# Beyond Diagnosis: Remediation Strategies for Clinical Reasoning

Presented by: Sarah Vick, MD Megan Wolak, MD

## Objectives

- Diagnose the clinical reasoning domain of concern
- Develop remediation strategies based on domain
- Apply remediation framework to struggling learners

Starting 1<sup>st</sup> day with a new learner

Your colleague told you that this learner really struggles and good luck

"This learner is clueless. He never knows what is going on. His presentations are terrible. I am just done."

You are now left unsure of what to do next....



# **Key Elements in Clinical Reasoning**



Adapted from Bowen, NEJM 2006









## **Right Answer**



# Right Reasoning

### "Read More"



## Knowledge Organization

### So how do doctors think?

### Exhaustive method

Gather every bit of data possible, don't miss a thing! Then try to come up with a diagnosis

### Pattern recognition

Know it when you see it--you've seen it before

### **Hypothesis generation**

Propose an explanatory hypothesis--see if it "fits" the story. Revise as you go along



### Clinical Reasoning Process From Symptoms to Diagnosis



#### Primary Problem

#### Lack of elaboration of primary problem

Major Symptoms

Hypothesis-driven data gathering and premature closure

Limited exploration of other signs or symptoms





ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_ DATE\_\_\_\_\_

DX: hypothesis generation and premature closure

Tx: \_\_\_





1+ LE edema

+ tobacco

### Biases



#### Remediation Strategy

#### Primary Problem

Hypothesis-driven data gathering and premature closure Observe or role play a clinical encounter

Review documentation

Essential Tasks		Assessment of Behaviors		
Learner Function	Specified Task	Instructions: Circle the box corresponding to the learner's observed behavior		
Collecting Data gathering recognition of urgent or emergent clinical scenario	<ul> <li>Collect/Report history and exam data in hypothesis-directed manner</li> <li>Recognize patient and disease specific factors as potential etiologies of decompensation</li> <li>Recognize severity of clinical problem and contextual signs of urgency or emergency</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Non-focused history and exam</li> <li>Included extraneous information</li> <li>Missed key findings</li> <li>Did not recognize contextual clues of urgency</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>History and exam reflect potential diagnoses</li> <li>Limited recognition of urgent contextual clues</li> <li>Included limited pertinent positive and negative findings</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Logical history and exam for potential diagnoses</li> <li>Questions assessed likelihood of specific diagnoses</li> <li>Full recognition of urgency contextual clues</li> <li>Prioritization on pertinent positive and negative findings</li> </ul>

Direct Observation



## Role Play

- Act out history
- Discuss physical exam features
- Prioritize a differential



### Documentation

Rate the quality of each section of the written note based on the extent to which defined elements are present

1 = minimal to no elements

2 = some to many elements

3= most or all elements

WRITTEN HISTORY Detailed history of presenting illness							
Defined as including a complete description of the complaint(s) such as location, quality, severity, duration, timing, radia aggravate or alleviate symptoms	tion, fa	actors that	t)				
	1	2	3				
Descriptive history of presenting illness							
Defined by use of semantic and descriptive vocabulary such as acute or chronic, sharp or dull, continuous or intermittent		-					
	1	2	3				
Chronologic history of presenting illness			ĺ				
Defined as telling a clear story that flows logically	1	2	2				
Contextualized history of presenting illness	1	4	2				
Contextualized history of presenting liness Defined by identification and inclusion of key findings from past, family and social history and relevant other symptoms that might otherwise							
belong in fater portions of the comprehensive mistory	1	2	3				
Complete comprehensive history		-	-				
Defined as a complete past, family, and social histories and complete review of systems	1	2	3				
WRITTEN PHYSICAL EXAMINATION FINDINGS							
Complete physical examination	1	2	3				
Defined as documenting a comprehensive examination			82				
Key physical examination findings Defined as including an even that highlights the absence and presence of key even findings, as suggested by the diagnost	1 tic por	2 ssibilities	3				
benned as menduing an exam that ingringhts the absence and presence of key exam midnigs, as suggested by the diagnos	sue pos	saturnes					

Remediation in Medical Education. 2014 Baker. Teaching & Learning in Medicine. 2015.



