was used to provide case summaries and to document the MDT's discussion and decisions. These records contained free (unstructured) text rather than the coded and structured data-used by a modern electronic health record (EHR). The tradeoffs between structured (computer interpretable) and unstructured (free text clinical notes, scanned documents, pdfs) EHRs are well known.[9] MDT discussion records in an unstructured form, hinders the process of accurate measurement of MDT performance as computer based data analysis and auditing tools can not be used on unstructured data.

The main drawbacks of an unstructured MDT record are that it hinders attempts to accurately measure the performance of the MDT and provision of automated data analysis processes and implementation of alerts and reminders, and decision support etc.

There are many commercially available information and communication systems such as EHR systems which can assist in the preparation, presentation and documentation of cases at the MDT meetings. However the objectives of our MDT service improvement exercise was to go beyond improvements in data management by providing active support for evidence-based decision making, improving recruitment into clinical trials and supporting prospective audit.[10]

Measures of improvement

Evidence compliant care: Adherence with clinical practice guidelines

With the increasing recognition of shortcomings in healthcare systems, there is a significant cultural and professional shift towards using evidence-based guidance. Evidence-based standards of care, such as published practice guidelines and technology assessment reports developed by authoritative organisations provide an objective standard against which to assess MDT decisions. There is growing evidence that use of evidence-based guidelines can improve patient outcomes,[11-13] and MDT meetings

Comment [vivek3]: On page 8 of 19 (according to the pdf) in the paragraph starting "Prior to the introduction of our..." – the last sentence is written poorly and ends with etc – this doesn't make sense and some thought needs to be given to rewriting these points more clearly.- provide the best opportunity to actively promote an *appropriate* and *judicious* use of the guidelines at the point of care.

Promoting research: Identification of patients eligible for ongoing research trials

It is widely accepted that recruiting patients into clinical trials is an effective strategy for ensuring that cancer patients get the best care as well as providing important information about the efficacy of treatments. However, the literature continues to report low rates of accrual to cancer clinical trials, [14] and many organisations at national and international levels are investigating strategies for improving accrual rates. Cancer MDT meetings represent a major opportunity for identifying patients who are eligible for participation in clinical trials.[15]

Methods

In order to assess the performance of the breast MDT on the above mentioned measures we developed a computerised decision support system, **MATE** (Multidisciplinary meeting Assistant and Treatment sElector), that captures patient data, identifies eligible patients for clinical trials and suggests evidence-based treatment recommendations. MATE also captures MDT decisions and hence can automatically compare them with guideline recommendations.

System development

We followed a systematic, stepwise approach throughout the system development lifecycle. Requirements for MATE were identified through a systematic review of the literature and by working closely with members of the breast MDT at RFH. We adopted the CommonKADS methodology to develop a comprehensive process and knowledge model for breast cancer MDT meetings.[16] A controlled vocabulary from National <u>Cancer Institute thesaurus [17]</u> was used to facilitate data standardisation. The evidence sources reviewed included Clinical Practice Guidelines, Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses and reports of Randomised Controlled trials. Along with the guideline recommendations, the eligibility criteria of ongoing clinical trials in breast cancer that

Comment [vivek4]: R2 Readers may be interested to know what controlled vocabulary was used

BMJ Open

60

were open for the recruitment at our institution were also coded into the system. PROforma,[<u>18</u>] a decision modelling language for formalising clinical decisions and care pathways, was used for the formal evidence representation in MATE. The PROforma language and application development software Tallis used in this project were originally developed at Cancer Research UK; Tallis is now being developed at Oxford University. Tallis was used to implement a range of decision support and other services¹ as determined by the requirements development process outlined above, and is used to update recommendations and other components of the PROforma knowledge base when new guidance is published.

System description

MATE functionality can be categorised into two broad labels: 1. Structured data capture, presentation and audit modules 2. Advanced evidence-based decision support module

Data capture: MATE allows user to capture detailed structured clinical data including, demographics, co morbidities, test results, clinical findings, imaging, pathology and treatment related data. The data is entered in the system either before (preparation phase) or during the MDT meetings (presentation phase). In the preparation phase the data is entered by a clinician, who is responsible for the preparation of the meeting. The data entry is flexible, quick and secure and it was found to save the preparation time. If some of the test results such as pathology report are not available before the MDT meeting, they could easily be entered in MATE during the meeting by a clinician in charge, without delaying the proceedings. MATE also provides automatic summary generation and prospective audit facilities.

Advanced evidence-based decision support module: is the key component of MATE which sets it apart from cancer tracking systems, EHR systems and the first generation rule based alert or reminder systems. MATE actively evaluates diagnostic markers histo-pathological data and other patient related factors such as co-morbidities to generate

¹ http://mate.cossac.org/

Comment [vivek5]: R2: summarised clinical description of the system may be warranted and

R1: It is not entirely clear upon what information the recommendations of MATE are based upon - is it simply on diagnostic markers (radiology/hisotology) or does it take account of any patient-based factors (demographics, comorbidities, preferences of patients etc?) Blazeby's work has shown that failure to consider such information is a major reason for non-implementation of recommendations (assocated with delays to treatment etc). Could this system work for complex cases or is it mostly for 'routine' cases? If so could one benefit of such a system be to help MDTs to prioritise cases according to their complexity ensuring that more time is spent on complex cases and that the routine case that are protocol led are instead agreed consensually to be such?

Can the system come up with a ranking of options for example - whereby if the fitness of the patient is in question or they refuse a recommendation for any reason it can determine the next best in terms of evidence?

--- Formatted: Spanish (Argentina)

patient specific recommendations for the management. An advanced PROforma decision support technology enables MATE to rank the recommended options: for example - if the fitness of the patient is in question due to co-morbidity, MATE can recommend the next best option in terms of evidence. In principle, patient preferences could also be factored _ in to the MATE decision model and we are actively exploring the ways of supporting patient preferences as discussed in the last section under heading patient empowerment. The recommendations are presented to the user in the form of arguments, linked to the supporting evidence, for the transparency. MATE knowledge base consisted of a comprehensive set of published national and international clinical practice guidelines, which enables MATE to provide recommendations even in complex cases that are covered by these guidelines. MATE also provides quantitative risk estimates based on published models as an adjunct to the recommendations. The user interface of MATE is illustrated in Fig 2. The detailed description of the knowledge_base, technology and architecture is published elsewhere² [19].

We used the following processes to understand and analyse the design issues and to feed back clinical experience into the MATE development lifecycle.

Evaluation phase

MATE was used to prospectively record the proceedings of breast MDT meetings between April 2008 and July 2009 to gather 1,295 cases discussed in the MDMs during this period. <u>An Aappropriate_ethics and R & D</u>-approvals for an audit study from <u>Research and Development department of the hospital_were-was_obtained_before starting_</u> the study, and data-security measures such as encryption were put in place. MATE allows us to capture both patient data and MDT decisions in a structured form. MATE records were cross-checked with the official MDM record sheets and, in case of any discrepancies, the MATE record was corrected to reflect the official MDM record. **Comment [vivek6]:** R1: Can the system come up with a ranking of options for example whereby if the fitness of the patient is in question or they refuse a recommendation for any reason it can determine the next best in terms of evidence?

Comment [vivek7]: R1: appropriate ethics and r&d were obtained, but p15 states ethics approval was not required. This needs further explanation - how was patient data obtained/stored/analysed in order to avoid requiring ethics approval?

Formatted: Spanish (Argentina)

²Acosta, D. et al., 2010. Challenges in Delivering Decision Support Systems: The MATE Experience. In *Knowledge Representation for Health-Care. Data, Processes and Guidelines*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, pp. 124-140. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-11808-1_11.

One of the key distinctive features of MATE compared to a traditional electronic health record is the clinical decision support (CDS) element. MATE is able to evaluate patient data and to *actively* offer guideline-based recommendations in real time which are specific for each individual patient. We used MATE to compare *the actual MDT decisions* to that of *guideline recommendations*.

The discordant cases (where MATE recommendations differed from those of MDT decisions) were further investigated by a panel who reviewed the patient's clinical notes. _MATE also automatically flags patients who meet eligibility criteria for ongoing clinical trials.

Structured feedback

The MATE development team was invited to conduct a workshop at the England Cancer Networks' Development Programme conference in March 2010, The conference was attended by key members from all cancer networks, who are instrumental in governing and improving MDT conduct in their respective cancer networks. MATE was demonstrated in the workshop and a questionnaire survey was conducted at the end of the presentation and discussion session.

Results

Evaluation phase results

A total of 1,295 breast cases were recorded on MATE between April 2008 and July 2009 (each time a patient was discussed in the MDT meeting was counted as a separate encounter). The case mix included cancers and benign pathologies. Table 2 shows the overall distribution of cases recorded on the MATE system during the study system. Metastatic, recurrent and non epithelial malignancies were excluded from the guideline concordance analysis as the guidelines and evidence-base for those subsets were not initially coded in MATE. In 239 cases of recurrent, metastatic or non-epithelial malignancies, MATE therefore provided data capture services but no decision support. The remaining 1056 cases were analysed for concordance between management

recommendations made by MATE and the actual MDT decisions and the level of concordance was encouragingly high (93.2 %; N = 984). When the <u>6.8 %</u> discordant cases were further analysed it was found that <u>in</u> 3.2% <u>cases</u>. of the MDT deviant decisions were corrected by the treating clinician in the results clinic.

MATE also identified 61% more patients who were eligible for the recruitment into clinical trials than the MDT alone. To note that MATE only screens the patients as possibly eligible for the trials, based on the main eligibility criteria. All the information needed before recruiting the patient is often not available to the MDT. Certain tests specific for the trial (e.g. 2D Echo for ejection fraction) are done after MDT discussion and the results are not available at the MDM.

Structured Feedback

The MATE workshop at the Cancer Networks' Development Programme conference was attended by 54 people, of whom 48 completed the questionnaire. Most respondents (95.8%) agreed that clinical decision support has a useful role in cancer MDMs. The majority of respondents found the services provided by MATE useful for the breast MDM (93.47) and potentially for other types of cancer MDMs (92.6%). <u>The roles</u> of respondents were categorised as follows

Clinicians (Doctors & Nurses) = 13

Patients/survivors = 5

Service improvement managers = 18

Informaticians = 7

Others = 5

Respondents were asked to select from a choice of 5 categories (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree) for five structured questions regarding usefulness of the system. They were also asked open ended questions to find any perceived barriers and their general comments. For the analysis we combined "strongly agree or agree" responses as "agree" category and "neutral, disagree or strongly disagree" responses as disagree category. The "neutral" category was included in disagree to ensure a conservative interpretation.

Comment [vivek8]: is it 3.2% of the 7% of discordant cases or 3.2% of decisions? this is not clear. Also what does it mean that 'decisions were 'corrected' by the treating clinician in the results clinic'. Does this mean that the MDT recommendation was not protocol led and was 'corrected' to be so in the clinic (i.e. MATE was 'right')?

Comment [vivek9]: R1: was eligibility for trial recruitment checked in terms of the factors that are not considered by MATE (fitness, comoribidities etc)? If not then this figure could be an inflation of the percentage over and above the team recommendations for trials.

R2: Assuming that MATE was used in the context of the current MDM,– this would mean that the effect of change should perhaps read "MATE identified 61% more patients who were eligible for recruitment into clinical trials than the MDT alone

Comment [vivek10]: R1: I do not understand: 'the need for practical knowledge validation and maitenance mechanisms' - suggest this may need rewording/explaining R2:

The weakest area of the paper is the description and reporting of the data from the questionnaire survey where there is little description of methodology and must be open to bias. Providing data to one significant figure from 48 questionnaires without any indication about the content or methods of the questionnaire is dubious

There was very high consensus over the usefulness of clinical decision support in general, and MATE in particular, for cancer MDT meetings. Most respondents (95.8%) agreed that clinical decision support has a useful role in cancer MDMs. The majority of respondents found the services provided by MATE useful for the breast MDM (93.47) and potentially for other types of cancer MDMs (92.6%). The clinical decision support component and ability to automatically screen patients for ongoing clinical trials were seen as the two most valuable capabilities of MATE by the majority of respondents (84.5% and 81.2% of respondents respectively). Other capabilities of MATE , identified as valuable were patient data capture (70% of respondents), clinical audit services (67%), peer review support (58%) and education/training (45%). The majority of respondents (73.8%) were favourable to recommending MATE, if it were made available in their network.

The survey also identified important barriers to large-scale deployment of MATE. The main perceived obstacle to adoption was double data entry (50%) in situations where existing data capture systems are in place and it was suggested that MATE should be able to interface with existing data capture systems. Other barriers identified were costs and resources, clinical buy-in, scalability and the need for practical knowledge validation and scalable knowledge maintenance mechanisms.

Strategies for change and effects

The encouraging performance of MATE in this initial phase established the confidence of the breast team at RFH, and MATE was subsequently introduced as the standard breast MDM management tool. Introducing a new technology into as complex a setting as the cancer MDM was a challenging task and our implementation strategy was guided by the experiences of others reported in the literature.[20, 21]

The principles of the implementation strategy for MATE are summarised as follows.

• *Building around the existing clinical work-flow:* In order to ensure the clinical acceptability of MATE, a key design objective was to fit the system around the existing work-flow of the breast MDM and not the other way round.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

- *Anticipating clinical needs and pragmatic constraints:* As well as obvious requirements such as access to detailed patient data, a number of other useful services were identified during the modelling phase (e.g. quick access to past MDT decisions).
- Active involvement of users throughout audit, feedback and implementation: As
 described in previous sections active participation of the users in the design
 process was encouraged through audit and feedback, and wider inputs from
 workshops and surveys.

