2020

Operationalizing Healthcare Big Data in the Electronic Health Records using a Heatmap Visualization Technique

Don Roosan
Western University of Health Sciences

Mazharul Karim
Western University of Health Sciences

Jay Chok
Keck Graduate Institute

Moom Roosan
Chapman University, roosan@chapman.edu

Recommended Citation

Roosan, D.; Karim, M.; Chok, J. and Roosan, M. (2020). Operationalizing Healthcare Big Data in the Electronic Health Records using a Heatmap Visualization Technique. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Joint Conference on Biomedical Engineering Systems and Technologies - Volume 5: HEALTHINF*, ISBN 978-989-758-398-8, pages 361-368. DOI: 10.5220/0008912503610368

Operationalizing Healthcare Big Data in the Electronic Health Records using a Heatmap Visualization Technique

Don Roosan[1][a], Mazharul Karim[1][b], Jay Chok[2][c] and Moom R. Roosan[3][d]
[1]*College of Pharmacy, Western University of Health Science, Pomona, California, U.S.A.*
[2]*School of Applied Life Science, Keck Graduate Institute, Claremont, California, U.S.A.*
[3]*School of Pharmacy, Chapman University, Irvine, California, U.S.A.*

Keywords: Electronic Health Record, Big Data, Visualization, Heatmap, Data Science.

Abstract: Background: The majority of the electronic health record (EHR) contains a wealth of information, including unstructured notes. Healthcare professionals may be missing substantial portions of essential diagnostic and treatment information by not focusing on unstructured texts. The objective of this study is to present progress notes data using heatmap visualization. Methods: In this study, the research team used the unstructured text from the progress notes of deidentified patient data. The research team conducted qualitative content-coding based on the clinical complexity model and developed a heatmap based on the processed frequency data. Result: The researchers developed a color-coded heatmap focusing on the severity and acuity of patients' status accumulated through multiple previous patient's visits. Conclusions: Future research into creating an automated process to generate the heatmap from an unstructured dataset can open up opportunities to operationalize big data in healthcare.

1 INTRODUCTION

The electronic health record (EHR) contains vital information about patients' overall health. Much of this information is found in the unstructured notes taken by doctors, nurses, and other practitioners, making it easy to overlook. By ignoring the unstructured text, healthcare professionals may be missing a substantial amount of essential diagnostic and treatment information. Due to heavy workloads, healthcare professionals cannot afford to take the time to analyze and incorporate all the data available in a patient's EHR from previous visits and admissions (Ben-Assuli, Shabtai, & Leshno, 2013; Lanham et al., 2014). Currently, more than the 80% of information in the EHR is disjointed and incoherent and not in a structured format, making it difficult for healthcare professionals to decipher and integrate it into their decision-making process (Thyvalikakath et al., 2014; Islam, Weir, & Del Fiol, 2014). Moreover, data are reaching "critical mass" in EHRs and should be reused in other ways, including in "quality improvement," in the healthcare settings.

Several visualization techniques have been incorporated with decision-support systems to facilitate healthcare decision-making during treatment. However, visualization techniques for unstructured data are not widely used (Hersh, 2014). Also, medical and diagnostic errors are threats that the medical community cannot afford to ignore (Medford-Davis et al., 2015). Moreover, the lack of timely attention to diagnostic error can have dire implications for public health, as exemplified by the widely reported diagnostic error regarding Ebola virus infection in a Dallas hospital emergency department (ED) (Mandl, 2014). Diagnostic error is likely to be one of the most common types of errors in ED settings (Berner, 2009; Medford-Davis et al., 2015). The ED environment is high-paced and high-volume. It carries low-certainty in a multi-agent, dynamic and complex environment. These factors compound and may lead to diagnostic errors and

[a] https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2482-6053
[b] https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4412-1819
[c] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2082-0079
[d] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5318-5120

Roosan, D., Karim, M., Chok, J. and Roosan, M.
Operationalizing Healthcare Big Data in the Electronic Health Records using a Heatmap Visualization Technique.
DOI: 10.5220/0008912503610368
In *Proceedings of the 13th International Joint Conference on Biomedical Engineering Systems and Technologies (BIOSTEC 2020)*, pages 361-368
ISBN: 978-989-758-398-8

adverse events due to information loss. Thus, in an environment prone to interruptions like the ED, vital patient information and cues are often lost during information collection and integration among physicians, residents, nurses, and other healthcare providers (Carter, Davis, Evans, & Cone, 2009). This data loss is significantly due to a lack of time to adequately review the previous progress notes or visits, information that could potentially provide essential information.