Recognize and	Coaching and	Application and	
diagnose	practice	review	
Hypothesis generation Premature closure	Direct observation Role play	Leading and prioritized ddx Key features for	
	Assign written cases	comparisons Review documentation	



DX: hypothesis generation and premature closure

Tx:

Meet with Dr. Vick to role play the last 2 patients seen in clinic Assign 2 cases/week to foster systemic generation of ddx Provide prompts to apply to cases and bring in 2 cases to review together







#### **Primary Problem**

#### Problem generating an assessment

Major Symptoms

Inadequate problem representation or patient abstraction

Problem developing a differential diagnosis

### **Problem Representation**

- Summary of the clinical picture
- Becomes more and more detailed as additional data is collected



### Identifying Differentiating & Key Features

Clues that can help generate a differential diagnosis and distinguish between diseases with shared characteristics



### Semantic Qualifiers



### **Unpaired**

- Location
- Pattern
- Association

### Semantic Qualifiers: Diarrhea





DX: prioritization of key features (problem representation)

Tx:



#### Remediation Strategy

Guide development and evolution of the problem representation

#### **Primary Problem**

Inadequate problem representation or patient abstraction

> Reinforce connections and integration of data

> > Remediation in Medical Education. 2014

# Development and evolution of the problem representation

- Buy a qualifier
  - Buy 2 semantic features
  - Discriminating factors
- Reverse presentations (ASOAP)
  - Assessment first
  - Presentation justifies assessment



### Reinforce connections and integration of data

- One Minute Preceptor
- SNAPPS
- IDEA (notes)
- Scaffolding
- Contrasting cases
- Asking "why"

One Minute Preceptor Model

- 1. Ask questions to get a commitment
- 2. Ask questions to get justification
- 3. Provide a brief teaching point
- 4. Provide reinforcing feedback
- 5. Provide constructive feedback



### Reinforce connections and integration of data

- One Minute Preceptor
- SNAPPS
- IDEA (notes)
- Scaffolding
- Contrasting cases
- Asking "why"

Please rate the skills this student documented in this patient note:

#### Reporting skills (based on Written History and Physical Exam Findings)

- Early: includes some important elements of history, exam, and test findings (1 point)
- Good: includes many important elements of history, exam, and test findings (2 points)
- Excellent: includes nearly all or all important elements of history, exam, and test findings (3 points)

#### Diagnostic reasoning skills (based on Written Assessment)

- Early: errors in diagnostic accuracy OR limited explanation of reasoning OR errors in reasoning (1 point)
- Good: commits to at least one pertinent diagnosis, accurately defines epidemiology and key features of diagnosis and compares to the patient's history, exam, and test findings (2 points)
- Excellent: includes complete, pertinent differential diagnosis, commits to most likely diagnosis, accurately defines epidemiology and key features of most likely diagnosis and alternative diagnoses, and compares/contrasts with the patient's history, exam, and test findings (3 points)

#### Decision making skills (based on Written Plan)

- Early: *lists* diagnostic testing and treatment plans (1point)
- Good: uses sound reasoning to support some diagnostic testing and treatment plans (2 points)
- Excellent: uses evidence to support most important diagnostic testing and treatment plans, considers patient preferences (if applicable) (3 points)

### **Reinforce connections** and integration of data

- One Minute Preceptor
- SNAPPS
- IDEA (notes)
- Scaffolding
- Contrasting cases
- Asking "why"



Key features	Crohn's disease	Ulcerative colitis	
Location			
Upper parts of GIT	Rarely	Never	
Distal Ileum	Very common	Never	
Colon	Common	Always	
Rectum	Rarely	Never	
Signs and symptoms	Pain in the lower	Pain in the lower left	
	right abdomen,	abdomen, diarrhea,	
	swelling, thickening	weight loss, rectal	
	of the bowel wall	bleeding	

Abbreviation: GIT, gastrointestinal tract. https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Comparison-of-key-features-in-Crohns-disease-and-ulcerative-colitis\_tbl1\_264433805


Recognize and diagnose	Coaching and practice	Application and review
Prioritization of key	Case summaries with	Commit to leading dx
features	semantic qualifiers	Reverse presentations
		OMP or SNAAPS
Develop and refine a	Utilize cases to develop a	
problem representation	problem representation,	Review documentation
	provide new data and	
	refine	



DX: prioritization of key features (problem representation)

Tx:

Meet with Dr. Wolak to review this weeks H&Ps; review PR's and refine them

Assign cases from Frameworks of Internal Medicine to develop PR's

Utilize ASOAP on rounds

REFILL 0 1 2 4 5 PRN





#### **Primary Problem**

#### Problem developing a differential diagnosis

Major Symptoms

Problem gathering and reporting relevant data Ineffective development or storage of illness scripts

Remediation in Medical Education. 2014

### Organizing Knowledge

What are the **key features** from the history and PE?

- Tempo/course of the CC/HPI
- Age, exposures, other risk factors
- Key findings

Recognize pertinent positive AND negative findings

Can the patient's illness be characterized as a particular 'syndrome'?

### Lump or Split



How will we discern that THIS is the problem?

