An Expert System For The Prediction Of Outcome In Gastrointestinal Haemorrhage

Ng Geok Hoon¹, Fong San Nee¹, Thio Seng Joo¹, Ong Lean Suan¹,

Melvin Look², A. Vijayan² and Tan Yah Yuen²

¹Institute of Systems Science, National University of Singapore,

25 Heng Mui Keng Terrace, Singapore 119615

email: khjane@singnet.com.sg,snhen@pacific.net.sg,thiosg@pacific.net.sg, leansuan@iss.nus.edu.sg

²Department of General Surgery, Tan Tock Seng Hospital,

11 Jalan Tan Tock Seng, Singapore 308433 email: Melvin_Look, Vijayan_A, Yah_Yuen_Tan@notes.ttsh.gov.sg

ABSTRACT

Acute Upper Gastrointestinal Bleeding (AUGIB) requires immediate, urgent attention. Accurately predicting the outcome of a patient with AUGIB allows a doctor to decide on the appropriate treatment, which range from medication and endoscopy to surgery. The 'traditional' means of predicting outcome is through mathematical and statistical models. A decision support tool, built using the case-based reasoning approach, however, has a built-in degree of flexibility and offers an intuitive attraction to its users since it utilizes past learned experiences. This paper describes such a tool, its knowledge base structure, the nearest neighbour matching and retrieval of past cases that best match the profile of a new case and the future potential of a system 'intelligently' monitoring and managing patients dynamically.

Index terms - Case-based reasoning, gastrointestinal bleeding, prediction.

I INTRODUCTION

Acute Upper Gastrointestinal Bleeding (AUGIB) accounts for a large number of all emergency admissions to a general hospital. Overall morbidity and mortality remains significant. The range of medical, endoscopic and surgical therapy available is wide and is often dependent on physician factors and availability of facilities and expertise. Therapeutic decision making is usually difficult and any error or delay may result in adverse outcomes.

Studies from specialist units have shown that management based on strict treatment protocols have resulted in improved outcomes. Moreover, many clinical and endoscopic factors have a value in predicting outcome, re-bleeding and requirement for surgery[1,2]. These allow a more rationale treatment based on a defined approach. Many systems have been described which utilise risk scoring based on mathematical and statistical models[3, 4]. However, they are inflexible, lack clinical intuition and ability to utilise new learned experiences.

The deployment of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology in a medical domain is still largely limited. However, there is tremendous potential that someday AI technology will support the traditional statistical approach for the analysis of data from studies and clinical trials. An Expert System is able to reason and solve complex problems in a specialised domain. An AI approach known as Case Based Reasoning (CBR) is the main paradigm used in this system. CBR reasons from past cases to solve new problems and can learn by assimilation for future use[5,6]. Version 1 of the AUGIB expert system utilises CBR for the prediction of outcome in AUGIB, and version 2 is currently being developed to enhance the system further using other technologies such as rule-based reasoning. This will, in future, lead to a system which can not only dynamically monitor all patients but also provide powerful computer aided assessment and treatment.

II DOMAIN DESCRIPTION

The first step taken by a doctor in managing a patient presented with AUGIB is to assess his condition and taking necessary resuscitative measures to ensure that the patient is medically stable. Blood tests are taken promptly to assess the need for a blood transfusion. Once the patient's condition stabilises, the doctor will proceed to gather the patient's medical history and particulars (patient factors), and perform a physical examination and diagnostic endoscopy to establish the symptoms presented (disease factors). Based on the patient and disease factors, the doctor will assess the likely outcome of a patient's condition and decide on the appropriate treatment. Choices of treatment range from medication and endoscopy to surgery. Each day, as treatment is being administered, the patient's condition is monitored, and the outcome re-assessed. The management of an AUGIB patient is summarised in Figure 1.

While statistical scoring systems based on mathematical and statistical models are currently being used in the assessment of outcome, an approach using CBR may be more accurate and intuitive. This is because of the following characteristics of the AUGIB domain which makes CBR amenable to solving this problem:

- Domain is naturally case-oriented, with each patient admission treated as a case by itself.
- Similar problems have similar solutions. Patients showing the same symptoms and have similar medical histories and other characteristics may be prescribed the same treatment.
- Historical records exist. For each new case of AUGIB, there is a good chance that at least one sufficiently similar previous case exists from which a probable treatment can be applied.



Figure 1: Management of AUGIB patient

III THE EXPERT SYSTEM

This paper describes the design and development of an expert system for the prediction of outcome of patients with AUGIB. Essentially, the system predicts patient's outcome based on past cases of AUGIB patients who share similar profiles of patient and disease factors instead of using existing statistical scoring systems. With the information collected, the system selects from the casebase of past AUGIB patients, cases with profiles that best match the profile of the patient. From the selected list of past cases, the system estimates the patient's outcome; alternatively the doctor may choose to view records of these best matching cases, and use his own judgement to predict the patient's outcome.

A. Case Representation

Currently, a case in the system is represented by 86 fields pertaining to the patient's particulars, admission details, past history/co-morbidity, disease factors, symptoms, investigations, endoscopy (OGD) pathology, daily progress and outcome. Table 1 shows a sample list of fields captured and stored by the system. The fields marked with a $\sqrt{}$ are used as match fields. Not all these fields are used to represent the problem description and solution for a case, but are nevertheless captured to make the case extensible. While risk factors extracted from statistical systems are used as the starting point (see Table 2) the doctors working on this project have identified other key factors to be used for predicting outcome. Currently there are about 200 cases in the casebase, but the process of adding new cases is on-going.