Several attempts have been made to alleviate the burden posed by the amount and complexity of information available within EHR systems. Informatics and analytics have been proven to improve decision-making with the help of EHR data (Roosan, Law, Karim, & Roosan, 2019). To remedy problems such as documentation redundancy, neglect of crucial data, and difficulty navigating EHR software, prototype visualization tools have been tested to be effective (Carroll et al., 2014; Shneiderman, Plaisant, & Hesse, 2013). Various visualization tools, as simple as bar graphs and pie charts, can aggregate data visually. The problem at hand, however, is that large-scale multidimensional data are difficult to aggregate into these types of visualization tools. Therefore, researchers have been using more complex visualization tools such as parallel coordinates or heatmaps to assist with visualizing complex data (Islam, Weir, & Del Fiol, 2016).

To understand healthcare data complexity, it is essential to assess the factors related to both objective properties of the task and perceived task complexity (Liu & Li, 2012; Roosan et al., 2016). The objective properties of the task involve specific task characteristics, such as the number of decision steps or competing goals. On the other hand, perceived task complexity refers to the conjunct properties of the task and the characteristics of the task performer. When the task overwhelms the cognitive capacity of the task performer, the task is perceived to be complex by the task performer. Models of task complexity have been created in other research domains such as aviation and the military to influence and predict human performance and behavior. In a previous study, the research team developed and validated a clinical complexity measurement model that includes both patient and task complexity contributing factors (CCFs) (Islam, Weir, & Del Fiol, 2016).

In another study, experts operationalized the complexity model and created a visualization to support a big data information display based on finding similar patients from the Veteran's Administration (VA) database (Roosan et al., 2016). The team used MySQL to query similar patients from the VA database to create a similarity profile based on the clinical complexity model. Using this profile, the team was able to develop a visualization technique that supported the similarity of patients' treatment outcomes to select the best possible therapy.

To build the clinical complexity model, Roosan et al. (2016) used the transcripts from a previous observational study to iteratively construct the measurement model. This model integrates the patient CCFs proposed by Schaink et al. (2012) and task CCFs outlined by Liu and Li (2012). In the clinical complexity model, task complexity is conceptualized as having seven dimensions. Each dimension is then broken down into a subset of factors. For example, the dimension "ambiguity" (i.e., unclear, vague, or less specific clinical task components) consists of the factors "confusing information" (missing, ambiguous, or contradictory information cues) and "unclear goals" (objective is unclear or vague or less transparent or lacks specific goals). The patient complexity factors are divided into five dimensions, each of which is then broken down into several factors. For example, Mental Health relates to issues dealing with psychological stress, addiction/substance abuse, and related conditions. Our research team applied this model to identify the specific complexity-contributing factors of clinical decision tasks to find the frequencies of particular complexity factors in the progress notes.

In this study, the research team used the same clinical complexity model to construct a heatmap of the progress notes data to highlight the severity and acuity of patients. We hypothesize that by using unstructured texts in the EHR, researchers can operationalize a significant proportion of currently available but unused healthcare big data. The objective of this study was to explore the feasibility of creating a heatmap to visualize data from the progress notes dataset.

2 METHOD

The research team consisted of pharmacy students, pharmacists, and academic researchers. The team conducted a secondary chart review using a large healthcare dataset. The research team decided to use progress notes for content-coding from the Neehr Perfect® program ("EHR Go,"2019), which is an EHR that is built on VistA, the most widely used EHR in the world. Neehr Perfect® provided deidentified data for the pharmacy students so that they could get a realistic experience using the EHR. The program includes 170 patients' charts ranging in complexity

Table 1: Clinical complexity-contributing factors.