### Lump or Split

VS

#### Symptoms and Signs

- 1. Fever
  - Differential...
- 2. RUQ pain
  - Differential...
- 3. Jaundice
  - Differential...

#### Symptoms and Signs

1. Fever + RUQ pain + jaundice

• Differential...

### Illness script scanning

#### **Information from your patient**



#### Prioritizing the Differential Diagnosis



How will we discern that THIS is the problem?

Weinstein et al. MedEdPORTAL. 2017. https://doi.org/10.15766/mep\_2374-8265.10650

### The Working Diagnosis

The one *most likely* at a given point in the data gathering process.



*Is the learner changing the working dx* as *new information is obtained?* (new symptoms, exam findings, or study results inconsistent with previous working dx)

#### Adjusting the Working Diagnosis





 NAME
 \_\_\_\_\_\_ AGE

 ADDRESS
 \_\_\_\_\_\_ DATE

DX: synthesis of data and seeing the "big picture"

Tx: \_\_\_\_



Essential Tasks		Assessment of Behaviors		
Learner Function	Specified Task	Instructions: Circle the box corresponding to the learner's observed behavior		
<ul> <li>Interpreting</li> <li>Diagnostic reasoning         <ul> <li>differential diagnosis</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Generate prioritized differential diagnosis of most likely, less likely, unlikely in urgent clinical situations</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Differential diagnosis missing likely or "can't miss" diagnoses in urgent situations</li> <li>Includes inappropriate diagnoses</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Differential diagnosis included likely and "can't miss" diagnoses in urgent situations but missed key diagnoses</li> <li>Inappropriate rank-order of diagnoses</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Accurately ranked differential diagnosis including key, likely, and "can't miss" diagnoses in urgent situations</li> <li>Prioritized urgent diagnoses appropriately</li> </ul>



## Direct Observation

# Development and evolution of the illness script

- Highlighting exercise
  - Discriminating factors

- Persuade MD
  - 30 seconds to convince MD of diagnosis

A 34-year-old woman with a history of hyperthyroidism, untreated for the past 5 years, presented to the Emergency Department via EMS with the chief complaint of dyspnea with palpitations. On review of systems, she did endorse loose stools. She denied taking daily medications.

Physical examination revealed: BP 150/78 mmHg; HR 130-170 beats/min; Temperature 36.7 C; respiratory rate 24 breaths/min; and SpO2 100% on room air. The patient was alert and oriented, but hyperactive and with an anxious affect. She repeatedly requested to leave her stretcher and was found pacing back and forth to the bathroom. She was tremulous, with no focal neurologic deficits. With the exception of tachycardia, the cardiovascular exam was within normal limits. Lungs were clear to auscultation. The skin was of normal color. Bowel sounds were hyperactive, but the abdomen was non-tender to palpation.

Her initial EKG revealed sinus tachycardia at 170 beats/min that improved to 140 beats/min following lorazepam 1 mg IV for anxiety.



# Development and evolution of the illness script

• Illness script exercises

Diagnosis:			
Epi/ Risk Factors:			
HPI:			
Exam:			
Testing:			

	Abrupt onset	Prior URI	Severe pain	Normal CBC	Total
Transient hip synovitis	0	+	-	++	++
Septic arthritis	++	0	++	-	+++
Reactive arthritis	0	0	+	0	+
Leukemia		-	+		

# Development and evolution of the illness script

## Chart Stimulate Recall

- Uncertainty due to incomplete/conflicting information
  - History unclear or discordant
  - Another physician/consultant
  - Labs/imaging
- Diagnostic reasoning uncertainty
  - Lump or split?
  - Severe or "can't miss" diagnoses
  - Complex case
  - No clear illness script

Mutter et al. JGIM. 2022 Philibert. JGME. 2018 Schipper. Canadian FM. 2010 ACGME CSR Documents



Recognize and	Coaching and	Application and
diagnose	practice	review
Synthesis of data	Highlighting exercises Chart stimulated recall	Framework for uncertainty/conflicting
Inability to make		information
connections to see the	Utilize cases to develop	Documentation review
"big picture"	and refine illness scripts	



DX: synthesis of data and seeing the "big picture"

Tx:

Meet with Dr. Vick to elaborate illness scripts and play persuade MD

Assign 2 cases per week with key features highlighted and be prepared to discuss reasoning

Provide and bring in 2 recent admissions H&P notes for chart stimulated recall

REFILL 0 1 2 4 5 PRN

#### Case 4







Inability to articulate or justify a plan



How will we discern that THIS is the problem?