Challenges and Next steps

We would emphasize that the role of MATE or any similar IT system is purely supportive and the MDT meeting continues to be led by the clinical team. Advanced IT systems can only complement an effective and functional multidisciplinary team,[22] and cannot compensate for inherent weaknesses in team composition, organisation or operation. The preliminary audit results and the qualitative assessment data reported in this study, however encouraging, are at this point indicative of the potential benefits but not yet conclusive. They should be treated with caution until further rigorous evaluations confirm the effectiveness and generalisability of MATE or similar services.

Generalisability:

It is has been reported that clinical decision support systems are often at their best when the developing team is involved in the trial of the system. One review reported for example that the success rate for clinical decision support systems dropped from 74% to 28% when the systems were tested by independent teams.[23] The team involved in the development of MATE was also involved in testing and the deployment of the system so replication of our results on other sites is a key objective. Demonstrating that MATE can confer significant benefits for other cancer MDTs is also a high priority. MATE has attracted the attention of the UK Department of Health's National Cancer Action Team and deployment of the system in other NHS trusts is being explored.

Effectiveness trials:

Definitive evidence of the value of complex (multifaceted) interventions such as MATE requires a multi-centre trial in which a cluster randomised design is likely to be the preferred methodology.[24] The trial should look into all important impacts of the intervention including quantitative measures of cost, patient outcomes and process measures as well as qualitative measures.

Patient empowerment:

Patient involvement in decisions about their treatment is widely considered to be crucial to improving outcomes and many cancer patients wish to play a more active role in their care. The current structure of the cancer MDT meeting makes patient participation very difficult to achieve. [25] We are therefore exploring ways in which MATE could facilitate patient engagement, by extending access to certain of its functions by the patients, in a variety of settings, including consultations in results clinic and from home, allowing the patients to review their clinical history, and the MDT recommendations and explanations for the recommendations.

I

Ethics approval

Ethics approval was not required for the submitted work however for the subsequent randomised controlled trial, which is ongoing, ethics approval was taken from the Moorfields & Whittington Research Ethics Committee.

Competing interest

All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form and declare that (1) None of the authors have support from any company for the submitted work; (2) All authors have no relationships with any company that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years; (3) their spouses, partners, or children have no financial relationships that may be relevant to the submitted work; and (4) [VP, DA, JF, MK] have following specified non-financial interests that may be relevant to the submitted work.

UCL(B): a subsidiary of University College London and ISIS innovation: a subsidiary of the University of Oxford, are actively looking to commercialise aspects of this project in the form of a spin-out company.

Funding

The development and subsequent trial of MATE decision support system was funded by Cancer Research UK extramural grant to Prof John Fox and the Royal Free Charity.

Acknowledgement:

We acknowledge the Cancer Research UK for funding the development and the trial of the system and we acknowledge all members of the breast multidisciplinary team at Royal Free for their support.

Contributorship statement:

All authors have made substantial contributions as follow VP, JF and MK: conception and design; VP, DA, TD, AJ and MK: Conducting the pilot study VP and DA: developing the system, acquisition of data, VP and MK: analysis and interpretation of data; VP, DA, JF, MK: drafting the article; All authors: revising it critically for important intellectual content; All authors: final approval of the version to be published.
References

1. Westert GP, Faber M. Commentary: the Dutch approach to unwarranted medical	
practice variation. BMJ. 2011;342:d1429.	
2. Wishart GC, Greenberg DC, Chou P, et al. Treatment and survival in breast	
cancer in the Eastern Region of England. Ann Oncol. 2010 Feb;21(2):291-6.	
3. Taylor C, Munro AJ, Glynne-Jones R, et al. Multidisciplinary team working in	
cancer: what is the evidence? BMJ. 2010;340:c951.	
4. Lamb BW, Brown KF, Nagpal K, et al. Quality of care management decisions by	
multidisciplinary cancer teams: a systematic review. Ann Surg Oncol 2011;18(8):2116-	
25.	
5. Mazzaferro V, Majno P. Principles for the best multidisciplinary meetings. Lancet	
Oncol. Apr;12(4):323-5.	
6. Lamb BW, Green JS, Vincent C, et al. Decision making in surgical oncology.	
Surg Oncol. 2011 Sep;20(3):163-8.	
7. National Cancer Peer Review Programme Report 2009/2010 An overview of the	
findings from the 2009/2010 National Cancer Peer Review of Cancer Services in England	
8. Patkar V, Acosta D, Davidson T, et al. Cancer Multidisciplinary Team Meetings:	
Evidence, Challenges, and the Role of Clinical Decision Support Technology.	
International Journal of Breast Cancer. 2011.	
9. Rosenbloom ST, Denny JC, Xu H, et al. Data from clinical notes: a perspective on	
the tension between structure and flexible documentation. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2011	
<u>Mar 1;18(2):181-6.</u>	
10. Webb SB, Jr., Bracken MB, Wagner FC, Jr. Retrospective versus prospective	
audit: a trial of two methods. Hosp Med Staff. 1978 Jan;7(1):13-7.	
11. Scott IA, Harper CM. Guideline-discordant care in acute myocardial infarction:	
predictors and outcomes. Med J Aust. 2002 Jul 1;177(1):26-31.	
12. Peterson ED, Roe MT, Mulgund J, et al. Association between hospital process	
performance and outcomes among patients with acute coronary syndromes. JAMA. 2006	
<u>Apr 26;295(16):1912-20.</u>	
13. Bahtsevani C, Uden G, Willman A. Outcomes of evidence-based clinical practice	
guidelines: a systematic review. Int J Technol Assess Health Care. 2004 Fall;20(4):427-	
<u>33.</u>	
14. Lara PN, Jr., Higdon R, Lim N, et al. Prospective evaluation of cancer clinical	
trial accrual patterns: identifying potential barriers to enrollment. J Clin Oncol. 2001 Mar	
<u>15;19(6):1728-33.</u>	
15. Bouvier AM, Bauvin E, Danzon A, et al. Place of multidisciplinary consulting	
meetings and clinical trials in the management of colorectal cancer in France in 2000.	
Gastroenterol Clin Biol. 2007 Mar;31(3):286-91.	
<u>16.</u> Schreiber G, Akkermans H, Anjewierden A, et al. Knowledge Engineering and	
Management: The CommonKADS Methodology.: The MIT Press; 1999.	
<u>17.</u> <u>Golbeck, J., Fragoso, G., Hartel, F., et al The national cancer institutes thesaurus</u>	Formatted: Spanish (Argentin
and ontology. Web Semantics: Science, Services and Agents on the World Wide	
<u>Web 1(1), $75-80(2003)$</u>	

1
2
2
3
4
5
6
7
6
8
9
10
11
10
12
13
14
15
16
17
17
18
19
20
21
20
22
23
24
25
26
20
27
28
29
30
24
31
32
33
34
35
20
36
37
38
39
10
40
41
42
43
44
17
45
46
47
48
⊿0
+3
50
51
52
53
50
54
55
56
57
58
E0
59
60

18. Sutton DR, Fox J. The syntax and semantics of the PROforma guideline modeling
language. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2003 Sep-Oct; 10(5):433-43.
MATE Experience. In Knowledge Representation for Health-Care. Data, Processes and Guidelines. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, pp. 124-
<u>140. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-11808-1_11.</u>
20. Grimshaw JM, Eccles MP, Walker AE, et al. Changing physicians' behavior: what works and thoughts on getting more things to work. J Contin Educ Health Prof. 2002
21. Bates DW, Kuperman GJ, Wang S, et al. Ten commandments for effective
clinical decision support: making the practice of evidence-based medicine a reality. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2003 Nov-Dec;10(6):523-30.
 22. Lemieux-Charles L MW. What do we know about health care team effectiveness? A review of the literature. Medical Care Research and Review. 2006;63:263-300. 23. Garg AX, Adhikari NK, McDonald H, et al. Effects of computerized clinical
decision support systems on practitioner performance and patient outcomes: a systematic review, JAMA, 2005 Mar 9:293(10):1223-38.
24. Campbell NC, Murray E, Darbyshire J, et al. Designing and evaluating complex interventions to improve health care. BMJ. 2007 Mar 3;334(7591):455-9.
25. Choy ET, Chiu A, Butow P, et al. A pilot study to evaluate the impact of
treatment plan. Breast. 2007 Apr;16(2):178-89.
1. Westert GP, Faber M. Commentary: the Dutch approach to unwarranted medical
practice variation. BMJ. 2011;342:d1429.
2. Wishart GC, Greenberg DC, Chou P, et al. Treatment and survival in breast
eancer in the Eastern Region of England. Ann Oncol. 2010 Feb;21(2):291-6.
3. Taylor C, Munro AJ, Glynne Jones R, et al. Multidisciplinary team working in
cancer: what is the evidence? BMJ. 2010;340:c951.
4. Mazzareno v, Majno P. Principles for the best mutual sciplinary meetings. Lancet Oncol. Apr;12(4):323-5.
- Lamb B, Green JS, Vincent C, et al. Decision making in surgical oncology. Surg Oncol. 2011 Sep:20(3):163-8.
6. Patkar V, Acosta D, Davidson T, et al. Cancer Multidisciplinary Team Meetings:
Evidence, Challenges, and the Role of Clinical Decision Support Technology.
International Journal of Breast Cancer. 2011.
7. Rosenbloom ST, Denny JC, Xu H, et al. Data from clinical notes: a perspective on
the tension between structure and flexible documentation. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2011
8 Webb SB_Ir_Bracken MB_Wagner FC_Ir_Retrospective versus prospective
audit: a trial of two methods. Hosp Med Staff. 1978 Jan;7(1):13-7.
10. Peterson ED, Roe MT, Mulgund J, et al. Association between hospital process
performance and outcomes among patients with acute coronary syndromes. JAMA. 2006 Apr 26;295(16):1912-20.

3
4
4
5
6
7
, 0
8
9
10
11
10
12
13
14
15
16
10
17
18
19
20
24
21
22
23
24
25
20
26
27
28
29
23
30
31
32
33
24
34
35
36
37
38
30
39
40
41
42
12
43
44
45
46
47
71 40
4ð
49
50
51
50
52
53
54
55
56
50
5/
58
59
60

11. Bahtsevani C, Uden G, Willman A. Outcomes of evidence based clinical practice guidelines: a systematic review. Int J Technol Assess Health Care. 2004 Fall;20(4):427-33.

12. Lara PN, Jr., Higdon R, Lim N, et al. Prospective evaluation of cancer clinical trial accrual patterns: identifying potential barriers to enrollment. J Clin Oncol. 2001 Mar 15;19(6):1728-33.

13. Bouvier AM, Bauvin E, Danzon A, et al. Place of multidisciplinary consulting meetings and clinical trials in the management of colorectal cancer in France in 2000. Gastroenterol Clin Biol. 2007 Mar;31(3):286 91.

14. Schreiber G, Akkermans H, Anjewierden A, et al. Knowledge Engineering and Management: The CommonKADS Methodology.: The MIT Press; 1999.

15. Sutton DR, Fox J. The syntax and semantics of the PROforma guideline modeling language. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2003 Sep Oct;10(5):433-43.

16. Grimshaw JM, Eccles MP, Walker AE, et al. Changing physicians' behavior: what works and thoughts on getting more things to work. J Contin Educ Health Prof. 2002 Fall;22(4):237-43.

17. Bates DW, Kuperman GJ, Wang S, et al. Ten commandments for effective clinical decision support: making the practice of evidence based medicine a reality. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2003 Nov Dec;10(6):523-30.

18. Lemieux Charles L MW. What do we know about health care team effectiveness? A review of the literature. Medical Care Research and Review. 2006;63:263-300.

19. Garg AX, Adhikari NK, McDonald H, et al. Effects of computerized clinical decision support systems on practitioner performance and patient outcomes: a systematic review. JAMA. 2005 Mar 9;293(10):1223-38.

20. Campbell NC, Murray E, Darbyshire J, et al. Designing and evaluating complex interventions to improve health care. BMJ. 2007 Mar 3;334(7591):455-9.

21. Choy ET, Chiu A, Butow P, et al. A pilot study to evaluate the impact of involving breast cancer patients in the multidisciplinary discussion of their disease and treatment plan. Breast. 2007 Apr;16(2):178-89.

Table 1. Pragmatic challenges for cancer MDT meetings

1. Ensuring and documenting adherence with standards (e.g. evidence-based guidelines)

- 2. Identifying patients who are eligible for recruitment into clinical trials
- 3. Ensuring the consistent collection of crucial data such as disease staging and outcomes
- 4. Establishing robust mechanisms for prospective assessment of MDT performance
- 5. Ensuring MDT recommendations are followed in practice
- 6. Achieving the right balance of educational and care delivery objectives of this forum
- 7. Establishing reliable interfaces with primary care to ensure continuity of care



Figure 1. MATE in use at Royal Free breast MDT meeting.