Table 1: Fields captured and represented as a case; not all the fields are listed here

	[
Patient's particulars	Admission details
1) IC No	6) Ward class
2) Name	7) Admission date
3) Sex $$	8) Source of admission $$
4) Age $$	
5) Race $$	
Past history / co-morbidity	Disease factor
9) Previous GI bleed $\sqrt{10}$ Previous ulcer $\sqrt{10}$	27) Duration of symptoms (no. of days) $$
11) Previous gastric	
surgery √	Symptoms
12) NSAIDs $\sqrt{12}$	28) 11
13) ASpirin $\sqrt{14}$ Warfarin / anticoag $\sqrt{14}$	28) Haemalemesis $\sqrt{29}$ Coffee ground emesis $\sqrt{29}$
15) Steroids $$	30) Malaena hx /PR $$
16) Alcohol $$	31) Fresh blood on BO /PR $$
18) Liver disease /	32) NG fresh blood $$
cirrhosis √26)	
Investigation	OGD pathology (3 sets, ach for the
	first OGD, and subsequent OGD2 &
37) Prothrombin time /	<u>OGD3)</u>
partial thromboplastin time $\sqrt{2}$	
38) Platelets V	40 Esophagitis $$
	40) Esophagins $$
Endoscopic Stigmata of	Daily progress (value as per readings
Recent Haemorrhage (If ulcer)	recorded)
56) Active bleeding $$	62) Haemoglobin (for each day in
57) Adherent clot $\sqrt[7]{}$	the ward – max. of 14 days)
58) Visible vessel $$	63) Time (at A&E and admission;
59) Red spot $$	and for each day in the ward - 14
60) Blood in upper	days) 64) Plood prossure (same as Time)
61) Size of ulcer (measured	65) Pulse rate (same as Time)
in mm)	(sume us rine)
Outcome	Outcome
Endoscopic therapy 66) ENDOTY (first	Surgery (values are the day that
endoscopic therapy)	surgery is done)
67) ENDOTX2 (second	81) SX (first surgery)
endoscopic therapy)	82) SX2 (second surgery)
68) ENDOTX3 (third	83) SX3 (third surgery)
endoscopic therapy)	84) major morbidity / mortality
69) Blood transfusion (no.	85) day of discharge (day)
01 pints) 70) re-bleeding	(day) death (day)
80) unplanned repeat OGD	

Table 2: Sample of a scoring system

Risk Factors Associated with Stress Mucosal Bleeding in the						
ICU						
Ventilatory assistance > 24 hours' duration						
Shock (systolic BP $\leq 90 \text{ mm H}\sigma$)						
Shoek (systeme D1 <)0 min rig)						
Sepsis						
Myocardial infarction or congestive heart f	ailure					
Acute renal failure (creatinine > 3 mm/ dl	or BUN > 50 mm/					
dl)						
CNS injury						
Steroid administration						
Coagulopathy (platelet count <50 K or PT < 30% of						
control value)						
Bilirubin > 5 mm/ dl						
No. of Risk factors Incidence of						
	Bleeding					
0-2	11 %					
3-6 34 %						
> / 55 %						

B. System Architecture

The system is broadly divided into 3 separate modules – the system (or CBR) engine, the user interface and the casebase. The CBR engine is responsible for all processing required – search, match, compute, retrieve, add, delete, update, etc. The CBR engine is further divided into subsystems responsible for the following functions:

- Maintenance of the casebase stores and maintains records of existing AUGIB patients, system data and online help manuals;
- Search the case base, compute similarity scores and matching degrees (MD), select best-matching cases based on MD threshold, and compute predicted outcomes;
- Retrieve past cases from case base of AUGIB patients.

The user interface and CBR engine modules were implemented making use of distributed component technology, such that both modules can be developed, tested and enhanced without requiring much modification on the other module. A set of APIs serve as the 'contact' between the two components.

For future reuse of the same engine for other applications, the CBR engine has minimal knowledge of the problem domain; only the weights are domain dependent. Thus the CBR Engine provides a generic set of primitive functions and features, both for the manipulation of data during case retrieval and matching as well as for ease in redefining the case library to suit other applications. The user interface provides the standard facilities for the entry, retrieval and updating of a patient's record. For ease of data entry, checkboxes or menu selection list are predominant; monitors are provided to prompt user of erroneous data input and allow spontaneous corrections to be made. Users may view a summary of the retrieved cases, each with its respective outcomes, or the details of a retrieved case by clicking on that particular case in the summary list. The system will compute the patient's predicted outcome based on the set of retrieved cases, and displayed graphically as bar/pie charts. Doctors are able to revise the weights used in the CBR algorithm if the results presented do not agree with their own predictions. Once a patient is discharged, the system is able to confirm the completeness of the patient's records and prompts the user for its inclusion in the case base. To assist in the maintenance of the case base (such as removing obsolete cases) a statistical summary on case usage showing cases that were never retrieved is presented to allow the user to decide whether to remove these cases. Online user guidelines are available for guick references on the system usage. Some screen shots of the user interface are shown in Figure 2 below.