	Complexity contributing factors (CCFs)	Definitions
Task complexity contributing factors	Unclear goals	The objective is ambiguous or vague, less clear or lacks specific goals
	Large number of goals	Multiple goal elements, higher or larger number of goals
	Conflicting goals	Achieving one goal has a negative effect or outcome on another goal
	Confusing information	Unclear, missing, ambiguous or contradictory information cues
	Unnecessary information	Large quantity of not useful information
	Changing information	Unpredictable events, high rate of information change
	Urgent information	Information about very acute patient situation
	Multiple decision-making options	Large number of options to make a decision
	Large number of decision steps	More than two steps or actions to attain the objective
	Decision conflict	Two or more actions that are incompatible or competing, conflict between task components
	Lack of expertise	Unique situation requiring additional knowledge, novel and non-routine decisions, treatment or disease uncertainty
	Lack of team coordination	Coordinating activities and creating shared decision-making within and between healthcare teams
	Time pressure	Situations that need immediate attention due to scarcity of time
Patient complexity contributing factors	Polypharmacy	Patient receiving medications from more than one pharmacy
	Significant physical illness	Multiple chronic conditions, loss of physical functioning
	Mental anxiety	External factors creating cognitive stress (e.g., job, culture, family)
	Psychological illness	Depression, mood disorders, losing self-consciousness
	Addiction/substance abuse	Drug or substance abuse in the past or present
	Older age	Patient age 75 and older
	Health disparity	Patients with a different ethnic background or cultural barrier with limited access to healthcare
	Noncompliant patient	Patient not following medication or treatment regimen, difficulty communicating with providers
	Poverty and low social support	Poor social support, low quality of life due to economic strains and lower social status
	Heavy utilization of healthcare resources	Complex chronic patients with multiple care providers and institutions require more resources
	Difficulty with healthcare system navigation	Low understanding of healthcare system, limited healthcare literacy

and type. For this study, the research team initially selected three complex patient charts, finally selecting the most complex chart. Researchers identified charts in which patients had more than three diagnoses for inpatient admission and at least 20 or more visits to inpatient settings. Once the three patients' charts were selected, the team selected one complex case that included more than 20 visits from the same patient. Two clinical pharmacists verified that the case was complex. Researchers used the complex patient's chart and transferred the data to a The researchers used Atlas.ti Version 8.0 software to code the data. The study was exempted by the Claremont College IRB board as the dataset team used was acquired from the Neehr Perfect® program, which included only deidentified information. We conducted qualitative content coding of the dataset based on the clinical complexity factors from the clinical complexity model (Islam, Mayer, & Clutter, 2016; Islam et al., 2015). The factors are listed in Table 1.

The data analysis was based on content analysis (Roosan et al., 2016; Stemler, 2001). Specifically, the team members followed the "emergent coding" process of content analysis (Haney, Russell, Gulek, & Fierros, 1998). In this process, researchers independently review a subset of the data and form a checklist for coding. After independently coding, the research team meets to discuss and reconcile the differences. Once the coding has reached the desired level of reliability, it is applied to the remainder of the data. For the transcriptions of the interviews, the research team used the RATS (relevance of the study, appropriateness of qualitative method, transparency of procedure, and soundness of interpretive approach) protocol for qualitative data analysis (Clark, 2003). This protocol provides standardized guidelines for qualitative research methods.

Two students parsed the sentences to meaningful content (Table 2), and three other students coded the only one code was applied to each parsed sentence. After each coding session, the three students met to examine coding disagreements and to revise codes and code definitions. The interrater reliability, Cohen's kappa, was calculated to be 0.83. A final Excel file was developed consisting of the frequencies of the total of 49 CCFs from the 21 visits recorded on a complex patient chart. Utilizing these frequency tables, researchers plotted and visualized the data in R "*pheatmap V0.2*" package to develop the heatmap.

3 RESULTS

The research team constructed the visual heatmap from the aggregated data, as described in Figure 1. Researchers plotted patient visits on the X-axis and clinical complexity variables on the Y-axis.

The unique feature of this visualization tool is the use of color-coding based on severity: dark blue means fewer frequencies and dark red exemplifies higher frequencies. Values range from 0 to 1, with 0 indicating the patient displayed baseline clinical complexity variables and 1 when the frequencies of the different complexity variables were high. The research team selected a "spectral" visualization color scheme to show variation in the frequency with multiple colors with adequate depth. The complexity factors on the Y axis provide the information complexity within the heatmap on which the practitioner should focus. The dark red color in the sentences based on the clinical complexity factors. heatmap represents the high presence of complexity factors in a visit. For example, the team was looking for vital patient could information for this complex patient in the charts that provide better insight into the severity and acuity of the case.