							-				
& MDM Data	MDC Earonama00 Curra	meno 60 vecem ald FEM	AL E		Delet			No			
2009-07-24	Invostigations Decisions	Drogoostication Adminis	stration		PIINt	odve	Tree	ment			
Patient Type] Investigations Decisions	Progrostication warning	suddon				End	crino			
Core Bionsy	MRS. Forename00 Sun	name00, 69 years old, FEM	ALE.		1 \		Ello	crine			
Patient	Presenting Symptoms	Lump		-	1/-	-		FEC			
Sumame00, F.	Relevant History	rt neobrectomy. Hypothy	rold. HTN.	N		1.					
Sumame01, F. Sumame02, F.		Right Breast	Left Breast	1.	1	N/	,	EC + Endo			
Sumame03, F. Sumame04 E	Past Cancer Tx			10	7.5	71					
Surrances, r.	Examination Findings	1st Discrete Lump.			$^{\sim}$	-1	FE	C + Tr			
	Investigations	R5 U5 B5			Title Instituted and	A dealers		EC+			
	Treatment	Dreast Conservation, Wide Local Excision, Sentinel Node Biopsy.		Nipple discha	paget like Retracted ni	ipple	End	0 20	40	60 80	108
	Histopathology	Invasive Ductal Carcinoma, Size 18 mm, Grade High, O Nodes Positive, ER Positive, Her2 3.	e		10084	Argun	entHame	1	For	Symb	xak:Support
	Decision Summary	BEATRICE, Chemotherap	y, Breast radiotherapy.		Caption	Completely ex breast conserv	cised early brea ation) and (Earl	t cancer treated breast carcinon	with breast on a stage I to	conservation. (IIIA) and (not	Breast ca margin i
ision Detail Decision A	nalysis Justification Trial	Analysis				mm/Transecte	d/Involved NOS	ny involvedy drid	(not margin	Dero oneon de	and triat a
liuvant Therapy Adjuva	nt Endocrine Therapy	al Trial Staging Surveilla	ince or Follow-up		Iustification	<u>a</u>		20			
		REACT	TARGIT	None	Scistification	Improves OS,E recurrence is t	ICSS and DFS. F he conserved br	or women who ar east itself. The r	e treated wit isk of recurrer	h WLE, the mo noe in the cons	served br
BETTED CADE	D POSH		REATRICE	C) risks		20%) even in o breast conserv	confirmed axillar	y lymph node-ne	gative wome	n. Thus, whole le acceccing H	breast r
I GLACIER	D POSTIC	TACT 2				breast-conserv	ing therapy hav	shown highly s	tatistically si	gnificant reduc	tions in I
- CACIER	- Poeric	L (AC) 2	E Per Ci			no single trial Early Breast C combined, 15- radiation there 0.83: 95% CL	has demonstrat ancer Trialists' (year breast cano py (absolute di 0.75 0.91; P =	ed a statistically ollaborative Gro er mortality was ference of 5.4%; 002). There was	significant re up's (EBCTCG reduced from 95% CI, 2.1 a similar effe	duction in mo) update, whe i 35.9% to 30. % 8.7%; brea act on all caus	n all relev 5% in wo st cancer se mortali
ht Breast		Left Breast									
ljuvant Radiotherapy A	xillary Surgery	Adjuvant Radiothe	rapy Axillary Surgery		1						
		Breast Treat	ment Breast I		Evidence	Le lu r	las r				
Breast radiotherapy	Chestwall + regiona	RT Therapeutic ex	cision 🔲 Mastectomy	+/- Recon			Studies				
Chestwall radiotherap	y 🔲 No radiotherapy	Wide local exc	ision 🔲 Margin reexcl	sion		NCCN, 2008					
		Primary chemo	therapy 🛛 🔲 No treatment			SIGN 84, 200	S EBCTCG, 2000	EBCTCG, 1995	EBCTCG, 20	02: Malmstrom	n, P., 200
		Primary endocr	ine the			NCI, 2008	Clarke, M., 20	<u>05</u> .			
					Grade	1/A]				
st Lesion Second Lesio	n Third Lesion	First Lesion Secon	nd Lesion Third Lesion					0	(

Figure 2. Composite screen-shot showing the user interface and some of the functionalities of MATE; Upper left: the summary screen for the patient. Upper right: one of the many prognostication tools available, Lower left: decision panel where system recommendations and eligible clinical trials are highlighted in blue. Lower right: the evidential justification for each recommended option.

Pathology	Number
Benign breast disease	413
Operable breast cancer (in situ and invasive)	511
No final diagnosis reached (e.g. C1/C3/C4 on cytology or B1/B3/B4 on core biopsy)	132
at the time of MDT meeting	
Metastatic and or recurrent cancers	198
Other than breast epithelial malignancies	41
Total cases	1295

Table 2. Distribution of breast cases discussed at MDM according to type



Figure 1. MATE in use at Royal Free breast MDT meeting. 454x165mm (300 x 300 DPI)

MDM Date	MRS. Forename00 Surna	me00, 69 years old, FEM.	ALE.		Print	Save		No				41
2009-07-24 🗸	Investigations Decisions	Prognostication Adminis	stration					reatment		_		11
Patient Type						1		ndocrine				11
Core Biopsy 🗸	MRS. Forename00 Sun	name00, 69 years old, FEM	ALE.									1
Patient	Presenting Symptoms	Lump.			~V-	-		FEC				11
Sumame00, F.	Relevant History	rt nephrectomy, Hypothy	roid, HTN.	1		1						31
Sumame02, F.		Right Breast	Left Breast))•	A			FEC + Endo				
Sumame03, F.	Past Cancer Tx				7 6							1
Sumarias 4, 1.	Examination Findings	1st Discrete Lump.			$^{\sim}$	1		-EC + Tr				41
	Investigations	R5 U5 B5			· · ·			FEC +				e II.
	Treatment	Dreast Conservation,		Nipple discha	roe A Paget like	butanty	E	ndo + Tr				41
		Wide Local Excision, Sentinel Node Biopsy.			Retracted ni	pple		0	20 40	60	80	100
	Histopathology	Invasive Ductal							1	_	0.01.0.0	_
		Carcinoma, Size 18 mm,	L	-	10084	Argur	ientivame		For		symbolicsupp	ort
		Positive, ER Positive,										
		Her2 3.			Caption	Completely ev	ricad aarly br	aget concer tr	astad with bre	aet consen	ation (Brage)	t can
	Decision Summary	BEATRICE, Chemotherap	y, Breast radiotherapy.	1	1	breast conserv	ation) and (E	orly breast ca	rcinome stege	I to IIIA) a	nd (not margi	in inve
sion Detail Decision Ana	alysis Justification Trial	Analysis				mm/Transected/In	d/Involved NO	Carry Involved DS)	u) and (not ma	rgin Dets o	leor Less trid	0.1
juvant Therapy Adjuvant	Endocrine Therapy Clinic	al Trial Staging Surveilla	nce or Follow-up		Justification	a						
ALTTO	OPTION	REACT	TARGIT	None None		recurrence is t	he conserved	breast itself.	vno are treated The risk of rec	sumence in t	the most cor he conserved	breas
BETTER CARE	POSH	SUPREMO	BEATRICE			20%) even in breast conserv	confirmed axi ing surgery is	llary lymph no recommende	de-negative w d. Although al	omen. Thus I trials asse	, whole breas ssing the role	t radia
GIACIER		TACT 2	PET CT			breast-consen	ing therapy h	ave shown hi	ghly statistical	lly significar	t reductions	In loca
	-	-	-			Early Breast C	ancer Trialist	Collaborativ	e Group's (EBC	TCG) updat	e, when all re	elevan
						radiation there	year breast c apy (absolute	ancer mortalit difference of	y was reduced 5.4%; 95% CI	from 35.9% , 2.1% 8.79	to 30.5% in 6; breast can	cer de
					1	0.83; 95% CI,	0.75 0.91; P	= .002). Ther	e was a simila	r effect on a	all cause mort	ality.
iuvant Radiotherany	llary Surgary	Adjuster Breast	rany Avillary Sumary		•							
Breast Treatment	Breast Imaging	Breast Treat	ment Breas	Imaging	C 11	0.						_
Breast radiotherapy	Chestwall + regiona	RT Therapeutic ex	cicion 🔲 Mastectorr		Evidence	Guideline	Studies					
Chestwall radiotherapy	No radiotherapy	Wide local exc	ision 🔲 Margin ree			CCO , 2005						
	-	Primary chemo	therapy 🔲 No treatm	ent		NCCN, 2008						
		Primary endocr	ine the			SIGN 84, 200	5 EBCTCG, 2	200; EBCTCG,	1995; EBCTCC	5, 2002; Ma	mstrom, P., 2	1003.
						10CL 2008	Clarke, M.,	2005.				_
					Grade	1/A						
st Lesion Second Lesion	Third Lesion	First Lesion Secon	d Lesion Third Lesion					[01			

Figure 2. Composite screen-shot showing the user interface and some of the functionalities of MATE; Upper left: the summary screen for the patient. Upper right: one of the many prognostication tools available, Lower left: decision panel where system recommendations and eligible clinical trials are highlighted in blue. Lower right: the evidential justification for each recommended option.



Using computerised decision support to improve compliance of cancer multidisciplinary meetings with evidence-based guidance

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2011-000439.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Apr-2012
Complete List of Authors:	Patkar, Vivek; University College London, ; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit Acosta, Dionisio; University College London, Davidson, Tim; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit Jones, Alison; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit Fox, John; Oxford University, Department of Engineering Science Keshtgar, Mohammed; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit; University College London,
Primary Subject Heading :	Health informatics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Oncology, Evidence-based practice, Health services research, Surgery
Keywords:	Breast tumours < ONCOLOGY, ONCOLOGY, HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Clinical governance < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts 3/2



Figure 1. MATE in use at Royal Free breast MDT meeting. 454x165mm (300 x 300 DPI)

÷									
MDM Date N	IRS. Forename00 Surna	me00, 69 years old, FEM.	ALE.		Print	Save	No		
2009-07-24	Investigations Decisions	Prognostication Admini	stration						
Patient Type				5	/ \		Endocrine		
Core Biopsy	MRS. Forename00 Surr	name00, 69 years old, FEM	ALE.		., `				
Patent Sumame00, F.	Presenting Symptoms	Lump.		· ·		-	FEC		
Surname01, F.	Relevant History	rt nephrectomy, Hypothy	roid, HTN.	2	15	.1	FEC +		
Sumame02, F. Sumame03, F		Right Breast	Left Breast	\\ • @	-/-		Endo		
Sumame04, F.	Past Cancer Tx	<u>.</u>			1	\mathcal{I}	FEC + Tr		
	Examination Findings	1st Discrete Lump.			1		12011		
	Investigations	R5 U5 B5		🔒 discrete lump	12 localised not	dularity	FEC +		
	Treatment	Dreast Conservation, Wide Local Excision, Sentinel Node Biopsy.	b	Nipple dischar	ge 🕚 Paget like Retracted nij	pple	0	20 40	60 80 100
	Histopathology	Invasive Ductal Carcinoma, Size 18 mm, Grade High, 0 Nodes Positive, ER Positive, Her2 3.			10084	Argum	entName	For	SymbolicSupport
	Decision Summary	BEATRICE, Chemotherap	y, Breast radiotherapy.	-	Caption	Completely exc breast conserve	ised early breast cance ation) and (Early breast	r treated with breast c carcinoma stage I to :	onservation. (Breast cano IIA) and (not margin inve
sion Detail Decision Anal	vsis Justification Trial	Analysis				Transected/Inv mm/Transected	olved NOS/Focally invol //Involved NOS)	lved) and (not margin (CIS oneof Less than 1
iuvant Therapy Adjuvant	Endocrine Therapy Clinic	al Trial Station Streeilla	roce or Follow-up		Tradification	<u>a</u>			
		E PEACT	ET TARGET	None	Justification	Improves OS,B/ recurrence is th	CSS and DFS. For wome to conserved breast itse	en who are treated with elf. The risk of recurren	i WLE, the most common ce in the conserved breas
RETTED CADE			REATRICE	- HANNE		20%) even in o	onfirmed axillary lymph	node-negative women	. Thus, whole breast radi
						breast-conservi	ng therapy have shown	highly statistically sig	nificant reductions in loci
CA MULTIPLE	E POPTIC	L TACT 2	Li per cr			Early Breast Ca	nas demonstrated a ste incer Trialists' Collabora	atistically significant re ative Group's (EBCTCG)	update, when all relevan
						combined, 15-y	ear breast cancer mort	ality was reduced from	35.9% to 30.5% in wome
					1	0.83; 95% CI, 0	0.75 0.91; P = .002). T	here was a similar effe	ct on all cause mortality.
nt Breast		Left Breast							
Breast Treatment	Breast Imaging	Adjuvant Radiothe Breast Treat	ment Breast	Imaging		0.			
Durant an Eath many			sisian 🗖 Maskasham	LL (Daesa	Evidence	Guideline	Studies		
Chestwall radiotherapy	No radiotherany	Wide local evo	ision Maroin raav			CCO , 2005			
chester rearoundary		Doimany chomo	thoranu No troatmo	et.		NCCN, 2008			
		Drimany chemo	ing the			SIGN 84, 2005	EBCTCG, 2000; EBCTC	CG, 1995; EBCTCG, 200	2; Malmstrom, P., 2003.
		Primary endoor	me me			NCI, 2008	Clarke, M., 2005.		
					Grade	1/A			
t Lesion Second Lesion	Third Lesion	First Lesion Secon	nd Lesion Third Lesion					OK	

Figure 2. Composite screen-shot showing the user interface and some of the functionalities of MATE; Upper left: the summary screen for the patient. Upper right: one of the many prognostication tools available, Lower left: decision panel where system recommendations and eligible clinical trials are highlighted in blue. Lower right: the evidential justification for each recommended option.