6 100	-			-		NEE
		Rading		1	Febrer	
	114	Parent	Pullada	Tago/ullar#g	Uplement of Stat	113
	11	1420534	10	By .	140	6.2
H E I	31	ATCH.	10	Ra .	140	1
2.01	1)	410391	14	84	10.	1.1
R L L	11	10001	16	Rei .	16	102
	2.1	40004	10	Ba	10.	10
	15	48501	10	Sec. 1	18-	1.1
-	7.6	LOYNEL	No.	Re .	The .	100
Time in a	31	601004	14	51	10	1.1
the later	11	1001034	in .	Re .	16	10
I have a l	310	10401	ie .	84	18.	1.1
and I	1.11	40405	ie.	101	19	6.0
Antes 1	11	1012102	16	No.	18-	N.1
I NAME I	ti.	adding.	14	- Ba	14	N.C.
Line I	11	NF0701E	10	84	14.	100
Votes I	11	ARCES.	10	- Bi.	16	10.0
I heat	H E	1000144	Ye :	51	No.	100
	111	100521	10	50	14	NO 1
	111	e1279/1	14	Re .	19	14
14	1000					1
						100

Figure 2: User Interface

C. Nearest Neighbour Matching

Eighty-six fields, which correspond to every patient and disease factors, are captured and represented as a case in the system. However, not all the fields are used for matching. Only the fields deemed useful for the prediction of outcome are used (but fields with no values are not used for matching) and weights indicating the relative importance of the fields are used to compute the similarity scores of the cases in the casebase, and the highest ranked cases retrieved. These are the cases deemed to be sufficiently similar to the input case. Final similarity score between two cases is given by computing the weighted average of the score of all fields.

For each field, depending on its type, one of the following computation methods is applied to obtain the field's similarity score:

¹ Extracted from Gastrointestinal Bleeding by Sugawa, Schuman and Lucas

- Match/No-match fields: For example, *Source, Race, Sex* and binary valued fields. These fields either match, for which the similarity score of 100 is assigned, or don't match, for which a score of 0 is given instead.
- Integer scoring: For example, *Class, Duration, Age, Investigations (PT/PTT, Platelets* and *Size if Ulcer)* Each field is assigned a new value based on the mean and standard deviation calculated for the field across the casebase. The similarity score is computed as:

100 - | (assigned value for input field) - (assigned value for the same field from a case in the casebase) |

• List scoring: For example, Symptoms, Past History, Investigations (OGD Pathology, ESRH if Ulcer)

> The similarity measure for list fields requires groupings of the values of each list field, and assigning hierarchical weights to each list field value.

> Consider the simplest method of one-to-one match for each value of the list fields, then:

Similarity score = 100 * (size of intersection)/(size of union)

This method cannot correctly compute the similarity of cases when there exist some values that are as important as others. For example, if *Esophagitis* is as important as *Mallory Weiss* in terms of judgement of severity and decision of treatment to be administered, then two cases, one with only *Esophagitis* and the other with only *Mallory Weiss* will be considered quite different which is erroneous.

This is solved by introducing the concept of groups. Size of intersection and size of union refers to groups instead of values. Thus in the example above, Esophagitis and Mallory Weiss belong to the same group, so size of intersection will be at least 1. The user has to indicate the groupings of values for each list field. With groupings, all values or groups are assumed to be of equal importance and are independent of each other. What if a certain combination of values or groups is very different in terms of treatment compared with other combinations? For example, if a test case contains values 1, 2 and 3. Matching two cases, one containing 1, 2 & 4, the other with 2, 3 & 4 returns the same similarity measure. So if a match of values 2 & 3 is much more important than a match of values 1 & 2, this method fails.

To resolve this, weights are introduced to each value or group, much like introducing weights to the fields of cases, at a micro-level. Thus the weights specified by the user is hierarchical – highest level weight to the list field itself relative to other fields in the cases plus lower level weight applicable to the individual value or group within each list field. A 'ROOT' variable is created to represent the total similarity score between two cases. The hierarchical grouping of the fields is partially shown in Figure 3.

But all the above remedies fall short of catering to field-to-field synergistic relationship. For example, cases with similar values in fields 1 & 2 may be more 'similar' than cases with similar values in fields 3 & 4, even though individually fields 1 & 2 are weighted less relative to fields 3 & 4. Specifying hierarchies of weights solves this problem. Say if two fields under the same hierarchy matches, the user specified higher-level weight is used to 'boost' or 'weaken' the similarity measure. The score for each field without sub-field, or sub-field without sub-sub-field is computed as follows:

Score = 100% - |Val_CaseB - Val_CaseA| / (Max Possible Val - 1)

Groupings can be assigned for lowest level fields that take *yes/no* as values. When this is the case, their values become the sum of the values of each of the constituent fields. Thus for a group of 3 sub-sub-fields, the Max_Possible_Val is 4 (i.e. 0, 1, 2 & 3), and the total number of sub-sub-fields within the same super-field will be changed from N to N - 2 for the purpose of computing the weighted average of the scores.