Looking at this heatmap, one can find that several visits had *significant physical illnesses* and *changing information*. These instances corresponded to the progress notes when the patient developed sepsis several times during previous visits. As a result, the patient became resistant to several antibiotics.

Table 2: Unitized texts of the transcript from the patient's clinical notes.

Unitized texts	Associated codes
"The patient has several immediate needs such as stabilizing high blood pressure, taking care of blood transfusion high blood glucose levels and mental health issues. I am not sure where researchers should focus more. I think the blood pressure should be a priority but I am still confused."	Conflicting goals
"Researchers' kind of think using Vancomycin should be able to take care of most of the infections even though team do not have the lab results. Researchers may wait for it but patient's situations may get worse."	Decision conflict
"There are quite a few other options as well. For example, azithromycin or clindamycin."	Multiple decision-making options
"The patient was readmitted from a previous infection in this thigh. I am not sure if the patient received appropriate antibiotics during discharge and if he actually received it or not."	Confusing information
"But the cellulitis in his thigh is getting worse and that is more what I would be worried about. I don't know if it is from his previous wound or not."	Changing information



Figure 1: Heatmap visualizing results of content coded progress notes. Value of 0 shows baseline clinical complexity and a value of 1 shows the highest presence of clinical complexity factors for the patient across all visits.

Such information can be vital and time-sensitive in a moment of urgency, allowing clinicians to focus on finding more appropriate antibiotics for the multidrug resistance organisms rather than using first-line antibiotic, which otherwise could have failed. The lack of access to this information can lead to worse patient prognosis or result in patient death.

In this example, the team normalized the score of frequencies and used the values of 0 to 1 for visualization purposes. Complexity factors with 0 values do not indicate that the frequencies do not exist, only that the frequencies were the same as reference or baseline. A value of 1 shows the highest presence of clinical complexity factors for the patient across all visits.

The color-coded heatmap can assist clinicians in determining a more focused plan for the patient's next visit. In addition, the researchers hope to incorporate filtering tools into the heatmap to further assist clinicians. Being able to filter the heatmap by time or area of interest can help clinicians understand the severity and acuity of the patient. In the heatmap in Figure 1, researchers focused on the different complexity factors to understand the specific activities that occurred on a particular visit for the patient. For example, the dark red on visits 11, 12, 16, and 17 for changing information refers to the many activities occurring during these visits. Examinations of the patient chart for those days revealed that the patient had recurrent infections and was admitted several times to the hospital. Obtaining this vital life-saving information early in treatment may help the admitting clinician choose between different antibiotics or therapy options. Moreover, knowing in advance about a patient's previous recurrent infection can also help with assessing risk for readmissions and determining alternative antibiotics as appropriate.

4 DISCUSSION

Previous studies have used different visualization techniques for specific datasets. For example, some studies have visualized public health datasets to predict the progression of infection or individual disease states (Elliott et al., 2012). However, due to the digitization of healthcare data, a robust technique is needed to understand the meaningful information hidden in different visits for the patient. Specifically, the complexity of the information can help us understand patient readmission to the hospital. In this study, researchers have contributed by developing an innovative heatmap technique to understand the complexity of clinical progress notes.

The study adds a unique perspective in the EHR design for future designers and researchers. Currently, very few mechanisms exist to help health professionals utilize large amounts of unstructured texts in the EHR. Visualizing such information can help clinicians focus on crucial pieces of information that otherwise might be ignored. In this study, the heatmap researchers created provides a unique overview of 21 visits in a very complex patient case consisting of hundreds of pages. Using the heatmap, researchers can easily visualize multiple visits and identify more critical visits.

Currently, very few healthcare programs utilize a heatmap to visualize patient data across visits. Problems need to be accurately represented via a heatmap in order to craft proper policy (Ulmer, McFadden, & Nerenz, 2009). The goal of this study was to provide a tool that can help clinicians visualize data from patient progress notes, allowing them to identify and access specific visits to understand the severity and acuity of a patient's illness or injury. The functionality of heatmaps includes the filtering of aggregated data that can be used to help clinicians narrow the possible sources of a problem that a patient may have. This filtering can help clinicians focus on what can be improved to ensure the patient receive high-quality care.