2
1
4 5
6
7
0
0
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
1/
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
16
40 17
41 10
-10 10
49 50
50
01 50
ວ∠ ⊑ວ
ວວ = 4
54 55
55
56
5/
58
59
60

Using computerised decision support to improve <u>compliance of cancer</u> multidisciplinary meetings <u>with evidence-based guidance</u>

Vivek Patkar^{1,2}, Dionisio Acosta², Tim Davidson¹, Alison Jones¹, John Fox³, Mohammed Keshtgar^{1,2}

¹ The Breast Unit, Department of Surgery, Royal Free Hospital
 ² University College London
 ³ Department of Engineering Science, Oxford University

Author addresses

Vivek Pa	tkar
	Senior Research Fellow
	Department of Oncology
	Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust.
	Pond street
	London
	NW3 2QG
Dionisio	Acosta
	Senior Research Associate
	Centre for Health Informatics & Multiprofessional Education (CHIME)
	University College London
	4th Floor Holborn Union Building
	Highgate Hill
	London N19 5LW
Tim Dav	dson
	Consultant breast surgeon
	The Breast unit
	Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust.
	Pond street
	London
	NW3 2QG
Alison Jo	nes
	Consultant Medical Oncologist
	Department of Oncology
	Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust.
	Pond street
	London
	NW3 2QG
John Fox	
	Professor
	Department of Engineering Science, Oxford University.
	Parks road
Mahamm	UX1 3FJ
Monamin	ad Kesnigai (corresponding autor)
	The Preset Unit
	The Bleast Unit
	University College London
	Dand stract
	London
	NW3 20G
email [.] m	keshtaar@uel.ac.uk
cinan. III.	Kronten (guri.ur. uk

Comment [v1]: Reviewer: It would be helpful if the research question/s were explicitly stated. The title is broad 'improving meetings' and conduct of meetings is mentioned as an aim but this is not measured - the focus seems to be on the concordence of MATE recommendations with MDT recommendations and recruitment into trials, with some estimate of acceptability of it but taken from a workshop not the actual users. Suggest clarifying the research questions would add structure to the paper. Title and article focus should possibly be revised in line with this

Article summary

Article focus:

12345678

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26 27

28

29

-_How to improve the conduct of a cancer MDT and standardize decision-making in accordance with best evidence

- Development and implementation of a novel clinical decision support (CDS) platform

for <u>breast</u> cancer MDT

- Pilot This study evaluates a) the concordance between the CDS suggestions and MDT _ recommendations; and b) the identification rate of potentially eligible patients for recruiting into the ongoing research trials, by the MDT and the CDS. A separate questionnaire survey was conducted at the national workshop at the Cancer Networks' Development Programme to get an estimate of acceptability of such MDT decision support systems by the cancer networks.evaluation results

Key messages:

- An advanced CDS platform could significantly improve the conduct of cancer MDT meetings.

- Further robust evaluations are necessary.

Strengths and limitations:

- We share our valuable experience of developing an advanced decision support system and implementing it in a complex clinical environment of cancer MDT which is was subsequently adopted as a breast MDT meetings management tool.

-The results reported here, however encouraging, are at this point indicative of the potential benefits but not yet conclusive. They should be treated with caution until further rigorous evaluations confirm the effectiveness and generalisability of the CDS system.

Data sharing statement:

There is no additional data available.

Research checklist:

Appropriate research checklist could not be found.

Comment [v2]: Reviewer t would be helpful if the research question/s were explicitly stated. The title is broad 'improving meetings' and conduct of meetings is mentioned as an aim but this is not measured - the focus seems to be on the concordance of MATE recommendations with MDT recommendations and recruitment into trials, with some estimate of acceptability of it but taken from a workshop not the actual users. Suggest clarifying the research questions would add structure to the paper. Title and article focus should possibly be revised in line with this.

Abstract:

Objectives: The cancer multidisciplinary team (MDT) meeting is regarded as the best platform to reduce unwarranted variation in cancer care through evidence-compliant management. However, MDT meetings are often overburdened with many different agendas, and hence struggle to achieve their full potential. We developed an interactive clinical decision support system called MATE (Multidisciplinary meeting Assistant and Treatment sElector), to facilitate explicit, evidence-based decision making in the breast MDT meetings and to improve the overall conduct of the meeting.

Design: Audit study and a questionnaire survey.

Setting: Breast multidisciplinary unit in a large secondary care teaching hospital.

Participants: The participants included all members of the breast MDT at the Royal Free Hospital, London. The emphasis was on active user participation through audit, feedback and response, acknowledging the clinical needs and practical constraints of the MDT and fitting the system around the team's work-flow rather than the other way around.

Outcome measures: The <u>measures included measures included</u> evidence compliant care; measured by adherence to clinical practice guidelines (CPGs) and promoting research; measured by the patient identification rate for ongoing clinical trials.

Results: MATE identified 61% more patients who were <u>potentially</u> eligible for recruitment into clinical trials than the MDT and MATE recommendations demonstrated better concordance with CPG than MDT recommendations (97% of MATE vs 93.2 % of MDT; N = 984). MATE is in routine use in breast MDT meetings at <u>the</u> Royal Free hospital, London and wider evaluations are being <u>exploredconsidered</u>.

Conclusions: Sophisticated decision support systems can enhance the conduct of MDT meetings in a way that is acceptable to and valued by the clinical team. Further rigorous evaluations are required to examine cost-effectiveness and measure the impact on patient outcomes. The decision support technology used in MATE is generic and if found useful can be applied across the medicine.

Problem statement

Unwarranted practice variation across different medical domains has unfortunately become a pervasive finding in health service research and breast cancer care is no exception.[1] A recently published study reported significant differences in breast cancer survival across hospitals in the same geographical region in England.[2] The reasons for practice variation are multifactorial and standardisation of care has been attempted by the introduction of Regional Cancer Networks in England and the adoption of the Multi Disciplinary Team (MDT) model to promote maximal adoption of evidence-based practice. The MDT model is increasingly being adopted in other non-cancer medical domains such as stroke, cardiovascular diseases and diabetes.

Many benefits of MDTs have been claimed, but few have been backed by strong evidence.[3,4] However, despite a significant lack of prospective evidence, MDTs are well accepted in clinical practice; they are regarded as a major advance in management of cancer patients and their use appears to be increasing.[5] As many health care systems have already committed to and invested in the MDT model, further reductions in unwarranted variation are likely to be best achieved by improving their conduct and standardizing their decision making processes.[6] Data collected by the UK national cancer peer review programme from over 1000 teams across six cancer types in England indicates that there is significant room for improvement in the conduct of MDT meetings and shows considerable variability in the performance of MDTs.[7] A recent national survey of more than 2000 members of cancer multidisciplinary teams, demonstrated agreement on the range of criteria necessary for effective MDT working.[3] A review of the literature by the authors identified many pragmatic challenges and shortcomings in the current conduct of cancer MDT meetings summarised in Table 1.[8]

Context

The Royal Free Hospital NHS Trust (RFH) serves a population of 2.6 million within the North London Cancer Network (NLCN) catchment area. The number of new patients (both benign and cancer) seen as outpatients by the breast unit in 2009-10 was 2,944.

The Breast Cancer Multidisciplinary team at RFH was established in 2005, in line with the recommendations of the NHS Cancer Plan. The MDT uses a set of NLCN-approved clinical guidelines and a standardized minimum data set.

MDT meetings (MDM) are held every week in a conventional conference format. The core members of a breast MDT include breast surgeons, radiologists, pathologists, medical and clinical oncologists, plastic surgeons and breast <u>care nursesclinical nurse</u> <u>specilaists</u>. A typical breast MDM discusses an average of 30 to 40 patients at various stages in their care pathways every week to decide further courses of action<u>in their</u> <u>management</u>.

Prior to the introduction of our computer-based service into the MDT meetings, an entirely paper based record system was used to provide case summaries and to document the MDT's discussion and decisions. These records contained free (unstructured) text rather than the coded and structured data. The tradeoffs between structured (computer interpretable) and unstructured (free text clinical notes, scanned documents, pdfs) EHRs are well known.[9] <u>Recording MDT discussions</u> records-in an unstructured form such as free text clinical notes, scanned documents, pdfs etc, hinders the process of accurate measurement of MDT performance as computer based data analysis and auditing tools cannot be used on unstructured data.

There are many commercially available information and communication systems such as EHR systems which can assist in the preparation, presentation and documentation of cases at the MDT meetings such as EHR systems. However the objectives of our MDT service improvement exercise was to go beyond improvements in data management by providing active support for evidence-based decision making, improving recruitment into clinical trials and supporting prospective audit.[10]

Measures of improvement

Evidence compliant care: Adherence with clinical practice guidelines

With the increasing recognition of shortcomings in healthcare systems, there is a significant cultural and professional shift towards using evidence-based guidance. Evidence-based standards of care, such as published practice guidelines and technology

assessment reports developed by authoritative organisations_a provide an objective standard against which to assess MDT decisions. There is growing evidence that use of evidence-based guidelines can improve patient outcomes,[11-13] and MDT meetings provide the best opportunity to actively promote an *appropriate* and *judicious* use of the guidelines at the point of care.

Promoting research: Identification of patients eligible for ongoing research trials

It is widely accepted that recruiting patients into clinical trials is an effective strategy for ensuring that cancer patients get the best care as well as providing important information about the efficacy of treatments. However, the literature continues to report low rates of accrual to cancer clinical trials[14] and many organisations at national and international levels are investigating strategies for improving accrual rates. Cancer MDT meetings represent offer a major opportunity for identifying patients who are eligible for participation in clinical trials.[15]

Methods

In order to assess the performance of the breast MDT on the above mentioned measures we developed a computerised decision support system, **MATE** (Multidisciplinary meeting Assistant and Treatment sElector), that captures patient data, identifies eligible patients for clinical trials and suggests evidence-based treatment recommendations. MATE also captures MDT decisions and hence can automatically compare them with guideline recommendations.

System development

We followed a systematic, stepwise approach throughout the system development lifecycle. Requirements for MATE were identified through a systematic review of the literature[16] and by working closely with members of the breast MDT at RFH. We adopted the Common_KADS methodology to develop a comprehensive process and knowledge model for breast cancer MDT meetings.[17] A controlled vocabulary from the National Cancer Institute thesaurus [18] was used to facilitate data standardisation. The

Comment [v3]: Riviewer A systematic review is mentioned but no further details given - review of what literature? is this described/published elsewhere?

BMJ Open

evidence sources reviewed included Clinical Practice Guidelines, Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses and reports of Randomised Controlled trials. Along with the guideline recommendations, the eligibility criteria of ongoing clinical trials in breast cancer that were open for the recruitment at our institution were also coded into the system.

PROforma,[19] an established decision modelling language for formalising modelling clinical decisions and care pathways, was used for the formal evidence to formalise decisions and supporting evidence-representation in MATE. The PROforma language and application development software Tallis used in this project were originally developed at Cancer Research UK, Tallis is now being developed at Oxford University. Tallis was used to implement a range of decision support and other services¹ as determined by the requirements development process outlined above, and is used to update recommendations and other components of the PROforma knowledge base when new guidance is published. Tallis is being developed jointly by Oxford University and the Royal Free development team.

System description

MATE functionality can be categorised <u>into-under</u> two broad <u>labelsheadings</u>: 1. Structured data capture, presentation and audit <u>modules-2</u>. Advanced evidence-based decision support <u>module</u>

Data capture: MATE allows users to capture detailed structured clinical data including, demographics, co morbidities, test results, clinical findings, imaging, pathology and treatment related data. The data <u>are</u> entered into the system either before (preparation phase) or during the MDT meetings (presentation phase). In the preparation phase the data <u>are</u> entered by a clinician, who is responsible for the preparation of the meeting. <u>DThe data entry is flexible, quick and secure and it was found to save-reduce preparation time. If some of the test results such as pathology reports are not available before the MDT meeting, they <u>can</u> easily be entered in MATE during the meeting by a clinician in</u>

http://mate.cossac.org/

charge, without delaying the proceedings. MATE also provides <u>patient summaries</u> automatic<u>ally</u> summary generation and prospective audit facilities.

Advanced evidence-based decision support module: is the key component of MATE which sets it apart from cancer tracking systems, EHR systems and the first generation decision support such as rule based alert or and reminder systems. MATE actively evaluates diagnostic markers histo-pathological data and other patient related factors such as co-morbidities to generate patient specific recommendations for the clinical management. An advanced The PROforma Tallis decision support technology enables MATE to rank the recommended options: for example - if the fitness of the patient is in question due to co-morbidity, MATE can recommend the next best option in terms of with supporting evidence. In principle, patient preferences could can also be factored in-to the MATE decision model process and we are actively exploring the ways of supporting patient preferences as discussed in the last section under headingways of doing this in line with widely discussed needs for greater patient empowerment.

The <u>All clinical</u> recommendations <u>made by MATE</u> are presented to the user in the form of together with a summary of the rationale in the form of arguments, linked to the and supporting evidence, for transparency. <u>The MATE</u> knowledge base consisted of <u>has</u> been developed with reference to a comprehensive set of published national and international clinical practice guidelines, which enables MATE to provide give recommendations even in complex cases that are covered by these guidelines.

MATE also provides quantitative risk estimates based on published models as an adjunct to the <u>clinical</u> recommendations.

The user interface of MATE is illustrated in Fig 2. The detailed description of the knowledge base, technology and architecture is published elsewhere [20].

We used the following processes to understand and analyse the design issues and to feed back clinical experience into the MATE development lifecycle. Evaluation phaseof concordance between MATE and MDT recommendations **Comment [v4]:** Reviewer Clarity about how MATE was evaluated is needed: it is stated it was used prospectively (presumably in-situ?) but who operated it and could the team see the output? or was it used outside of the meeting? If used in situa and team could see output this casts the concordance exercise into doubt as the team would have seen the MATE recommendation. Also, the evaluation of data is not entirely clear: Were MATE recommendations, or were "MATE records amended to be in line with official MDM records" as stated in the evaluation phase section?

MATE was used in the background to prospectively record the proceedings of breast MDT meetings between April 2008 and July 2009 to gather 1,295 cases discussed in the MDMs during this period (each time a patient was discussed in the MDT meeting was counted as a separate encounter). The patient data and the MDT decisions were entered in MATE during the meeting by the first author. MATE recommendations were not shown to the MDT to avoid any confounding effect. After the meeting, the correctness of patient data and MDT recommendations entered in MATE were cross checked with the official paper MDT records by a separate data entry person, and, in case of any discrepancies, the patient data and MDT decisions entered in MATE record data were amended to be in line with the official MDT record. An appropriate aApproval for an audit study was obtained from the Research and Development department of the hospital before starting the study was obtained before starting the study, and data-security measures such as encryption were put in place. MATE allows us to capture both patient data and MDT decisions in a structured form. MATE and these records were crosschecked with the official MDM record sheets and, in case of any discrepancies, the MATE record was corrected to reflect the official MDM record.