If the weight for a sub-sub-field is set, then the weight for its sub-field and field must also be set. Otherwise the weight set for the sub-sub-field will be ignored. If Groups of all sub-subfields are not defined (i.e. all sub-sub-fields belong to different Groups), then the weight for all sub-sub-fields under the same sub-field will be equal (i.e. weight has no effect). The score for each field with sub-fields, or sub-field with sub-sub-fields is computed by taking the weighted average of the scores of the sub-fields or sub-sub-fields. Table 3 illustrates the similarity score computation.



Figure 3: Hierarchical grouping of the fields

Σ/No Age AGE Integer in years C 45 71 2 Duration of Symptom DUR Integer in days 3 2 3 Disease Factor / Symptom Haamatemesis SYHAEM 1 1 2 4 Disease Factor / Symptom Haamatemesis SYHAEM 1. Yes, 2. No 1 1 2 6. Coffee ground emesis SYNALA 1. Yes, 2. No 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1		Field	Sub-Field	Sub-Sub-Field	Name in Code	Possible Values	Weight	Group	Case	Case	Score
EXNo AGE Integer in years (0 - 100) 45 71 2 Duration of Symptom DUR Integer in years (0 - 10) 3 2 3 Disease Factor / Symptom Barmatemesis SYNAEM 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1									10	20	
Z/NO near and any and any and any and any											
Age AGE Integer in years (0 - 100) AGE AGE AGE Integer in years (0 - 100) AGE AGE <th>0</th> <th></th>	0										
Age AGE Integer in years (0 - 10) AGE Integer in years (0 - 10) AGE Integer in dys (0 - 10) AGE AGE Integer in dys (0 - 10) AGE AGE Integer in dys (0 - 10) AGE											
2 Duration of Symptom DUR Integer in days (0-10) 3 2 3 Disease Factor / Symptom		Age			AGE	Integer in years			45	71	74%
2 Duration of symptom 00R Integer in days (0 - 10) 3 2 3 Disease Factor / Symptom 0 - <td< td=""><td></td><td>D</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>(0 – 100)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>		D				(0 – 100)					
3 Disease Factor / Symptom 0 00 0 0 a. Haematemesis SYHAEM 1. Yes, 2. No 1 1 2 2 1 b. Coffee ground emesis SYCOFF 1. Yes, 2. No 3 2 1 d. Fresh blood on BO/PR SYRABL 1. Yes, 2. No 3 2 2 e. NG fresh blood on BO/PR SYRABL 1. Yes, 2. No 5 2 2 f. Past History/Co-Morbidity 1. Yes, 2. No 6 1 1 2 2 d. Prev Gal Bleed PHGIBL 1. Yes, 2. No 1 1 2 2 g. Prev Ulcer PHGIBL 1. Yes, 2. No 1 1 2 2 2 g. Mariani/anicog PHASAL 1. Yes, 2. No 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		Duration of Symptom			DUR	Integer in days			3	2	90%
3. Lisease ractor / Symptom Haematemesis SYHAEM 1. Yes, 2. No 1 1 2 b. Coffee ground emesis SYCOFF 1. Yes, 2. No 2 2 1 c. Coffee ground emesis SYCOFF 1. Yes, 2. No 3 2 1 d. Fresh blood SYRALA 1. Yes, 2. No 4 2 2 2 e. Fresh blood SYRABL 1. Yes, 2. No 4 2 2 2 e. Epigastric pain SYPAIN 1. Yes, 2. No 6 1 1 2 d. Pest History/Co-Morbidity Free Gastric Surgery PHGIBL 1. Yes, 2. No 1 1 2 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>(0 – 10)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>500/</td></td<>						(0 – 10)					500/
d. Patrixermetimesis SYCOFF 1. Yes, 2. No 1		Disease Factor / Symptom						4		0	50%
b. Contegration emissis SYRUPF 1. Yes, 2. No 2 2 1 d. Fresh blood on BO/PR SYMALA 1. Yes, 2. No 3 2 1 d. Fresh blood on BO/PR SYMALA 1. Yes, 2. No 4 2 2 e. Epigastric pain SYNAIN 1. Yes, 2. No 6 1 1 4 Past History/Co-Morbidity Frev GI Bleed PHGIBL 1. Yes, 2. No 6 1 1 a. Prev Git Surgery PHGIBL 1. Yes, 2. No 1 1 2 2 b. Prev Gattic Surgery PHGIBSX 1. Yes, 2. No 3 2 2 2 c. NSAIDS PHNSAI 1. Yes, 2. No 3 2 2 2 d. NSAIDS PHASPR 1. Yes, 2. No 5 2 2 2 f. Warfanivanicoag PHSTER 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 2 f. Investigations			Haematemesis		STHAEM	1. Yes, 2. No		1	1	2	0%
d. Madaetia IuXPR STWRA 1. fes. 2. NO 3 2 1 d. Fresh blood on BO/PR SYNRBL 1. Yes, 2. NO 4 2 2 f. NG fresh blood SYNRBL 1. Yes, 2. NO 6 1 1 4 Past History/Co-Morbidity Prev G Bleed PHGIBL 1. Yes, 2. NO 1 1 2 a. Prev G Bleed PHGIBL 1. Yes, 2. NO 1 1 2 2 c. Prev Gastric Surgery PHGBL 1. Yes, 2. NO 1 1 2 2 c. NSAIDS PHNSAI 1. Yes, 2. NO 3 2 2 2 d. NSAIDS PHNSAI 1. Yes, 2. NO 6 2 2 2 d. NSAIDS PHASPR 1. Yes, 2. NO 6 2 2 2 d. Investigations PT/PTT PHASPR 1. Yes, 2. NO 6 2 2 d. Investigations <			Collee ground emesis		SYLOFF	1. Yes, 2. No		2	2	1	0%
Hest block Of BOPR STPRE 1. Fes. 2. No 4 2 2 RG fresh blocd STPRE 1. Yes. 2. No 6 1 1 1 4 Past History/Co-Morbidiy Prev Gl Bleed PHGIBL 1. Yes. 2. No 6 1 1 2 2 4. Past History/Co-Morbidiy Prev Gl Bleed PHGIBL 1. Yes. 2. No 1 1 2 2 2 a. Prev Gastric Surgery PHGASX 1. Yes. 2. No 3 2 2 2 d. Prev Gastric Surgery PHGASX 1. Yes. 2. No 4 2 2 2 d. Martanivanticoag PHNSAI 1. Yes. 2. No 4 2 2 2 g. Investigations PHASPR 1. Yes. 2. No 6 2 2 2 g. Investigations PT/PTT Not done, 1. Normal, 2. Low 7 2 2 d. Propertime Strends OGDPATH Normal, 2. Low 1 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1. Yes, 2. No</td> <td></td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0%</td>						1. Yes, 2. No		3	2	1	0%
