

## **Meeting MIE2008 Gothenburg EFMI &IMIA WG Evaluation 27 May 2008-05-27**

Jan Talmon, Jytte Brender, Pyrkko Nykanen, Nicolette de Keizer  
Elske Ammenwerth (with apologies)

### *In general*

The WG meeting was very successful with more than 60 attendees and active participation of some of them. A list with names and email addresses is collected by Jan. Attendees were enthusiastic about STARE-HI and GEP-HI and some of them already use STARE-HI e.g. for supervising Master theses. This document briefly summarized the remarks from the audience which mainly address GEP-HI. At the end of this document the discussed actions for the coming year are described.

### *Comments on GEP-HI*

1. The question was raised whether GEP-HI pays attention to ethical aspects and especially the need for approval of a medical ethical committee (MEC) before performing an evaluation study, e.g. a DSS. Jytte and Jan answered that most of the time we are observing users not patients and the effect of the IS is an intermediate effect through the physician. Pyrkko added that in Finland you need approval of the MEC even when you just observe users of an IS. GEP-HI is a list of items that need attention to prepare and design an evaluation study and therefore the ethical issues are mentioned in the primary design of the study. We discussed that there are differences between countries in the need for an approval of the MEC and this should be addressed in the elaboration paper of GEP-HI. Ethical aspects of performing HI evaluation might be a subject to work on in the future.
2. The question was raised whether legal aspects about the system's use and the results of the evaluation is described in GEP-HI. It was explained by the editorial team that in the exploration phase you should get a clear and written agreement of the all stakeholders (but at least the systems vendor and the organizations management) that the results of the evaluation can be published. Hence, you have to take care that the person who signs the agreement is the one with the right authority. Jan added that researchers need to publish their results and therefore if the vendor does not want to have the results published they have to pay a lot of money to compensate that someone else of the research department can do another study that can be published.
3. Once again the aspects of ethical rules for doing evaluations was addressed. Some evaluation can have a tremendous effect on some stakeholders but it might also be possible that the results are not so relevant for a specific group of stakeholders. In medicine there is the declaration of Helsinki about what is allowed and what is not concerning patients data. Something similar might be relevant for HI evaluation.
4. The question was raised that different stakeholders can have different interests and aspects wanted to be evaluated. The editorial team explained that this is no problem during the phase of study exploration. However at the end there should be an agreement what the evaluation study will investigate and so in the first

- study design there should be an agreement on the ultimate evaluation goal and the aspects to be evaluated to reach this goal.
5. Some comments were made about the figure described in GEP-HI describing the different phases and their interaction. It was clear from these comments that the audience think that this is a linear process while other evaluation approach might be more iterative. It should be made clear in GEP-HI that evaluation can be iterative (especially in formative evaluations and qualitative analyses) but in these case the iterative character of the evaluation study should be described in the exploration phase. Otherwise each phase in GEP-HI should be finished with a resulting product (e.g. report with decisions about the study) that will be the input for the next phase.
  6. The question was raised how to deal with the dynamics of an evaluation project. It might be possible that a project start on indication of 1 party ( e.g. a governmental body) but then evolve to another direction with many other stakeholders. This is something that should be described in the risk analyses during the primary design of the study.
  7. The relation between project management and GEP-Hi was addressed. It have to be clear that you always have to follow the regular project management rules and integrate GEP-HI into this. GEP-HI is not a replacement for regular project management.

#### *Other business than GEP-HI*

There was a discussion whether STARE-HI is broad enough or too broad to cover specific evaluation types such as usability studies. The overall opinion is that STARE-HI was broad enough to cover all kind of evaluation studies but in the elaboration paper we could pay attention to those aspects (e.g. methods) that need additional issues for specific evaluation studies. Another option would be to have a STARE-HI extension for e.g. usability studies comparable to CONSORT for clustered RCTs in addition to regular CONSORT.

There was a question whether STARE-HI fits to the reporting of meta-analyses in HI evaluation. Meta-analyses in HI evaluation is an interesting area for the future for the WG.

Selected future actions:

- Finish STARE-HI and get it published
- Elaboration paper on STARE-HI
- Continue work on GEP-HI