One of the key distinctive features of MATE compared to a traditional electronic health record is the clinical decision support (CDS) element. MATE is able to *actively* evaluate patient data and to *actively* offer guideline-based recommendations in real time which are specific for each individual patient. We <u>used MATE to compared MATE</u> recommendations with the actual MDT decisions. to that those of indicated by guideline recommendations.

The discordant cases (where MATE recommendations differed from those of MDT decisions) were further investigated by a panel who reviewed the patient's clinical notes. MATE also automatically flags patients who meet eligibility criteria for ongoing clinical trials.

Structured feedback from members of cancer networks in UK

The MATE development team was invited to conduct a workshop at the England Cancer Networks' Development Programme conference in March 2010. The conference

was attended by key members from all cancer networks, who are instrumental in governing and improving MDT conduct in their respective cancer networks. MATE was demonstrated in <u>the a</u> workshop_and a questionnaire survey was conducted at the end of the presentation and discussion session. <u>The MATE workshop at the Cancer Networks</u> <u>Development Programme conference was attended by 54 people, of whom 48 completed the questionnaire. The roles of respondents were categorised as follows</u>

Clinicians (Doctors & Nurses) = 13

Patients/survivors = 5

Service improvement managers = 18

Informaticians = 7

Others = 5

Respondents were asked to select from a choice of 5 categories (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree) for five structured questions regarding usefulness of the system. They were also asked open ended questions to find any perceived barriers and their general comments.

Results

Evaluation phasephase results

A total of 1,295 breast cases were recorded on MATE between April 2008 and July 2009 (each time a patient was discussed in the MDT meeting was counted as a separate encounter). The case mix of 1,295 breast cases included cancers and benign pathologies. Table 2 shows the overall distribution of cases recorded on the MATE system during the study system. Metastatic, recurrent and non epithelial malignancies were excluded from the guideline concordance analysis as the guidelines and evidence-base for those subsets were not initially coded in MATE. In 239 cases of recurrent, metastatic or non-epithelial malignancies, MATE therefore provided data capture services but no decision support. The remaining 1056 cases were analysed for concordance between management recommendations made by MATE and the actual MDT decisions; and-the level of concordance was encouragingly high (93.2 %; N = 984). When the 6.8 % discordant

Comment [v5]: Also, some methods appear in results - e.g. detail about content of questionnaire belongs in methods rather than results.

cases were further analysed it was found that in 3.2% cases, the MDT deviant decisions which differed from MATE recommendations were corrected by the treating clinician in the results clinic.

MATE also identified 61% more patients who were were potentially eligible for recruitment into clinical trials than the MDT alone. Note that MATE only screens the patients as possibly eligible for the trials, based on the main eligibility criteria. All the information needed before recruiting the patient is often not available to the MDT. Certain tests specific for the trial (e.g. 2D Echo for ejection fraction) are done after MDT discussion and the results are not available at the MDM.

Structured Feedback results

The aim of the structured feed back was to estimate the acceptability of MATE and similar systems to the members of cancer networks, who are instrumental in governing and improving MDT conduct in the UK NHS system. For the analysissimplicity we have combined "strongly agree" or and "agree" responses as into an overall "agree" eategory rating and "neutral", "disagree" or and "strongly disagree" responses as into a an overall "disagree" eategory rating. The "neutral" category was included in "disagree" to ensure a conservative interpretation.

There was <u>a</u> very high consensus <u>over-on</u> the usefulness of clinical decision support in general, and MATE in particular, for cancer MDT meetings. Most respondents (95.8%) agreed that clinical decision support has a useful role in cancer MDMs. The majority of respondents found the services provided by MATE useful for the breast MDM (93.47) and potentially for other types of cancer MDMs (92.6%). The clinical decision support component and ability to automatically screen patients for ongoing clinical trials were seen as the two most valuable capabilities of MATE by the majority of respondents (84.5% and 81.2% of respondents respectively). Other capabilities of MATE, identified as valuable were patient data capture (70% of respondents), clinical audit services (67%), peer review support (58%) and education/training (45%). The majority of respondents (73.8%) were favourable to recommending MATE, if it were made available in their network.

The survey also identified important barriers to large-scale deployment of MATE. The main perceived obstacle to adoption was double data entry (50%) in situations where existing data capture systems are in place and it was suggested that MATE should be able to interface with existing data capture systems. Other barriers identified were costs and resources, clinical buy-in, scalability and the need for scalable-appropriate knowledge maintenance mechanisms that can cope with the large volumes of clinical evidence.

Strategies for change and effects

The encouraging performance of MATE in this initial phase established the confidence of the breast team at RFH, and MATE was subsequently introduced as the standard breast MDM management tool. Introducing a new technology into as complex a setting as the cancer MDM was a challenging task and our implementation strategy was guided by the experiences of others reported in the literature.[21, 22]

The principles of the implementation strategy for MATE are summarised as follows.

- <u>Building Development</u> around the existing clinical work-flow: In order to ensure the clinical acceptability of MATE, a key design objective was to fit the system around the existing work-flow of the breast MDM and not the other way round.
- Anticipating clinical needs and pragmatic constraints: As well as obvious requirements such as access to detailed patient data, a number of other useful services were identified during the modelling phase (e.g. quick access to past MDT decisions).
- Active involvement of users throughout audit, feedback and implementation: As
 described in previous sections active participation of the users in the design
 process was encouraged through audit and feedback, and wider inputs from
 workshops and surveys.

Challenges and Next steps

Comment [v6]: Reviewer- Some jargon needs explaining e.g. 'scalable knowledge maintenance mechanisms' - what does this mean

BMJ Open

We would wish to emphasize that the role of MATE or any similar IT system is purely supportive and the MDT meeting continues to be led by the clinical team. Advanced IT systems can only complement an effective and functional multidisciplinary team,[23] and cannot compensate for inherent weaknesses in team composition, organisation or operation. The preliminary audit results and the qualitative assessment data reported in this study, however encouraging, are at this point indicative of the potential benefits but not yet conclusive. They should be treated with eaution until further rigorous evaluations confirm the effectiveness and generalisability of MATE or similar services.

Generalisability:

It is has been reported that clinical decision support systems are often at their bestproduce better results when the developing team is involved inalso responsible for the trial of the system. One review reported for example that the success rate for clinical decision support systems dropped from 74% to 28% when the systems were tested by independent teams.[24] The team involved in the development of MATE was also involved in testing and the deployment of the system so replication of our results on other sites is a key objective. It was for the same reason that the questionnaire survey from the user was not conducted at this stage and this is planned during the wider implementation phase.

Demonstrating that MATE can confer significant benefits for other cancer MDTs is also a high priority. MATE has attracted the attention of the UK Department of Health's National Cancer Action Team and deployment of the system in other NHS trusts is being explored.

Effectiveness trials:

Definitive evidence of the value of complex (multifaceted) interventions such as MATE requires a multi-centre trial in which a cluster randomised design is likely to be the preferred methodology.[25] The trial should look into all important impacts of the

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

intervention including quantitative measures of cost, patient outcomes and process measures as well as qualitative measures.

Patient empowerment:

Patient involvement in decisions about their treatment is widely considered to be crucial to improving outcomes and many cancer patients wish to play a more active role in their care. The current structure of the cancer MDT meeting makes patient participation very difficult to achieve.[26] We are therefore exploring ways in which MATE could facilitate patient engagement, by extending access to certain of its functions by the patients, in. This could be achieved in a variety of settings, including consultations in results clinic and from the patient's home using the internet, allowing the patients to review their clinical history, and the MDT recommendations and explanations the reasons and justifying evidence for the-those recommendations.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Ethics approval

Ethics approval was not required for the <u>submitted workstudy</u> however for <u>the a</u> <u>subsequent</u> randomised controlled trial, which is ongoing, ethics approval was <u>taken</u> <u>fromgivenobtained byfrom</u> the Moorfields & Whittington Research Ethics Committee.

Competing interest

All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form and declare that (1) None of the authors have support from any company for the submitted work; (2) All authors have no relationships with any company that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years; (3) their spouses, partners, or children have no financial relationships that may be relevant to the submitted work; and (4) [VP, DA, JF, MK] have following specified non-financial interests that may be relevant to the submitted work.

UCL(B) (a subsidiary of University College London) and ISIS innovation (a subsidiary of the University of Oxford) are actively <u>seeking</u> to commercialise aspects of this project <u>through</u> a spin-out company.

Funding

The development and subsequent trial of <u>the MATE</u> decision support system was funded by Cancer Research UK <u>by an extramural programme</u> grant to Professor John Fox_x and <u>a</u> grant to the first author from the Royal Free Charity.

Acknowledgement:

We acknowledge thank the Cancer Research UK for funding the development and the trial of the system and we acknowledge all members of the breast multidisciplinary team at Royal Free for their <u>consistent</u> support.

Contributorship statement:

All authors have made substantial contributions as follow

VP, JF and MK: conception and design;

VP, DA, TD, AJ and MK: Conducting the pilot study

VP and DA: developing the system<u>MATE knowledge base and software</u>; acquisition of data,

VP and MK: analysis and interpretation of data; VP, DA, JF, MK: drafting the article;

All authors: revising <u>it-the manuscript</u> critically for important intellectual content; All authors: <u>have given</u> final approval of the version to be published.

References

1. Westert GP, Faber M. Commentary: the Dutch approach to unwarranted medical practice variation. BMJ. 2011;342:d1429.

2. Wishart GC, Greenberg DC, Chou P, et al. Treatment and survival in breast cancer in the Eastern Region of England. Ann Oncol. 2010 Feb;21(2):291-6.

3. Taylor C, Munro AJ, Glynne-Jones R, et al. Multidisciplinary team working in cancer: what is the evidence? BMJ. 2010;340:c951.

4. Lamb BW, Brown KF, Nagpal K, et al. Quality of care management decisions by multidisciplinary cancer teams: a systematic review. Ann Surg Oncol 2011;18(8):2116-25.

5. Mazzaferro V, Majno P. Principles for the best multidisciplinary meetings. Lancet Oncol. Apr;12(4):323-5.

6. Lamb BW, Green JS, Vincent C, et al. Decision making in surgical oncology. Surg Oncol. 2011 Sep;20(3):163-8.

 National Cancer Peer Review Programme Report 2009/2010 An overview of the findings from the 2009/2010 National Cancer Peer Review of Cancer Services in England
 Patkar V, Acosta D, Davidson T, et al. Cancer Multidisciplinary Team Meetings:

Evidence, Challenges, and the Role of Clinical Decision Support Technology. International Journal of Breast Cancer. 2011.

9. Rosenbloom ST, Denny JC, Xu H, et al. Data from clinical notes: a perspective on the tension between structure and flexible documentation. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2011 Mar 1;18(2):181-6.

10. Webb SB, Jr., Bracken MB, Wagner FC, Jr. Retrospective versus prospective audit: a trial of two methods. Hosp Med Staff. 1978 Jan;7(1):13-7.

11. Scott IA, Harper CM. Guideline-discordant care in acute myocardial infarction: predictors and outcomes. Med J Aust. 2002 Jul 1;177(1):26-31.

12. Peterson ED, Roe MT, Mulgund J, et al. Association between hospital process performance and outcomes among patients with acute coronary syndromes. JAMA. 2006 Apr 26;295(16):1912-20.

13. Bahtsevani C, Uden G, Willman A. Outcomes of evidence-based clinical practice guidelines: a systematic review. Int J Technol Assess Health Care. 2004 Fall;20(4):427-33.

14. Lara PN, Jr., Higdon R, Lim N, et al. Prospective evaluation of cancer clinical trial accrual patterns: identifying potential barriers to enrollment. J Clin Oncol. 2001 Mar 15;19(6):1728-33.

15. Bouvier AM, Bauvin E, Danzon A, et al. Place of multidisciplinary consulting meetings and clinical trials in the management of colorectal cancer in France in 2000. Gastroenterol Clin Biol. 2007 Mar;31(3):286-91.

16. Patkar V, Acosta D, Davidson T, et al. Cancer multidisciplinary team meetings: evidence, challenges, and the role of clinical decision support technology. Int J Breast Cancer.2011:831605

17. Schreiber G, Akkermans H, Anjewierden A, et al. Knowledge Engineering and Management: The CommonKADS Methodology.: The MIT Press; 1999.

18. Golbeck, J., Fragoso, G., Hartel, F., et al.. The national cancer institutes thesaurus and ontology. Web Semantics: Science, Services and Agents on the World Wide Web 1(1), 75–80 (2003)

19. Sutton DR, Fox J. The syntax and semantics of the PROforma guideline modeling language. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2003 Sep-Oct;10(5):433-43.

20. Acosta, D. et al., 2010. Challenges in Delivering Decision Support Systems: The MATE Experience. In Knowledge Representation for Health-Care. Data, Processes and Guidelines. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, pp. 124-140. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-11808-1 11.

21. Grimshaw JM, Eccles MP, Walker AE, et al. Changing physicians' behavior: what works and thoughts on getting more things to work. J Contin Educ Health Prof. 2002 Fall;22(4):237-43.

22. Bates DW, Kuperman GJ, Wang S, et al. Ten commandments for effective clinical decision support: making the practice of evidence-based medicine a reality. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2003 Nov-Dec;10(6):523-30.

23. Lemieux-Charles L MW. What do we know about health care team effectiveness? A review of the literature. Medical Care Research and Review. 2006;63:263-300.

24. Garg AX, Adhikari NK, McDonald H, et al. Effects of computerized clinical decision support systems on practitioner performance and patient outcomes: a systematic review. JAMA. 2005 Mar 9;293(10):1223-38.

25. Campbell NC, Murray E, Darbyshire J, et al. Designing and evaluating complex interventions to improve health care. BMJ. 2007 Mar 3;334(7591):455-9.

26. Choy ET, Chiu A, Butow P, et al. A pilot study to evaluate the impact of involving breast cancer patients in the multidisciplinary discussion of their disease and treatment plan. Breast. 2007 Apr;16(2):178-89.