i. Direst Dadu STRABL 1. Test, 2. NO 5 2 2 4. Past History/Co-Morbidity Prev Gi Bleed PHGIBL 1. Yes, 2. NO 6 1 1 a. Prev Gi Bleed PHGIBL 1. Yes, 2. NO 1 1 2 2 2 c. Prev Gi Bleed PHGIBL 1. Yes, 2. NO 2 2 2 2 c. Prev Gi Bleed PHGIBL 1. Yes, 2. NO 2			NC freeh bloed			1. Yes, 2. No		4	2	2	100%
4 Past History/Co-Morbidity Prev GI Bleed PHGIBL 1. Yes, 2. No 1 1 2 a, b, c, d, e, f, f Prev GI Bleed PHGIBL 1. Yes, 2. No 1 1 2 Prev Ulcer PHULCR PHGBSX 1. Yes, 2. No 2 2 2 d, e, f, f Aspirin PHASPR 1. Yes, 2. No 3 2 2 g Varfarin/anticoag PHMASPR 1. Yes, 2. No 4 2 2 g Steroids PHSTER 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 g Steroids PHSTER 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 g Investigations PT/PTT Not done, 1. Normal, 2. Low 7 2 2 g Investigations PT/PTT Not done, 1. Normal, 2. Low 1 1 1 g Investigations PT/PTT Not done, 1. Normal, 2. Low 1 1 1 g Intestigations PT/PT OGDPATH Intestig			Enigostria poin			1. Yes, 2. No		 	2	1	100%
A. Prev GI Bleed PHGIBL 1. Yes, 2. No 1 1 2 C. Prev Ulcer PHULCR 1. Yes, 2. No 2 2 2 C. Prev Gastric Surgery PHGASX 1. Yes, 2. No 3 2 2 Prev Gastric Surgery PHGASX 1. Yes, 2. No 4 2 2 Aspirin PHASP 1. Yes, 2. No 4 2 2 Aspirin PHASP 1. Yes, 2. No 5 2 2 Warfarin/anticoag PHWARF 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 Steroids PHSTER 1. Yes, 2. No 7 2 2 Steroids PHSTER 1. Yes, 2. No 7 2 2 Steroids Physics Normal, 2. No 7 2 2 startistications Protonged Normal, 2. No 7 2 2 startistications Protonged Normal, 2. Low 1 1 1 startisticatincos </td <td></td> <td>Past History/Co-Morbidity</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>STEAIN</td> <td>1. 165, Z. NU</td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>85%</td>		Past History/Co-Morbidity			STEAIN	1. 165, Z. NU		0			85%
b. Prev Unded Prive Castric Surgery PHULCR 1. Yes, 2. No 1 1 1 2 2 C. NSAIDS PHULCR 1. Yes, 2. No 3 2 2 Prev Gastric Surgery PHGASX 1. Yes, 2. No 3 2 2 Aspirin PHASPR 1. Yes, 2. No 4 2 2 Aspirin PHASPR 1. Yes, 2. No 4 2 2 Steroids PHWARF 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 Steroids PHSTER 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 Steroids PHSTER 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 Steroids PHSTER 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 Steroids Provinged Normal, 2. Normal, 2. Normal, 2. 2 Steroids PTPT 0. Not done, 1. 1 1 1 C. OGD Pathology OGDPATH 0 0 0 <t< td=""><td>-</td><td>Fast History/CO-Morbialty</td><td>Prev GI Bleed</td><td></td><td>PHCIBI</td><td>1 Ves 2 No</td><td></td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>00%</td></t<>	-	Fast History/CO-Morbialty	Prev GI Bleed		PHCIBI	1 Ves 2 No		1	1	2	00%
C. Industric Surgery PHGASX 1. Yes, 2. No 2 2 2 d. Prev Gastric Surgery PHORASX 1. Yes, 2. No 4 2 2 d. Aspirin PHASPR 1. Yes, 2. No 4 2 2 e. Aspirin PHASPR 1. Yes, 2. No 5 2 2 g. Warfarin/anticoag PHWARF 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 g. Warfarin/anticoag PHWARF 1. Yes, 2. No 7 2 2 g. Investigations PHORE 1. Yes, 2. No 7 2 2 a. Profonged INVESTIGATIONS 7 2 2 b. PItalelets PLATE 0. Not done, 1. Normal, 2. Low 1 1 1 i.i. I.i. Esophagitis OESO 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 0 i.i. Esophagitis OESO 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 i.i.			Prev I licer			1. Tes, 2. No		2	2	2	100%
d. Introductory PHNSAI 1. res. 2. No 4 2 2 Aspirin PHASPR 1. Yes, 2. No 5 2 2 Aspirin PHASPR 1. Yes, 2. No 5 2 2 Marfarin/anticoag PHAVARF 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 Steroids PHWARF 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 Investigations Investigations PHWARF 1. Yes, 2. No 7 2 2 a. PripT Normal, 2. Normal, 2. Normal, 2. Prolonged 1 1 1 1 c. OGD Pathology OGDPATH Normal, 2. Normal, 2. Normal, 2. 0 0 i.i Iii Mallory Weiss OMALLW 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 0 i.i GastErosions OGERO 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 i.i Iii Active Bleeding GAST 0. No, 1. Yes 4 0			Prev Gastric Surgery		PHGASX	1. Tes, 2. No		3	2	2	100%
e. Investigations PHASPR 1. Yes, 2. No 7 2 2 g. Varfarin/anticoag PHASPR 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 g. Steroids PHSTER 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 s. Investigations PHSTER 1. Yes, 2. No 7 2 2 a. PT/PT Netstigations 7 2 2 b. PT/PTT Normal, 2. Prolonged 1 1 1 c. OGD Pathology OGDPATH 0. Not done, 1. Normal, 2. Low 1 1 1 i. ii. Esophagitis OESO 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 0 i. Gastric Varices OEVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 i. Eso Varices OGVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 4 0 0 ii. Gastric Varices OGVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 0 ii. Gastric Varices			NSAIDS		PHNSAI	1. Yes 2 No		4	2	2	100%