### Threshold to Test & Threshold to Treat



#### Threshold to Test & Threshold to Treat





ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_\_ AGE \_\_\_\_\_

DX: elaborating a management plan

Tx: \_\_\_\_



#### Primary Problem

Guide development of treatment plans

Remediation

Strategy

Ineffective development of management plans

> Guide development of contingency plans

Essential Tasks		Assessment of Behaviors		
Learner Function	Specified Task	Instructions: Circle the box corresponding to the learner's observed behavior		
Managing <ul> <li>Management reasoning</li> <li>initial management</li> <li>option selection</li> <li>response to dynamic</li> <li>information</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Direct evaluation and treatment towards high priority diagnoses</li> <li>Initiate management in patient with urgent decompensation</li> <li>Recognize need to escalate patient care</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Directed evaluation and treatment toward unlikely/unimportant diagnoses</li> <li>Did not evaluate or treat most likely urgent diagnoses</li> <li>Did not evaluate for response to initial management plan</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Major focus of evaluation and treatment on likely and urgent diagnoses</li> <li>Included non-essential testing</li> <li>Evaluated for response to initial management plan</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Efficiently directed management towards most likely and urgent diagnoses</li> <li>Deferred tests directed towards less likely or less important diagnoses</li> <li>Evaluated for response to initial interventions</li> </ul>

## Direct Observation



# **Development of plans (and contingency plans)**

### Chart Stimulate Recall

- Uncertainty due to incomplete/conflicting information
  - History unclear or discordant
  - Another physician/consultant
  - Labs/imaging
- Diagnostic reasoning uncertainty
  - Lump or split?
  - Severe or "can't miss" diagnoses
  - Complex case
  - No clear illness script

#### Management Uncertainty

- Diagnostic uncertainty  $\rightarrow$  Treat or not?
- Risk/benefit of management decisions
- Adverse outcome reviews

Mutter et al. JGIM. 2022 Philibert. JGME. 2018 Schipper. Canadian FM. 2010 ACGME CSR Documents

# **Development of plans (and contingency plans)**

#### Consider alternative Dx

- Diagnostic "timeout"
- Reconsider data

# Reflect on expected course

- Is it following that?
- What to do if not?

#### Delineate next steps

- What if "X" happens?
- How will change plan?



Recognize and diagnose	Coaching and practice	Application and review
Elaborating a management plan	Direct observation Chart stimulated recall	Give a commitment Script anticipated outcome and contingency plan



DX: elaborating a management plan

Tx:

Meet with Dr. Wolak to review 2 recent patient notes (admission or new patient in clinic)

Assign 2 cases per week with cases with decision points and have them bring a plan and contingency plan

Bring in literature to support contrasting management plans for 2 cases

REFILL 0 1 2 4 5 PRN

#### Case 5





#### Primary Problem

#### Remediation Strategy



#### Where to start when there are LOTS of concerns?

- Lowest level
- Only 2-3 things at a time

• Longer course




Recognize and diagnose	Coaching and practice	Application and review
Multiple domains	Direct observation Role play	Leading and prioritized ddx
Start at the lowest – hypothesis generation	Assigned written cases to foster systemic generation of ddx	Key features for comparisons Review documentation



• DX: Multidomain

Lowest: hypothesis generation and premature closure

- Tx:
- Meet with Dr. Vick to role play the last 2 patients seen in clinic
- Assign 2 cases/week to foster systemic generation of ddx
- Provide prompts to apply to cases and bring in 2 cases to review together
- Frequent follow up

# Take home points

• Ensure you have the right diagnosis

- Craft a remediation plan to match the clinical reasoning domain
- Multi-domain or unsure where to start – work up the pyramid







### References



# Frameworks for INTERNAL MEDICINE

#### ANDRÉ M. MANSOOR



#### **MedEdPORTAL workshops with cases**:

Weinstein A, Pinto-Powell R. Introductory Clinical Reasoning

- Weinstein A, Gupta S, Pinto-Powell R, Jackson J, Appel J, Roussel D, Daniel M. Diagnosing and Remediating Clinical Reasoning Difficulties: A Faculty Development Workshop. 2017;13:10650. <u>https://doi.org/10.15766/mep</u> 2374-8265.10650
- Levin M, Cennimo D, Chen S, Lamba S. Teaching Clinical Reasoning to Medical Students: A Case-Based Illness Script Worksheet Approach.

2016;12:10445. <u>https://doi.org/10.15766/mep\_2374-</u> 8265.10445

 Battista A, Konopasky A, Ramani D, Ohmer M, Mikita J, Howle A, Krajnik S, Torre D, Durning SJ. Clinical Reasoning in the Primary Care Setting: Two Scenario-Based Simulations for Residents and Attendings. 2018;14:10773. <u>https://doi.org/10.15766/mep</u>

2374-8265.10773