Table 1. Pragmatic challenges for cancer MDT meetings

1. Ensuring and documenting adherence with standards (e.g. evidence-based guidelines)

- 2. Identifying patients who are eligible for recruitment into clinical trials
- 3. Ensuring the consistent collection of crucial data such as disease staging and outcomes
- 4. Establishing robust mechanisms for prospective assessment of MDT performance
- 5. Ensuring MDT recommendations are followed in practice
- 6. Achieving the right balance of educational and care delivery objectives of this forum
- 7. Establishing reliable interfaces with primary care to ensure continuity of care



Figure 1. MATE in use at Royal Free breast MDT meeting.

6							Г	1	1			
MDM Date	MRS. Forename00 Surna	me00, 69 years old, FEM	ALE.		Print	Save		No Treatment				
2009-07-24	Investigations Decisions	Prognostication Admini	stration									
Patient Type				1				Endocrine				
Core Biopsy 🗸 🗸	MRS. Forename00 Sun	name00, 69 years old, FEM	ALE.		· `							
Patient	Presenting Symptoms	Lump.		· ·	~V~	-		FEC				
Sumameou, F.	Relevant History	rt nephrectomy, Hypothy	, Hypothyrold, HTN.									
Surname02, F.		Right Breast	ht Breast			1		FEC + Endo				
Sumame03, F. Past Cancer Tx			1	10	7 - 6	$\neg I$						
Sumame04, F.	Examination Findings	1et Dierrete Lump		1~	$^{\sim}$	~		FEC + Tr				
	Investigations	R5 US B5		1	/ \	1		FF6 -				
	Treatment	Reast Conservation		eliscrete lump	The localised no	dularity		Endo + Tr				
		Wide Local Excision, Sentinel Node Biopsy.	h] 🍦 Nipple discha	rga Papet like Retracted ni	pple		0	20	40	60	80 10
	Histopathology	Invasive Ductal Carcinoma, Size 18 mm, Grade High, 0 Nodes Positive, ER Positive, Her2 3	2]	10084	Argum	ntName		For			3ymbolic9upport
	Decision Summary	BEATRICE, Chemotherap	y, Breast radiotherapy.	1	Caption	Completely exc breast conserva	ised early b ition) and (i	reast cancer Early breast o	treated wi carcinoma	th breast o stage I to	conservati IIIA) and	on. (Breast o (not margin
sico Detail Decision Ana	alvsis Justification Trial	Analysis				Transected/Invi mm/Transected	/Involved NOS/F	Focally involv IOS)	ed) and (n	ot margin	DCIS oned	f Less than :
iuvant Therapy Adjuvant	t Endocrine Therapy Clinic	cal Trial Staging Surveille	ance or Follow-up		Instification	a						
	OPTION	REACT	TARGIT	None		recurrence is th	e conserved	s. For women i breast itsel	f. The risk	of recurrer	n WLE, th nce in the	conserved br
RETTED CADE	D POSH		BEATRICE			20%) even in o breast conservi	onfirmed ax	illary lymph r	node-nega	tive women	n. Thus, w	hole breast r
						breast-conservi	ng therapy	have shown h	highly stat	istically si	gnificant r	eductions in
ISLACIER	- Poeric	- (AC) 2	- Hereit			no single trial f Early Breast Ca combined, 15-y radiation therap 0.83; 95% CI. (ias demons ncer Trialist ear breast (by (absolute),75 0.91; P	trated a stati s' Collaborat cancer mortal a difference o = .002). The	istically si ive Group' ity was re of 5.4%; 91 ere was a	s (EBCTCG duced from 9% CI, 2.1 similar effe) update, 1 35.9% to % 8.7%; I ect on all	when all rele 30.5% in w preast cancer cause mortal
t Breast		Left Breast										
juvant Radiotherapy Axii	llary Surgery	Adjuvant Radiothe	rapy Axillary Surgery		1							
Breast Treatment	Breast Imaging	Breast Trea	tment Breast I	maging	Evidence		1					
Breast radiotherapy	🔲 Chestwall + regiona	IRT Therapeutic ex	cision 👘 Mastectomy	+/- Recon		Guideline	Studies					
Chestwall radiotherapy	No radiotherapy	Wide local exc	ision 🛛 🔲 Margin reexc	ision		LCCU, 2005						
		Primary chemo	therapy 🛛 🔲 No treatmen	t;		STCN 84, 2008	EPCTCC -	DOO: ERCTCO	2 1005 E	CTCC 20	03: Malmo	trom D. 200
		Primary endoc	ine the			NCI, 2008	Clarke, M.	. 2005.	2, 1222; El	20100, 20	oz, elanna	nan, P., 200
					Grade	1/A						
st Lesion Second Lesion	Third Lesion	First Lesion Seco	nd Lesion Third Lesion						OK			

Figure 2. Composite screen-shot showing the user interface and some of the functionalities of MATE; Upper left: the summary screen for the patient. Upper right: one of the many prognostication tools available, Lower left: decision panel where system recommendations and eligible clinical trials are highlighted in blue. Lower right: the evidential justification for each recommended option.

Pathology	Number
Benign breast disease	413
Operable breast cancer (in situ and invasive)	511
No final diagnosis reached (e.g. C1/C3/C4 on cytology or B1/B3/B4 on core biopsy)	132
at the time of MDT meeting	
Metastatic and or recurrent cancers	198
Other than breast epithelial malignancies	41
Total cases	1295

Table 2. Distribution of breast cases discussed at MDM according to type



Using computerised decision support to improve compliance of cancer multidisciplinary meetings with evidence-based guidance

Journal:	BMJ Open			
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2011-000439.R3			
Article Type:	Research			
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-May-2012			
Complete List of Authors:	Patkar, Vivek; University College London, ; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit Acosta, Dionisio; University College London, Davidson, Tim; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit Jones, Alison; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit Fox, John; Oxford University, Department of Engineering Science Keshtgar, Mohammed; Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust, Breast Unit; University College London,			
Primary Subject Heading :	Health informatics			
Secondary Subject Heading:	Oncology, Evidence-based practice, Health services research, Surgery			
Keywords:	Breast tumours < ONCOLOGY, ONCOLOGY, HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Clinical governance < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT			

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts 3/2



Figure 1. MATE in use at Royal Free breast MDT meeting. 454x165mm (300 x 300 DPI)

÷									
MDM Date N	MRS. Forename00 Surname00, 69 years old, FEMALE. Print			Print	Save	No			
2009-07-24	Investigations Decisions Prognostication Administration								
Patient Type				5	/ \		Endocrine		
Core Biopsy	MRS. Forename00 Surr	name00, 69 years old, FEM	ALE.		· `				
Patient Sumame00_E	Presenting Symptoms	Lump.	<u> </u>			FEC FEC			
Surname01, F.	Relevant History	rt nephrectomy, Hypothy	roid, HTN.	2			FEC +		
Sumame02, F. Sumame03, F		Right Breast	Left Breast	\\ • @	-/		Endo		
Sumame04, F.	Past Cancer Tx	<u>.</u>	6				FEC + Tr		
	Examination Findings	1st Discrete Lump.			1				
	Investigations	R5 U5 B5		🔒 discrete lump	12 localised not	dularity	FEC +		
	Treatment	Dreast Conservation, Wide Local Excision, Sentinel Node Biopsy.	<u>.</u>	Nipple dischar	ge 🕚 Paget like Retracted nij	pple	0	20 40	60 80 100
	Histopathology	Invasive Ductal Carcinoma, Size 18 mm, Grade High, 0 Nodes Positive, ER Positive, Her2 3.			10084	krgumen	itliame	For	SymbolicSupport
	Decision Summary	BEATRICE, Chemotherap	y, Breast radiotherapy.	7	Caption	Completely excision breast conservation	sed early breast cancer tion) and (Early breast	treated with breast co carcinoma stage I to I	nservation. (Breast cano IIA) and (not margin inve
sion Detail Decision Anal	vsis Justification Trial	Analysis				Transected/Invo mm/Transected/	lved NOS/Focally involv Involved NOS)	ed) and (not margin D	CIS oneof Less than 1
iuvant Therapy Adjuvant	Endocrine Therapy Clinic	al Trial Station Streeilla	nce or Follow-up		Austification	0			
		E PEACT	EI TARGIT	None	Jusuncauon	Improves OS,BC recurrence is the	SS and DFS. For womer conserved breast itsel	who are treated with f. The risk of recurrence	WLE, the most common the conserved breas
RETTED CADE			REATRICE			20%) even in co	nfirmed axillary lymph	node-negative women	Thus, whole breast radi
						breast-conservin	g therapy have shown	highly statistically sig	nificant reductions in loci
CA AL IPPO	E POPTIC	L TACT 2	E PET CT			Early Breast Can	as demonstrated a stat icer Trialists' Collaborat	istically significant rec ive Group's (EBCTCG)	luction in mortality. How update, when all relevar
						combined, 15-ye	ar breast cancer morta	lity was reduced from	35.9% to 30.5% in wome
					1	0.83; 95% CI, 0.	.75 0.91; P = .002). Th	ere was a similar effe	t on all cause mortality.
nt Breast		Left Breast							
uvant Radiotherapy Axill Breast Treatment	Breast Imaging	Adjuvant Radiothe	ment Breast	Imaging		6			
Distance Put					Evidence	Guideline	Studies		
Breast radiotherapy	Lie codiotherapy	Wilde legal ave	cicion Mactectom			CCO , 2005			
chestwan radiotherapy	Ino radiomerapy	Dimensional exc	ision i Margin nee			NCCN, 2008			
		Dimary chemo	unerapy I in treatme			SIGN 84, 2005	EBCTCG, 2000; EBCTC	3, 1995; EBCTCG, 200	2; Malmstrom, P., 2003.
		Primary endocr	inter unel			NCI, 2008	Clarke, M., 2005		
					Grade	1/A			
st Lesion Second Lesion	Third Lesion	First Lesion Secon	d Lesion Third Lesion						

Figure 2. Composite screen-shot showing the user interface and some of the functionalities of MATE; Upper left: the summary screen for the patient. Upper right: one of the many prognostication tools available, Lower left: decision panel where system recommendations and eligible clinical trials are highlighted in blue. Lower right: the evidential justification for each recommended option.

Using computerised decision support to improve compliance of cancer multidisciplinary meetings with evidence-based guidance

Vivek Patkar^{1,2}, Dionisio Acosta², Tim Davidson¹, Alison Jones¹, John Fox³, Mohammed Keshtgar^{1,2}

¹ The Breast Unit, Department of Surgery, Royal Free Hospital ² University College London ³ Department of Engineering Science, Oxford University

2
3
Δ
-
5
6
7
8
0
9
10
11
12
12
13
14
15
16
17
17
18
19
20
21
21
22
23
24
2-7 0E
25
26
27
28
20
29
30
31
22
32
33
34
35
36
30
37
38
39
10
40
41
42
43
11
44
45
46
47
10
40
49
50
51
50
52
53
54
55
56
50
5/
58
59
60
F 31

Author addresses Vivek Patkar

Dionisio Acosta

Tim Davidson

Alison Jones

John Fox

Senior Research Fellow Department of Oncology

Senior Research Associate

Consultant breast surgeon The Breast unit

Consultant Medical Oncologist Department of Oncology

University College London 4th Floor Holborn Union Building

Pond street London NW3 2QG

Highgate Hill London N19 5LW

Pond street London NW3 2QG

Pond street London NW3 2QG

Professor

Parks road Oxford OX1 3PJ

Mohammad Keshtgar (corresponding author)

University College London

The Breast Unit

Pond street London NW3 2QG email: m.keshtgar@ucl.ac.uk

Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust.

Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust.

Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust.

Department of Engineering Science, Oxford University.

Consultant Surgical Oncologist and Reader in Surgery

Royal Free Hospital Hampstead NHS Trust

Centre for Health Informatics & Multiprofessional Education (CHIME)

Article summary

Article focus:

- How to improve the conduct of a cancer MDT and standardize decision-making in accordance with best evidence

- Development and implementation of a novel clinical decision support (CDS) platform for breast cancer MDT

- This study evaluates a) the concordance between the CDS suggestions and MDT recommendations; and b) the identification rate of potentially eligible patients for recruiting into the ongoing research trials, by the MDT and the CDS. A separate questionnaire survey was conducted at the national workshop at the Cancer Networks' Development Programme to get an estimate of acceptability of such MDT decision support systems by the cancer networks.

Key messages:

- An advanced CDS platform could significantly improve the conduct of cancer MDT meetings.

- Further robust evaluations are necessary.

Strengths and limitations:

We share our experience of developing an advanced decision support system and implementing it in a complex clinical environment of cancer MDT which was subsequently adopted as a breast MDT meetings management tool.
The results reported here, however encouraging, are at this point indicative of the potential benefits but not yet conclusive. They should be treated with caution until further

rigorous evaluations confirm the effectiveness and generalisability of the CDS system.

Data sharing statement:

There is no additional data available.

Research checklist:

Appropriate research checklist could not be found.

Abstract:

Objectives: The cancer multidisciplinary team (MDT) meeting is regarded as the best platform to reduce unwarranted variation in cancer care through evidence-compliant management. However, MDT meetings are often overburdened with many different agendas, and hence struggle to achieve their full potential. We developed an interactive clinical decision support system called MATE (Multidisciplinary meeting Assistant and Treatment sElector), to facilitate explicit, evidence-based decision making in the breast MDT meetings and to improve the overall conduct of the meeting.

Design: Audit study and a questionnaire survey.

Setting: Breast multidisciplinary unit in a large secondary care teaching hospital. Participants: The participants included a<u>A</u>ll members of the breast MDT at the Royal Free Hospital, London, were consulted during the process of MATE development and implementation. -The emphasis was on active user participation through audit, feedback and response, acknowledging the clinical needs and practical constraints of the MDT and fitting the system around the team's work-flow rather than the other way around. Delegates, who attended MATE workshop at the England Cancer Networks' Development Programme conference in March 2010, participated in the questionnaire survey.