f. Investigations PHWARF 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 9. Steroids PHWARF 1. Yes, 2. No 6 2 2 5 Investigations PHSTER 1. Yes, 2. No 7 2 2 a. a. PT/PTT Investigations 1 1 1 b. PT/PTT PT/PTT O. Not done, 1. Normal, 2. Prolonged 1 1 1 c. OGD Pathology OGDPATH 0 0 0 1 1 i. I. Esophagitis OESO 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 0 ii. Mallory Weiss OMALLW 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 0 iii. Gastrices OEVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 ii. Gastrices OGVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 0 ii. Castrices OGVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 0 ii. </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>Aspirin</td> <td></td> <td>PHASPR</td> <td>1. Yes 2 No</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>100%</td>			Aspirin		PHASPR	1. Yes 2 No		5	2	2	100%
9. Numerication PHSTER 1. Yes, 2. No 7 2 2 5 Investigations INVESTIGATIONS INVESTIGATIONS Investigations 1 1 a. PT/PTT 0. Not done, 1. Normal, 2. Prolonged 1 1 1 1 b. Platelets PLATE 0. Not done, 1. Normal, 2. Low 1 1 1 c. OGD Pathology OGDPATH Investigation 1 0 0 ii. Esophagitis OESO 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 0 iii. Gastric Varices OEVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 vi. Gastric Varices OGAST 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 vi. Gastritis OGAST 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 0 vi. EsRH if Ulcer ESRH ii. Active Bleeding EACTV 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0			Warfarin/anticoag		PHWARE	1 Yes 2 No		6	2	2	100%
5 Investigations PT/PTT INVESTIGATIONS Involution a. PT/PTT PT/PTT 0. Not done, 1. Normal, 2. 1 1 1 b. Platelets PLATE 0. Not done, 1. Normal, 2. Low 1 1 1 c. OGD Pathology OGDPATH 1 0 0 ii. Mallory Weiss OMALLW 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 0 iii. Esophagitis OESO 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 0 iii. Gastric Varices OEVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 iii. Gastric Varices OGVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 4 0 0 iii. Gastritis OGAST 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 0 dast Erosions OGERO 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 1 ii. Mallory Weiss ORAST 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 0 dast Erosions OGERO 0. No, 1. Yes			Steroids		PHSTER	1 Yes 2 No		7	2	2	100%
a. PT/PTT PTPTT 0. Not done, 1. Normal, 2. Prolonged 1 1 b. Platelets PLATE 0. Not done, 1. Normal, 2. Low 1 1 c. OGD Pathology OGDPATH 0. Not, 1. Yes 1 0 i. ii. Mallory Weiss OESO 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 0 i. Gastric Varices OEVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 0 ii. Gastric Varices OEVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 iv. Gast Erosions OGERO 0. No, 1. Yes 4 0 0 vi. ESRH if Ulcer ESRH ESRH 1 0 1 ii. Nov, 1. Yes 1 0 1 1 1 vi. ESRH if Ulcer ESRH 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 ii. Visible Vessel EVIV 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 1 ii. Active Bleeding EA		Investigations	Ctorolad		INVESTIGATIONS	1. 100, 2.110			_	_	82%
Image: Second	-		PT/PTT		PTPTT	0. Not done, 1.			1	1	100%
b. Prolonged Image: Constraint of the second secon						Normal, 2.				·	
b. Platelets PLATE 0. Not done, 1. Normal, 2. Low 1 1 1 c. OGD Pathology OGDPATH Image: Comparison of the						Prolonged					
C. OGD Pathology OGDPATH Normal, 2. Low Image: Constraint of the system of the			Platelets		PLATE	0. Not done, 1.			1	1	100%
C. OGD Pathology OGDPATH i. Esophagitis OESO 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 0 ii. Mallory Weiss OMALLW 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 0 iii. Mallory Weiss OMALLW 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 0 iv. Eso Varices OEVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 vi. Gastric Varices OGAST 0. No, 1. Yes 4 0 0 vi. Gast Erosions OGERO 0. No, 1. Yes 6 0 0 d. ESRH if Ulcer ESRH ESRH 6 0 0 i. Active Bleeding EACTV 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 1 i. Active Bleeding EACTV 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 1 ii. Visible Vessel EVISV 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 iv. Red Spot ERED						Normal, 2. Low					
i. Esophagitis OESO 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 0 ii. Mallory Weiss OMALLW 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 0 iii. Eso Varices OEVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 0 iv. Gastric Varices OEVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 v. Gastric Varices OGVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 4 0 0 v. Gastrics OGAST 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 0 vi. Gast Erosions OGERO 0. No, 1. Yes 6 0 0 d. ESRH if Ulcer ESRH ESRH 6 0 0 i. i. Active Bleeding EACTV 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 1 ii. Adherent Clot ECLOT 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 1 ii. ii. Red Spot ERED 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 visible Vessel EVISV 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 0 <			OGD Pathology		OGDPATH						100%