Workload issues are causing critical problems in the healthcare industry. Provider burnout and fatigue due to the digitization of healthcare are causing new errors (Kwekkeboom, Abbott-Anderson, & Wanta, 2010; Saber Tehrani et al., 2013). Providers are overburdened with the extra work of using digital health tools when they should be taking care of patients (Huang, Tobin, & Tompane, 2012). Many clinicians are leaving the field or moving to part-time jobs due to the extra workload (Rahman, 2016). Therefore, system designers need to use innovative visualization techniques that are not disruptive of workflow and that support the clinician's cognition. The constant addition of new information into the EHR makes it difficult for clinicians to realize where the most critical information is buried. Our technique sheds light on dealing with this problem using this innovative heatmap visualization. This visualization improves the overall understanding of healthcare information for patients as well as their clinicians (Roosan et al., 2019).

The heatmap visualization of EHR data has several implications for big data. Currently, the amount of data generated in an EHR is voluminous. This poses a challenge for clinicians who need to review this data in a short time. Each admission and subsequent visit generate more than 100 data points. During readmissions, hospital staff commonly review the patient's previous visits. However, the information may be buried among hundreds of lines of data, and clinicians often have no clue about which visits they should focus. Using the heatmap approach, they may be able to identify a specific visit that holds the information they need. The approach may help administrators prioritize patients for discharge and focus on the more complex patients for better care. Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) currently does not reimburse for 30-day readmission for patients. However, if a patient has a history of readmissions and the clinician learns of this history by focusing on the pertinent information with the help of the heatmap, then he or she will be able to prioritize therapy for the patient.

Researchers assume that the analytics of the heatmap need to be integrated with the EHR. For example, clinicians need to be able to click on the specific heatmap to view the days related to the visit. Also, specific search options, such as using a text search, can help clinicians. Many EHRs already have text search options. Previous studies have used heatmaps mostly for understanding multidimensional genomics datasets (Gu, Eils, & Schlesner, 2016; Rahman et al., 2017; Ramírez, Dündar, Diehl, Grüning, & Manke, 2014; Shen, Olshen, & Ladanyi, 2009; Zhu et al., 2009). However, using a heatmap to visualize this unstructured text from clinical notes is a new concept introduced in this study.

In this study, the research team has created a heatmap of a single patient visit using qualitative content-coding and operationalizing the clinical complexity model. Future software or algorithms using machine learning and artificial intelligence can learn the content-coding process and automate the visualization process to create the heatmaps. Such a process can help not only clinicians but also patients who want to make sense of information in their health records. In the current age of health information digitization, meaningful and life-saving relevant information must be at the fingertips of clinicians at the point of care. Future studies with actual EHR data can further validate the process outlined in this study.

The study has several limitations. Researchers created the heatmap based on deidentified data from Neehr Perfect®. Data in the real world may be missing data points and may create more noise in the heatmap. Also, the heatmap was not validated by clinicians for usefulness. However, the assumption is that clinicians will benefit from such visualization-based decision support within the EHR. In this study, the research team did not do any usability evaluations of the heatmap visualization to understand how clinicians may perceive such tools. The heatmap was enthusiastically received by most of the providers, but it is not known how well it will be integrated within the clinical workflow. The manual coding may have introduced another form of bias. However, to reduce this bias, two distinct coders coded independently, and the inter-rater reliability was high.

5 CONCLUSIONS

The large amount of unstructured text data in the EHR provides a challenge for clinicians to focus on the information necessary for diagnosis and optimal therapy options. In this study, we used qualitative content-coding to visualize progress notes information to focus on patient visits that have crucial information. Using a clinical complexity model in this study, the research team visualized unstructured data from the EHR. By focusing and shifting attention for providers to the right information, the heatmap visualization technique may have the potential to reduce providers' cognitive fatigue and information overload. Future research into creating a machine learning approach to automate this process can support and operationalize big data in healthcare.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by an internal grant from Western University of Health Sciences, College of Pharmacy.

REFERENCES

Ben-Assuli, O., Shabtai, I., & Leshno, M. (2013). EHR at emergency rooms: Exploring the influence of main components on main complaints. *Procedia Technology*, *9*, 1016–1021. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.protcy.2013.12.113

Berner, E. S. (2009). Diagnostic error in medicine: Introduction. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, *14*(1 SUPPL), 1–5.