Outcome measures: The measures included evidence compliant care; measured by adherence to clinical practice guidelines (CPGs) and promoting research; measured by the patient identification rate for ongoing clinical trials.

Results: MATE identified 61% more patients who were potentially eligible for recruitment into clinical trials than the MDT and MATE recommendations demonstrated better concordance with CPG than MDT recommendations (97% of MATE vs 93.2 % of MDT; N = 984). MATE is in routine use in breast MDT meetings at the Royal Free hospital, London and wider evaluations are being considered.

Conclusions: Sophisticated decision support systems can enhance the conduct of MDT meetings in a way that is acceptable to and valued by the clinical team. Further rigorous evaluations are required to examine cost-effectiveness and measure the impact on patient outcomes. The decision support technology used in MATE is generic and if found useful can be applied across medicine.

Problem statement

Unwarranted practice variation across different medical domains has unfortunately become a pervasive finding in health service research and breast cancer care is no exception.[1] A recently published study reported significant differences in breast cancer survival across hospitals in the same geographical region in England.[2] The reasons for practice variation are multifactorial and standardisation of care has been attempted by the introduction of Regional Cancer Networks in England and the adoption of the Multi Disciplinary Team (MDT) model to promote maximal adoption of evidence-based practice. The MDT model is increasingly being adopted in other non-cancer medical domains such as stroke, cardiovascular diseases and diabetes.

Many benefits of MDTs have been claimed, but few have been backed by strong evidence.[3,4] However, despite a significant lack of prospective evidence, MDTs are well accepted in clinical practice; they are regarded as a major advance in management of cancer patients and their use appears to be increasing.[5] As many health care systems have already committed to and invested in the MDT model, further reductions in unwarranted variation are likely to be best achieved by improving their conduct and standardizing their decision making processes.[6] Data collected by the UK national cancer peer review programme from over 1000 teams across six cancer types in England indicates that there is significant room for improvement in the conduct of MDT meetings and shows considerable variability in the performance of MDTs.[7] A recent national survey of more than 2000 members of cancer multidisciplinary teams, demonstrated agreement on the range of criteria necessary for effective MDT working.[3] A review of the literature by the authors identified many pragmatic challenges and shortcomings in the current conduct of cancer MDT meetings summarised in Table 1.[8]

Context
The Royal Free Hospital NHS Trust (RFH) serves a population of 2.6 million within the North London Cancer Network (NLCN) catchment area. The number of new patients (both benign and cancer) seen as outpatients by the breast unit in 2009-10 was 2,944. The Breast Cancer Multidisciplinary team at RFH was established in 2005, in line with the recommendations of the NHS Cancer Plan. The MDT uses a set of NLCN-approved clinical guidelines and a standardized minimum data set.

MDT meetings (MDM) are held every week in a conventional conference format. The core members of a breast MDT include breast surgeons, radiologists, pathologists, medical and clinical oncologists, plastic surgeons and breast clinical nurse specilaists. A typical breast MDM discusses an average of 30 to 40 patients at various stages in their care pathways every week to decide further courses of action in their management.

Prior to the introduction of our computer-based service into the MDT meetings, an entirely paper based record system was used to provide case summaries and to document the MDT's discussion and decisions. These records contained free (unstructured) text rather than coded and structured data. The tradeoffs between structured (computer interpretable) and unstructured <u>electronic health records (EHRs</u>) are well known.[9] Recording MDT discussions in an unstructured form such as free text clinical notes, scanned documents, pdfs etc, hinders the process of accurate measurement of MDT performance as computer based data analysis and auditing tools cannot be used on unstructured data.

There are many commercially available information and communication systems which can assist in the preparation, presentation and documentation of cases at the MDT meetings such as EHR systems. However the objectives of our MDT service improvement exercise was to go beyond improvements in data management by providing active support for evidence-based decision making, improving recruitment into clinical trials and supporting prospective audit.[10]

Measures of improvement

Evidence compliant care: Adherence with clinical practice guidelines

With the increasing recognition of shortcomings in healthcare systems, there is a significant cultural and professional shift towards using evidence-based guidance. Evidence-based standards of care, such as published practice guidelines and technology assessment reports developed by authoritative organisations, provide an objective standard against which to assess MDT decisions. There is growing evidence that use of evidence-based guidelines can improve patient outcomes,[11-13] and MDT meetings provide the best opportunity to actively promote an *appropriate* and *judicious* use of the guidelines at the point of care.

Promoting research: Identification of patients eligible for ongoing research trials

It is widely accepted that recruiting patients into clinical trials is an effective strategy for ensuring that cancer patients get the best care as well as providing important information about the efficacy of treatments. However, the literature continues to report low rates of accrual to cancer clinical trials[14] and many organisations at national and international levels are investigating strategies for improving accrual rates. Cancer MDT meetings offer a major opportunity for identifying patients who are eligible for participation in clinical trials.[15]

Methods

In order to assess the performance of the breast MDT on the above mentioned measures we developed a computerised decision support system, **MATE** (Multidisciplinary meeting Assistant and Treatment sElector), that captures patient data, identifies eligible patients for clinical trials and suggests evidence-based treatment recommendations. MATE also captures MDT decisions and hence can automatically compare them with guideline recommendations.

System development

We followed a systematic, stepwise approach throughout the system development lifecycle. Requirements for MATE were identified through a systematic review of the

BMJ Open

literature[16] and by working closely with members of the breast MDT at RFH. We adopted the Common KADS methodology to develop a comprehensive process and knowledge model for breast cancer MDT meetings.[17] A controlled vocabulary from the National Cancer Institute thesaurus [18] was used to facilitate data standardisation. The evidence sources reviewed included Clinical Practice Guidelines, Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses and reports of Randomised Controlled trials. Along with the guideline recommendations, the eligibility criteria of ongoing clinical trials in breast cancer that were open for recruitment at our institution were also coded into the system.

PROforma,[19] an established decision modelling language for modelling clinical decisions and care pathways, was used to formalise decisions and supporting evidencein MATE. The PROforma language and application development software Tallis used in this project were originally developed at Cancer Research UK. Tallis was used to implement a range of decision support and other services¹ as determined by the requirements development process outlined above, and is used to update recommendations and other components of the PROforma knowledge base when new guidance is published. Tallis is being developed jointly by Oxford University and the Royal Free development team.

System description

MATE functionality can be categorised under two broad headings: 1. Structured data capture, presentation and audit 2. Advanced evidence-based decision support

Data capture: MATE allows users to capture detailed structured clinical data including, demographics, co morbidities, test results, clinical findings, imaging, pathology and treatment related data. The data are entered into the system either before (preparation phase) or during the MDT meetings (presentation phase). In the preparation phase the data are entered by a clinician, who is responsible for the preparation of the meeting. Data entry is flexible, quick and secure and it was found to reduce preparation time. If

http://mate.cossac.org/

some of the test results such as pathology reports are not available before the MDT meeting, they can easily be entered in MATE during the meeting by a clinician without delaying the proceedings. MATE also provides patient summaries automatically and prospective audit facilities.

Advanced evidence-based decision support module: is the key component of MATE which sets it apart from cancer tracking systems, EHR systems and the first generation decision support such as rule based alert and reminder systems. MATE actively evaluates diagnostic markers histo-pathological data and other patient related factors such as co-morbidities to generate patient specific recommendations for clinical management. The Tallis decision support technology enables MATE to rank the recommended options: for example - if the fitness of the patient is in question due to co-morbidity, MATE can recommend the next best option with supporting evidence. In principle, patient preferences can also be factored into the MATE decision process and we are actively exploring ways of doing this in line with widely discussed needs for greater patient empowerment.

All clinical recommendations made by MATE are presented to the user together with a summary of the rationale in the form of arguments and supporting evidence. The MATE knowledge base has been developed with reference to a comprehensive set of published national and international clinical practice guidelines, which enables MATE to give recommendations even in complex cases that are covered by these guidelines.

MATE also provides quantitative risk estimates based on published models as an adjunct to the clinical recommendations.

The user interface of MATE is illustrated in Fig 2. The detailed description of the knowledge base, technology and architecture is published elsewhere [20].

Evaluation of concordance between MATE and MDT recommendations

MATE was used in the background to prospectively record the proceedings of breast MDT meetings between April 2008 and July 2009 to gather 1,295 cases discussed in the MDMs during this period (each time a patient was discussed in the MDT meeting

BMJ Open

was counted as a separate encounter). The patient data and the MDT decisions were entered in MATE during the meeting by the first author. MATE recommendations were not shown to the MDT to avoid any confounding effect. After the meeting, the correctness of patient data and MDT recommendations entered in MATE were cross checked with the official paper MDT records by a separate data entry personresearch associate from the research team and, in case of any discrepancies, the patient data and MDT decisions entered in MATE record data were amended to be in line with the official MDT record. Approval for an audit study was obtained from the Research and Development department of the hospital before starting the study, and data-security measures such as encryption were put in place.

One of the key features of MATE compared to a traditional electronic health record is the clinical decision support (CDS) element. MATE is able to *actively* evaluate patient data and to offer guideline-based recommendations in real time which are specific for each individual patient. We compared MATE recommendations with *the MDT decisions*. The discordant cases (where MATE recommendations differed from those of MDT decisions) were further investigated by a panel who reviewed the patient's clinical notes. MATE also automatically flags patients who meet eligibility criteria for ongoing clinical trials.

Structured feedback from members of cancer networks in UK

The MATE development team was invited to conduct a workshop at the England Cancer Networks' Development Programme conference in March 2010. The conference was attended by key members from all cancer networks, who are instrumental in governing and improving MDT conduct in their respective cancer networks. MATE was demonstrated in a workshop and a questionnaire survey was conducted at the end of the presentation and discussion session. The aim of the structured feed back was to gather the views of the members of cancer networks about the usefulness of clinical decision support systems in general and MATE in particular, in the context of cancers MDMS. The MATE workshop at the Cancer Networks' Development Programme conference was

> attended by 54 people, of whom 48 completed the questionnaire. The roles of respondents were categorised as follows Clinicians (Doctors & Nurses) = 13 Patients/survivors = 5 Service improvement managers = 18 Informaticians = 7

Others = 5

Respondents were asked to select from a choice of 5 categories (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree) for five structured questions regarding usefulness of the system. They were also asked open ended questions to find any perceived barriers and their general comments. The questionnaire is summarised in For simplicity we have combined "strongly agree" and "agree" responses into an overall "agree" rating and "neutral", "disagree" and "strongly disagree" responses into a an overall "disagree" rating. The "neutral" category was included in "disagree" to ensure a conservative interpretation.

Results

Evaluation phase results

The case mix of 1,295 breast cases included cancers and benign pathologies. Table 2 shows the overall distribution of cases recorded on the MATE system during the study. Metastatic, recurrent and non epithelial malignancies were excluded from the guideline concordance analysis as the guidelines and evidence-base for those subsets were not initially coded in MATE. In 239 cases of recurrent, metastatic or non-epithelial malignancies, MATE therefore provided data capture services but no decision support. The remaining 1056 cases were analysed for concordance between management recommendations made by MATE and the actual MDT decisions; the level of concordance was encouragingly high (93.2 %; N = 984). When the 6.8 <u>% discordant</u> cases were further analysed it was found that in 3.2% cases, the MDT decisions which differed from MATE recommendations were corrected by the treating clinician in the

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

results clinic.

_____MATE also identified 61% more patients who were potentially eligible for recruitment into clinical trials than the MDT alone. Note that MATE only screens the patients as possibly eligible for the trials, based on the main eligibility criteria. All the information needed before recruiting the patient is often not available to the MDT. Certain tests specific for the trial (e.g. 2D Echo for ejection fraction) are done after MDT discussion and the results are not available at the MDM.

Structured Feedback results

<u>The MATE workshop at the Cancer Networks' Development Programme</u> conference was attended by 54 people, of whom 48 completed the questionnaire. The roles of respondents were categorised as follows

Clinicians (Doctors & Nurses) = 13

<u>Patients/survivors = 5</u>

Service improvement managers = 18

<u>Informaticians = 7</u>

Others = 5

The aim of the structured feed back was to estimate the acceptability of MATE and similar systems to the members of cancer networks, who are instrumental in governing and improving MDT conduct in the UK NHS system. For simplicity we have combined "strongly agree" and "agree" responses into an overall "agree" rating and "neutral", "disagree" and "strongly disagree" responses into a an overall "disagree" rating. The "neutral" category was included in "disagree" to ensure a conservative interpretation.-

There was a very high consensus on the usefulness of clinical decision support in general, and MATE in particular, for cancer MDT meetings. Most respondents (95.8%) agreed that clinical decision support has a useful role in cancer MDMs. The majority of respondents found the services provided by MATE useful for the breast MDM (93.47) and potentially for other types of cancer MDMs (92.6%). The clinical decision support component and ability to automatically screen patients for ongoing clinical trials were

seen as the two most valuable capabilities of MATE by the majority of respondents (84.5% and 81.2% of respondents respectively). Other capabilities of MATE, identified as valuable were patient data capture (70% of respondents), clinical audit services (67%), peer review support (58%) and education/training (45%). The majority of respondents (73.8%) were favourable to recommending MATE, if it were made available in their network.

The survey also identified important barriers to large-scale deployment of MATE. The main perceived obstacle to adoption was double data entry (50%) in situations where existing data capture systems are in place and it was suggested that MATE should be able to interface with existing data capture systems. Other barriers identified were costs and resources, clinical buy-in, scalability and the need for appropriate knowledge maintenance mechanisms that can cope with the large volumes of clinical evidence.

Strategies for change and effects

The encouraging performance of MATE in this initial phase established the confidence of the breast team at RFH, and MATE was subsequently introduced as the standard breast MDM management tool. Introducing a new technology into as complex a setting as the cancer MDM was a challenging task and our implementation strategy was guided by the experiences of others reported in the literature.[21, 22]

The principles of the implementation strategy for MATE are summarised as follows.