ii. Mallory Weiss OMALLW O. No, 1. Yes 2 0 0 iii. Eso Varices OEVAR O. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 iv. Gastric Varices OGVAR O. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 v. Gastric Varices OGVAR O. No, 1. Yes 4 0 0 v. Gastric Varices OGAST O. No, 1. Yes 5 0 0 vi. Gast Erosions OGERO O. No, 1. Yes 6 0 0 d. ESRH if Ulcer ESRH ESRH 6 0 0 i. i. Active Bleeding EACTV 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 1 ii. Active Bleeding EACTV 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 1 iii. Katherent Clot ECLOT 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 1 iii. Ked Spot ERED 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 v. Blood in UGIT EBLOD 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 1 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Esophagitis</td> <td>OESO</td> <td>0. No, 1. Yes</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>100%</td>				Esophagitis	OESO	0. No, 1. Yes		1	0	0	100%
iii. Eso Varices OEVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 iv. Gastric Varices OGVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 4 0 0 v. Gastric Varices OGVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 4 0 0 vi. Gastritis OGAST 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 0 d. ESRH if Ulcer ESRH 0. No, 1. Yes 6 0 0 i. i. Active Bleeding EACTV 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 1 ii. Active Bleeding EACTV 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 1 iii. Katherent Clot ECLOT 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 1 iii. Ked Spot ERED 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 v. Blood in UGIT EBLOD 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 1				Mallory Weiss	OMALLW	0. No, 1. Yes		2	0	0	100%
iv. Gastric Varices OGVAR 0. No, 1. Yes 4 0 0 v. Gastritis OGAST 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 0 vi. Gastritis OGAST 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 0 d. ESRH if Ulcer ESRH ESRH 6 0 0 i. . . Active Bleeding EACTV 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 1 iii. . . Adherent Clot ECLOT 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 1 iii. . Visible Vessel EVISV 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 iv. . Blood in UGIT EBLOD 0. No, 1. Yes 4 0 0				Eso Varices	OEVAR	0. No, 1. Yes		3	0	0	100%
V. Gastritis OGAST 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 0 vi. Gast Erosions OGERO 0. No, 1. Yes 6 0 0 d. ESRH if Ulcer ESRH ESRH 0. No, 1. Yes 6 0 1 i. i. Active Bleeding EACTV 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 1 iii. Adherent Clot ECLOT 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 1 iii. Visible Vessel EVISV 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 iv. Blood in UGIT EBLOD 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 1				Gastric Varices	OGVAR	0. No, 1. Yes		4	0	0	100%
VI. Gast Erosions OGERO 0. No, 1. Yes 6 0 0 d. ESRH if Ulcer ESRH 6 0 1 i. i. Active Bleeding EACTV 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 1 ii. Adherent Clot ECLOT 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 1 iii. Visible Vessel EVISV 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 iv. Red Spot ERED 0. No, 1. Yes 4 0 0 v. Blood in UGIT EBLOD 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 1				Gastritis	OGAST	0. No, 1. Yes		5	0	0	100%
d. ESRH if Ulcer ESRH Image: Constraint of the state of the s				Gast Erosions	OGERO	0. No, 1. Yes		6	0	0	100%
i. Active Bleeding EACTV 0. No, 1. Yes 1 0 1 ii. Adherent Clot ECLOT 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 1 iii. Visible Vessel EVISV 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 1 iv. Vesible Vessel EVISV 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 v. Blood in UGIT EBLOD 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 1			ESRH if Ulcer	1	ESRH						40%
II. Adherent Clot ECLOT 0. No, 1. Yes 2 0 1 iii. Visible Vessel EVISV 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 iv. Red Spot ERED 0. No, 1. Yes 4 0 0 v. Blood in UGIT EBLOD 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 1				Active Bleeding	EACTV	0. No, 1. Yes		1	0	1	0%
III. Visible Vessel EVISV 0. No, 1. Yes 3 0 0 iv. Red Spot ERED 0. No, 1. Yes 4 0 0 v. Blood in UGIT EBLOD 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 1				Adherent Clot	ECLOT	0. No, 1. Yes		2	0	1	0%
IV. Red Spot ERED 0. No, 1. Yes 4 0 0 V. Blood in UGIT EBLOD 0. No, 1. Yes 5 0 1				Visible Vessel	EVISV	0. No, 1. Yes		3	0	0	100%
I Blood in UGIT I EBLOD 0. No. 1. Yes 5 0 1				Red Spot	ERED	0. No, 1. Yes		4	0	0	100%
				Blood in UGIT	EBLOD	0. No, 1. Yes		5	0	1	0%
e. Size if Ulcer ULSZ Integer in 5 20			Size if Ulcer		ULSZ	Integer in			5	20	70%
milimeters (0 –						millimeters (0 –					
						50)					76 20/