Carroll, L. N., Au, A. P., Detwiler, L. T., Fu, T. C., Painter, I. S., & Abernethy, N. F. (2014). Visualization and analytics tools for infectious disease epidemiology: A systematic review. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, *51*, 287–298. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2014.04.006

Carter, A. J., Davis, K. A., Evans, L. V., & Cone, D. C. (2009). Information loss in emergency medical services handover of trauma patients. *Prehospital Emergency Care*, *13*(3), 280–285. https://doi.org/10.1080/10903120802706260

Clark, J. (2003). How to peer review a qualitative manuscript. *Peer Review in Health Sciences*, *2*, 219–235.

EHR Go. (2019. Web Version). Retrieved September 25, 2019, from https://web21.ehrgo.com/auth/login

Elliott, A. F., Davidson, A., Lum, F., Chiang, M. F., Saaddine, J. B., Zhang, X., … Chou, C. F. (2012). Use of electronic health records and administrative data for public health surveillance of eye health and vision-related conditions in the United States. *American Journal of Ophthalmology*, *154*(6 Suppl), S63-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2011.10.002

Gu, Z., Eils, R., & Schlesner, M. (2016). Complex heatmaps reveal patterns and correlations in multidimensional genomic data. *Bioinformatics*, *32*(18), 2847–2849.

Haney, W., Russell, M., Gulek, C., & Fierros, E. (1998). Drawing on education: Using student drawings to promote middle school improvement. *Schools in the Middle*, *7*(3), 38–43.

Hersh, W. R. (2014). Healthcare data analytics. *Health informatics: practical guide for healthcare and information technology professionals (6th ed.)*. Pensacola, FL: Lulu.com.

Huang, J. S., Tobin, A., & Tompane, T. (2012). Clinicians poorly assess health literacy–related readiness for transition to adult care in adolescents with inflammatory bowel disease. *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology*, *10*(6), 626–632. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2012.02.017

Islam, R., Weir, C., & Del Fiol, G. (2014). Heuristics in Managing Complex Clinical Decision Tasks in Experts' Decision Making. *IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics. IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics*, *2014*, 186–193. doi:10.1109/ICHI.2014.32

Islam, R., Mayer, J., & Clutter, J. (2016). Supporting novice clinicians cognitive strategies: System design perspective. In *2016 IEEE-EMBS International Conference on Biomedical and Health Informatics (BHI)* (pp. 509-512). IEEE.

Islam, R., Weir, C., & Del Fiol, G. (2016). Clinical complexity in medicine: A measurement model of task and patient complexity. *Methods of Information in Medicine*, *55*(1), 14–22. https://doi.org/10.3414/ME15-01-0031

Islam, R., Weir, C., Jones, M., Del Fiol, G., & Samore, M. (2015). Understanding complex clinical reasoning in infectious diseases for improving clinical decision support design. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision-Making*, *15*(1), 101. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-015-0221-z

Klimov, D., Shahar, Y., & Taieb-Maimon, M. (2010). Intelligent visualization and exploration of time-oriented data of multiple patients. *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, *49*(1), 11–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artmed.2010.02.001

Kwekkeboom, K. L., Abbott-Anderson, K., & Wanta, B. (2010). Feasibility of a patient-controlled cognitive-behavioral intervention for pain, fatigue, and sleep disturbance in cancer. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, *37*(3), E151-9. https://dx.doi.org/10.1188%2F10.ONF.E151-E159

Lanham, H. J., Sittig, D. F., Leykum, L. K., Parchman, M. L., Pugh, J. A., & McDaniel, R. R. (2014). Understanding differences in electronic health record (EHR) use: Linking individual physicians' perceptions of uncertainty and EHR use patterns in ambulatory care. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, *21*(1), 73–81.