- •Development around the existing clinical work-flow: In order to ensure the clinical acceptability of MATE, a key design objective was to fit the system around the existing work flow of the breast MDM and not the other way round.
- Anticipating clinical needs and pragmatic constraints: As well as obvious requirements such as access to detailed patient data, a number of other useful services were identified during the modelling phase (e.g. quick access to past MDT decisions).

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Active involvement of users throughout audit, feedback and implementation: As
described in previous sections active participation of the users in the design
process was encouraged through audit and feedback, and wider inputs from
workshops and surveys.

Challenges and Next steps

We wish to emphasize that the role of MATE or any similar IT system is purely supportive and the MDT meeting continues to be led by the clinical team. Advanced IT systems can only complement an effective and functional multidisciplinary team,[2321] and cannot compensate for inherent weaknesses in team composition, organisation or operation. The preliminary audit results and the qualitative assessment data reported in this study, however encouraging, are at this point indicative of the potential benefits but not yet conclusive until further rigorous evaluations confirm the effectiveness and generalisability of MATE or similar services.

Generalisability:

It has been reported that clinical decision support systems produce better results when the developing team is also responsible for the trial of the system. One review reported for example that the success rate for clinical decision support systems dropped from 74% to 28% when the systems were tested by independent teams.[2422] The team involved in the development of MATE was also involved in testing and the deployment of the system so replication of our results on other sites is a key objective. It was for the same reason that the questionnaire survey from the user was not conducted at this stage and this is planned during the wider implementation phase. Demonstrating that MATE can confer significant benefits for other cancer MDTs is also a high priority. MATE has attracted the attention of the UK Department of Health's National Cancer Action Team and deployment of the system in other NHS trusts is being explored.

Effectiveness trials:

Definitive evidence of the value of complex (multifaceted) interventions such as MATE requires a multi-centre trial in which a cluster randomised design is likely to be the preferred methodology.[2523] The trial should look into all important impacts of the intervention including quantitative measures of cost, patient outcomes and process measures as well as qualitative measures.

Patient empowerment:

Patient involvement in decisions about their treatment is widely considered to be crucial to improving outcomes and many cancer patients wish to play a more active role in their care. The current structure of the cancer MDT meeting makes patient participation very difficult to achieve.[2624] We are therefore exploring ways in which MATE could facilitate patient engagement, by extending access to certain of its functions by the patients. This could be achieved in a variety of settings, including consultations in results clinic and from the patient's home using the internet, allowing the patients to review their clinical history, the MDT recommendations and the reasons and justifying evidence for those recommendations.

Ethics approval

Ethics approval was not required for the study however for a randomised controlled trial, which is ongoing, ethics approval was obtained from the Moorfields & Whittington Research Ethics Committee.

Competing interest

All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form and declare that (1) None of the authors have support from any company for the submitted work; (2) All authors have no relationships with any company that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years; (3) their spouses, partners, or children have no financial relationships that may be relevant to the submitted work; and (4) [VP, DA, JF, MK] have following specified non-financial interests that may be relevant to the submitted work.

UCL(B) (a subsidiary of University College London) and ISIS innovation (a subsidiary of the University of Oxford) are actively seeking to commercialise aspects of this project through a spin-out company.

Funding

The development and subsequent trial of the MATE decision support system was funded by Cancer Research UK by an extramural programme grant to Professor John Fox.

Acknowledgement:

We thank Cancer Research UK for funding the development and the trial of the system and all members of the breast multidisciplinary team at Royal Free for their consistent support.

Contributorship statement:

All authors have made substantial contributions as follow VP, JF and MK: conception and design; VP, DA, TD, AJ and MK: Conducting the pilot study VP and DA: developing the MATE knowledge base and software; acquisition of data, VP and MK: analysis and interpretation of data; VP, DA, JF, MK: drafting the article; All authors: revising the manuscript critically for important intellectual content; All authors: have given final approval of the version to be published.

References

1. Westert GP, Faber M. Commentary: the Dutch approach to unwarranted medical practice variation. BMJ. 2011;342:d1429.

2. Wishart GC, Greenberg DC, Chou P, et al. Treatment and survival in breast cancer in the Eastern Region of England. Ann Oncol. 2010 Feb;21(2):291-6.

3. Taylor C, Munro AJ, Glynne-Jones R, et al. Multidisciplinary team working in cancer: what is the evidence? BMJ. 2010;340:c951.

4. Lamb BW, Brown KF, Nagpal K, et al. Quality of care management decisions by multidisciplinary cancer teams: a systematic review. Ann Surg Oncol 2011;18(8):2116-25.

5. Mazzaferro V, Majno P. Principles for the best multidisciplinary meetings. Lancet Oncol. Apr;12(4):323-5.

6. Lamb BW, Green JS, Vincent C, et al. Decision making in surgical oncology. Surg Oncol. 2011 Sep;20(3):163-8.

 National Cancer Peer Review Programme Report 2009/2010 An overview of the findings from the 2009/2010 National Cancer Peer Review of Cancer Services in England
 Patkar V, Acosta D, Davidson T, et al. Cancer Multidisciplinary Team Meetings:

Evidence, Challenges, and the Role of Clinical Decision Support Technology. International Journal of Breast Cancer. 2011.

9. Rosenbloom ST, Denny JC, Xu H, et al. Data from clinical notes: a perspective on the tension between structure and flexible documentation. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2011 Mar 1;18(2):181-6.

10. Webb SB, Jr., Bracken MB, Wagner FC, Jr. Retrospective versus prospective audit: a trial of two methods. Hosp Med Staff. 1978 Jan;7(1):13-7.

11. Scott IA, Harper CM. Guideline-discordant care in acute myocardial infarction: predictors and outcomes. Med J Aust. 2002 Jul 1;177(1):26-31.

12. Peterson ED, Roe MT, Mulgund J, et al. Association between hospital process performance and outcomes among patients with acute coronary syndromes. JAMA. 2006 Apr 26;295(16):1912-20.

13. Bahtsevani C, Uden G, Willman A. Outcomes of evidence-based clinical practice guidelines: a systematic review. Int J Technol Assess Health Care. 2004 Fall;20(4):427-33.

14. Lara PN, Jr., Higdon R, Lim N, et al. Prospective evaluation of cancer clinical trial accrual patterns: identifying potential barriers to enrollment. J Clin Oncol. 2001 Mar 15;19(6):1728-33.

15. Bouvier AM, Bauvin E, Danzon A, et al. Place of multidisciplinary consulting meetings and clinical trials in the management of colorectal cancer in France in 2000. Gastroenterol Clin Biol. 2007 Mar;31(3):286-91.

16. Patkar V, Acosta D, Davidson T, et al. Cancer multidisciplinary team meetings: evidence, challenges, and the role of clinical decision support technology. Int J Breast Cancer.2011:831605

17. Schreiber G, Akkermans H, Anjewierden A, et al. Knowledge Engineering and Management: The CommonKADS Methodology.: The MIT Press; 1999.

18. Golbeck, J., Fragoso, G., Hartel, F., et al.. The national cancer institutes thesaurus and ontology. Web Semantics: Science, Services and Agents on the World Wide Web 1(1), 75–80 (2003)

19. Sutton DR, Fox J. The syntax and semantics of the PROforma guideline modeling language. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2003 Sep-Oct;10(5):433-43.

20. Acosta, D. et al., 2010. Challenges in Delivering Decision Support Systems: The MATE Experience. In Knowledge Representation for Health-Care. Data, Processes and Guidelines. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, pp. 124-140. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-11808-1_11.

21. Grimshaw JM, Eccles MP, Walker AE, et al. Changing physicians' behavior: what works and thoughts on getting more things to work. J Contin Educ Health Prof. 2002 Fall;22(4):237-43.

22. Bates DW, Kuperman GJ, Wang S, et al. Ten commandments for effective clinical decision support: making the practice of evidence based medicine a reality. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2003 Nov Dec;10(6):523-30.

2<u>31</u>. Lemieux-Charles L MW. What do we know about health care team effectiveness? A review of the literature. Medical Care Research and Review. 2006;63:263-300.

- 24<u>22</u>. Garg AX, Adhikari NK, McDonald H, et al. Effects of computerized clinical decision support systems on practitioner performance and patient outcomes: a systematic review. JAMA. 2005 Mar 9;293(10):1223-38.
- 2523. Campbell NC, Murray E, Darbyshire J, et al. Designing and evaluating complex interventions to improve health care. BMJ. 2007 Mar 3;334(7591):455-9.
- **2624**. Choy ET, Chiu A, Butow P, et al. A pilot study to evaluate the impact of involving breast cancer patients in the multidisciplinary discussion of their disease and treatment plan. Breast. 2007 Apr;16(2):178-89.

Table 1. Pragmatic challenges for cancer MDT meetings

- 1. Ensuring and documenting adherence with standards (e.g. evidence-based guidelines)
- 2. Identifying patients who are eligible for recruitment into clinical trials
- 3. Ensuring the consistent collection of crucial data such as disease staging and outcomes
- 4. Establishing robust mechanisms for prospective assessment of MDT performance
- 5. Ensuring MDT recommendations are followed in practice
- 6. Achieving the right balance of educational and care delivery objectives of this forum
- 7. Establishing reliable interfaces with primary care to ensure continuity of care



Figure 1. MATE in use at Royal Free breast MDT meeting.

<u>4.</u>												
MDM Date	MRS. Forename00 Surname00, 69 years old, FEMALE. Print Save							No				
2009-07-24 🗸	Investigations Decisions Prognostication Administration							Treatment				
Patient Type								Endocrine				
Core Biopsy 🗸 🗸	MRS. Forename00 Sun	name00, 69 years old, FEM										
Patient	Presenting Symptoms	Lump.			~V~	-		FEC				
Sumame00, F.	Relevant History	rt nephrectomy, Hypothyrold, HTN.				10						
Sumame02, F.		Right Breast	Left Breast)).	Λ	1		FEC + Endo				
Sumame03, F.	Past Cancer Tx		i			$\neg 1$						
Sumame04, F.	Examination Findings Investigations	1st Discrete Lump			$^{\sim}$		FEC + Tr					
		RS US BS		· '	/ \			FEC I				
	Treatment	Dreast Conservation.		discrete lump	localised no	dularity	1	Endo + Tr				
	Histopathology	Wide Local Excision, Sentinel Node Biopsy.	6	reppin cracits	Retracted n	ipple		0	20	40	60	80 100
		Invasive Ductal Carcinoma, Size 18 mm, Grade High, O Nodes Positive, ER Positive, Her2 3.	<u>k</u>		10084	ArgumentHame For						SymbolicSupport
	Decision Summary	BEATRICE, Chemotherap	y, Breast radiotherapy.	1	Caption	Completely exp breast conserv	cised earl ation) an	y breast canc d (Early breas	er treated w t carcinoma	ith breast stage I to	conservat IIIA) and	ion. (Breast car I (not margin in
sion Detail Decision Ar	alysis Justification Trial	Analysis				mm/Transected/Inv	d/Involve	5/hocally invo d NOS)	lived) and (r	not margin	DCIS one	of Less than 1
juvant Therapy Adjuvar	nt Endocrine Therapy	al Trial Staging Surveille	ance or Follow-up		Justification	Improves OS B	CSS and I	DES Ear worn	an who are	treated wit	NME N	ne most comme
ALTTO	CPTION	REACT	TARGIT	None None		recurrence is th	he conser	ved breast its	elf. The risk	of recurre	nce in the	conserved bre
BETTER CARE	POSH	SUPREMO	BEATRICE			breast conserv	ing surge	ry is recomme	nded. Altho	ugh all tria	n. Thus, Is assess	ing the role of
] GLACIER		TACT 2	Прет ст			breast-conserving therapy have shown highly statistically significant reductions in loins aingle trial has demonstrated a statistically significant reductions in loins aingle trial has demonstrated a statistically asynificant reduction in mortality. In Server Development, and the Reverse Couples (BECTCO) update, when all relevation therapy (absolute difference of 5.4%; 95% CI, 2.1% 8.7%; breast concer di 0.83; 95% CI, 0.75 O.91; P = 0.02). There was a similar effect on all ocuse mortality.						
nt Breast		Left Breast										
juvant Radiotherapy Ax	illary Surgery	Adjuvant Radiothe	rapy Axillary Surgery		1							
		Breast Trea	tment Breast		Evidence	Contractions	Charles					
Breast radiotherapy	Chestwall + regiona	RT Therapeutic excision Mastectomy +,		r +/- Recon			Studies	,				
Chestwall radiotherapy	No radiotherapy	Wide local exc	tision 🔲 Margin reex	cision		NCCN, 2008	-					
		Primary chemo	otherapy 🛛 🔲 No treatmen	nt		SIGN 84, 200	5 EBCTCO	5, 2000; EBCT	CG, 1995; E	BCTCG, 20	02: Malm	strom, P., 2007
		Primary endoc	rine the			NCI, 2008	Clarke,	M., 2005.				
					Grade	1/A						
st Lesion Second Lesion	Third Lesion	First Lesion Seco	nd Lesion Third Lesion						OK			

Figure 2. Composite screen-shot showing the user interface and some of the functionalities of MATE; Upper left: the summary screen for the patient. Upper right: one of the many prognostication tools available, Lower left: decision panel where system recommendations and eligible clinical trials are highlighted in blue. Lower right: the evidential justification for each recommended option.

Pathology	Number
Benign breast disease	413
Operable breast cancer (in situ and invasive)	511
No final diagnosis reached (e.g. C1/C3/C4 on cytology or B1/B3/B4 on core biopsy)	132
at the time of MDT meeting	
Metastatic and or recurrent cancers	198
Other than breast epithelial malignancies	41
Total cases	1295

Table 2. Distribution of breast cases discussed at MDM according to type