Table 3 : Illustration of the similarity score computation

The final similarity score of each case is computed as follows:

- 1) For each weighted field, multiply the similarity score obtained from the formula above by the weight assigned.
- 2) Sum up the results in 1) for all weighted fields.
- 3) Divide the sum obtained in 2) by the total weight.

D. Computation of predicted outcome

The predicted outcome of the current case is computed based on the outcome of the list of most similar cases, known as nearest neighbours, which are retrieved if the overall match score is above a numeric cut-off value. This is to ensure that the system makes a reasonable good prediction based on the cases which are sufficiently similar to the new one. The predicted outcome is computed for each of the outcome type. The computation steps are as follows:

Suppose OC is one of the outcomes (e.g. re-bleeding):

OC (yes) = case that has this outcome OC (no) = case that does not have this outcome Total OC (yes) = \sum (case with OC (yes) * corresponding case MD) Total OC (no) = \sum (case with OC (no) * corresponding case MD)

P(yes) = Proportion (OC (yes)) = Total OC(yes)

∑caseMDs

P(no) = Proportion (OC (no)) = Total OC(no)

∑caseMDs

If P(yes) > P(no) then the predicted outcome for OC is *yes* at a probability of P(yes); and vice versa for P(no).

IV. SYSTEM EVALUATION

The system has performed to expectations when tested and evaluated using 20 past cases with known outcomes. The users have also given their feedback on the usefulness and relevance of the system, as summarised in Table 4. However, for actual deployment, this prototype should be evaluated over a longer period of time with real-time cases.

V. FUTURE WORK

The prototype system is currently being evaluated by the doctors at Tan Tock Seng Hospital. Initial reaction to the system has been very positive, and now the project is currently in Phase 2 with further enhancements to improve the accuracy of the prediction, recommend individually tailored treatment protocols (in real time) which will specify the execution of tasks over time, and include detection of problems (or recovery), drug prescriptions (that will automatically check for contraindications, drug interactions, patient allergies, etc). An important enhancement would be to combine rule-based reasoning and case-based reasoning by recommending treatment protocols based on a knowledge base of rules (defined by senior doctors) and past learned experience.

It is hoped that this project would result in the development of an intelligent system to provide guidance in clinical decisionmaking and thus quicker responses to patients with gastrointestinal bleeding who require urgent intervention.

Evaluation criteria	Comments
System is easy to use.	Agree. Interface is user-friendly and allows rapid input of data in acute emergency cases.
System's prediction is	Agree. System's predictions based on previous cases is advantageous over doctors', which
comparable with doctors'.	at best are often gross estimates only.
The comparison with	Agree. The ability to retrieve data of previous (matched) cases is definitely useful and
previous cases is useful.	improves confidence in management.
Doctors are comfortable	No opinion. A larger base of doctors is needed to try out the system first hand to have a feel
with system's predictions	of the system and its predictions/recommendations.
& recommendations	
System is useful for new /	Agree. It is useful as a guideline if senior doctors are not immediately available to assist in
inexperienced doctors.	management.

Table 4: Users' comments on the system

REFERENCES

- [1] Gastrointestinal Bleeding, Neville Krasner, B M J Books; ISBN: 0727910086; (1996)
- [2] <u>http://ibe.web.med.uni-</u>[4] <u>muenchen.de/lyon/innere/gi_blutung/MD</u>
- [3] Gastrointestinal Bleeding, Choichi Sugawa, Charles E. Lucas and Bernard M. Schuman

(Editor), Igaku-Shoin Medical Pub; ISBN: 0896402215; (1992)

[4] Introduction to Statistical reasoning, Gary Smith, McGraw-Hill Higher Education; August 1, 1997.