Liu, P., & Li, Z. (2012). Task complexity: A review and conceptualization framework. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, *42*(6), 553–568. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ergon.2012.09.001

Mandl, K. D. (2014). Ebola in the United States: Ehrs as a public health tool at the point of care. *JAMA*, *312*(23), 2499-2500. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2014.15064

Medford-Davis, L., Park, E., Shlamovitz, G., Suliburk, J., Meyer, A. N., & Singh, H. (2015). Diagnostic errors related to acute abdominal pain in the emergency department. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, *33*(4), 253-259. https://doi.org/10.1136/emermed-2015-204754

Rahman, M., MacNeil, S. M., Jenkins, D. F., Shrestha, G., Wyatt, S. R., McQuerry, J. A., Bild, A. H. (2017). Activity of distinct growth factor receptor network components in breast tumors uncovers two biologically relevant subtypes. *Genome Medicine*, *9*(1), 40. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13073-017-0429-x

Rahman, M. R. D. (2016). *Do pharmacists want to miss the boat again in informatics?* Presented at the Bangladesh-American Pharmacists Association Annual Convention. Ellenville, NY.

Ramírez, F., Dündar, F., Diehl, S., Grüning, B. A., & Manke, T. (2014). deepTools: A flexible platform for exploring deep-sequencing data. *Nucleic Acids Research*, *42*(W1), W187–W191.

Roosan, D., Del Fiol, G., Butler, J., Livnat, Y., Mayer, J., Samore, M., Weir, C. (2016). Feasibility of population health analytics and data visualization for decision support in the infectious diseases domain. A pilot study. *Applied Clinical Informatics*, *7*(2), 604–623. https://doi.org/10.4338/ACI-2015-12-RA-0182

Roosan, D., Samore, M., Jones, M., Livnat, Y., & Clutter, J. (2016). Big-data based decision-support systems to improve clinicians' cognition. *2016 IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI)*, 285–288. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICHI.2016.39

Roosan, D., Law, A. V., Karim, M., & Roosan, M. (2019). Improving team-based decision-making using data analytics and informatics: Protocol for a collaborative decision support design. *JMIR Research Protocols*, *8*(11), e16047. https://doi.org/10.2196/16047

Roosan, D., Li, Y., Law, A., Truong, H., Karim, M., Chok, J., & Roosan, M. (2019). Improving medication information presentation through interactive visualization in mobile apps: Human factors design. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*, *7*(11), e15940. https://doi.org/10.2196/15940

Roosan, D., Weir, C., Samore, M., Jones, M., Rahman, M., Stoddard, G. J., & Del Fiol, G. (2016.). Identifying complexity in infectious diseases inpatient settings: An observation study. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2016.10.018

Saber Tehrani, A. S., Lee, H., Mathews, S. C., Shore, A., Makary, M. A., Pronovost, P. J., & Newman-Toker, D. E. (2013). 25-Year summary of US malpractice claims for diagnostic errors 1986-2010: An analysis from the National Practitioner Data Bank. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, *22*(8), 672–680. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2012-001550

Schaink, A. K., Kuluski, K., Lyons, R. F., Fortin, M., Jadad, A. R., Upshur, R., & Wodchis, W. P. (2012). A scoping review and thematic classification of patient complexity: offering a unifying framework. *Journal of comorbidity*, *2*(1), 1-9

Shen, R., Olshen, A. B., & Ladanyi, M. (2009). Integrative clustering of multiple genomic data types using a joint latent variable model with application to breast and lung cancer subtype analysis. *Bioinformatics*, *25*(22), 2906–2912.

Shneiderman, B., Plaisant, C., & Hesse, B. W. (2013). Improving healthcare with interactive visualization. *Computer*, *46*(5), 58–66.

Stemler, S. (2001). An overview of content analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, *7*(17), 137–146.

Thyvalikakath, T. P., Dziabiak, M. P., Johnson, R., Torres-Urquidy, M. H., Acharya, A., Yabes, J., & Schleyer, T. K. (2014). Advancing cognitive engineering methods to support user interface design for electronic health records. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, *83*(4), 292–302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2014.01.007

Ulmer, C., McFadden, B., & Nerenz, D. R. (2009). Improving data collection across the health care system. In C. Ulmer, B. McFadden, & D.R. Nerenz (Eds.), *Race, Ethnicity, and Language Data: Standardization for Health Care Quality Improvement*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Zhu, J., Sanborn, J. Z., Benz, S., Szeto, C., Hsu, F., Kuhn, R. M., Esserman, L. J. (2009). The UCSC cancer genomics browser. *Nature Methods*, *6*(4), 239.