

A scalable electronic system for collecting co-morbidity data in cancer outpatient clinics

electronic Co-morbidity Assessment System (eCAS)

Penny Wright





Background

- Epidemiological studies extract co-morbidity data using a variety of validated methods/ instruments
- Clinical consultations do not commonly record previous medical problems using formal co-morbidity assessment
- Electronic patient self-report data capture and linkage already in use in clinical care
- Electronic data capture may provide a quick, cost-effective and accurate way to aid co-morbidity measurement for use in:
 - clinical practice
 - cancer registration

Service development project Aim

To develop and evaluate an electronic-Co-morbidity Assessment System (eCAS)

for use in cancer practice using the
Adult Co-morbidity Evaluation-27 (ACE-27)
with results stored in the individual's
electronic patient record (EPR) and
electronically transferred to the cancer registry.

What is the Adult Co-morbidity Evaluation-27 (ACE-27)?

- 26 'questions' + overall co-morbidity score
- 12 domains
 - Cardiovascular Respiratory Gastrointestinal Renal
 Endocrine Neurological Psychiatric Rheumatological
 Immunological Malignancy Substance abuse Body weight
- 3 levels of decompensation
 - Grade 3 Severe; Grade 2 Moderate; Grade 1 Mild
- Scoring
 - any domain "3" overall co-morbidity "3"
 - any 2 domains "2" overall co-morbidity "3"
 - If "1" or one "2" highest score then overall co-morbidity "1" or "2"

Piccirillo JF, Costas I, Claybour P, Borah AJ, Grove L, Jeffe DB (2003) The Measurement of Comorbidity By Cancer Registries. The Journal of Registry Management 30(1): 8-14

How would eCAS work in practice?

- New patient attends clinic
- Nurse logs onto QTool with patient username and password, enters weight and height
- Patient completes specifically designed self-report questionnaire which 'maps' to the ACE-27
- During consultation clinician completes ACE-27 accessed via electronic patient record (EPR) (patient reported areas highlighted)
- Co-morbidities listed for use in clinical practice
- ACE-27 domain/overall scores generated
- ACE-27 scores transferred across to Cancer Registry

How we planned the project

Stage one: set-up

- Purchase hardware
- Software programming
- Training manual
- Development of patient self-report

Stage two: implementation

- Surgical bladder (CNS led; 4-6 patients)
- Gynaecological oncology

(team approach; 5 new patients/ 40 week)

- Fast track lung
 (team approach; 25 patients week)
- 100-day post HSCT

(team approach; 1-2 new patients/25-30 week)

Stage three: performance

- Patientclinician
- ACE-27 clinical notes audit
- ACE-27 eCASaudit comparison

Stage One

•Tablet touchscreens procurement took five months



- •IT programming and testing
- Training manual



- •Patient co-morbidity self-report developed, tested and amended, comprises:
 - •weight and height for Body Mass Index calculation (staff completed)
 - •23 patient self-report items with response categories yes/no



•Minor ACE-27amendments to reflect UK medical nomenclature.

Stage Two: implementation

	Surgical bladder cancer	Gynaecological medical oncology	Fast track lung
Number of clinics	15	17	5
Number of patients identified	50	38	20
Self-report completions	42	19	12
eCAS full completions	41 (82%)	14 (37%)	7 (35%)
Non completion reasons			
Patient did not attend	1	1	0
Technical problems	3	7	1
Patient refusal	1	5	0
Organisational	1	4	10
Patient too ill	0	1	1
Not known	3	6	1

Stage Three: eACE-27 performance

- •Patient clinician agreement (yes/no response)
 - •all kappa > 0.41 (moderate)
 - •poorest Rheumatological domain kappa = 0.43
- •Clinician clinician ACE-27 scores agreement (audit) (4 response categories)
 - •all kappa ≥ 0.81 (very good) bar
 - •Malignancy (kappa = 0.79; 49/50 exact agreement)
- •eCAS-audit derived ACE-27 scores agreement (4 response categories)
 - •all kappa > 0.41 (moderate) bar
 - •Psychiatric (kappa = 0.37; 47/50 exact agreement)
 - •Malignancy (kappa = 0.23; 39/50 exact agreement)
 - (11 ACE-27 mismatches scored in eCAS not in audit)

kappa of 0.21-0.40 (fair), 0.41-0.60 (moderate), 0.61-0.80 (good) and .81-1.00 (very good)

Was eCAS a success?

In part but it only needs one thing to fail and the whole system fails

IT



- Hardware
- Software

Training

- Manual
- Staff

Questionnaires

- Self-report /
- ACE-27

Implementation

- Surgical bladder
- Gynaecological oncology
- Fast track lung 🥻



100-day post HSCT Not tested

Performance

- Reasonable
- Malignancy
- Transfer to registry
 - Not tested

Top tips for implementation

Staff

- Engage with staff from the start and find out how the system could fit in/be adapted to suit this clinic
- > All staff groups involved must 'buy in' to it
- ➤One clinical staff member should have overall responsibility
- There must sufficient number of others engaged (critical mass) so implementation will continue if the early adopter leaves

Space

- If possible negotiate exclusive use of a room close to the major clinic activities with network access
- >If it is a shared space make sure all concerned know you have a right to be there
- Ensure there are sufficient network sockets (wireless)/hardware available in the space for all users

Top tips for implementation

Priority

- Lip service is not good enough
- > Will other things have to be dropped if this is introduced?
- ➤ How will you cover absences?

Support

- ➤ Make sure there is training for all with 'boosters' if required
- ➤ Easy access to IT support
- ➤ Recognition of activity in annual reviews

•Where first?

- ➤ Not too busy/complex clinic
- ➤ Identify a potential early adopter
- Get it up and running there and then use this as an example
- >Advertise success

Thank you to:

all patients, clinicians, IT team, other hospital staff, the Psychosocial Oncology and Clinical Practice Research Group and Jay Piccirillo for allowing us to incorporate the ACE-27 into clinical practice

Research team: Laura Ashley, Helen Jones & Beverly Horne Clinical advisors: Geoff Hall, Galina Velikova & Maria Gilleece

Cancer managers: Angie Craig & Martin Waugh Technical support: Owen Johnson & Leon Bamforth Clinician auditors: Alison Young & Jenny Seligman

Project manager: Hayley Mullins

Funding: National Cancer Intelligence Network (NCIN)