

2020

From the editor: Defining the scholarship of Clinical Decision Science

James Peter Meza

Wayne State University School of Medicine, jmeza@med.wayne.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/crp>



Part of the [Medical Education Commons](#), and the [Translational Medical Research Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

MEZA JP. From the editor: Defining the scholarship of Clinical Decision Science. *Clin. Res. Prac.* Apr 22 2020;6(1):eP2408. <https://doi.org/10.22237/crp/1586476860>

This From the Editors is brought to you for free and open access by the Open Access Journals at DigitalCommons@WayneState. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Clinical Research in Practice: The Journal of Team Hippocrates* by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@WayneState.

FROM THE EDITOR:

Defining the scholarship of Clinical Decision Science

JAMES P. MEZA, MD, PhD, Wayne State University School of Medicine, jmeza@med.wayne.edu

I've been an avid consumer of evidence-based medicine publications for over 20 years. I remember reading the *JAMA* series, "User's Guide to the Medical Literature" when it was contemporaneously published.^{1,2} That series of publications helped launch the evidence-based medicine endeavor. I learned years ago how to critically appraise a clinical research article, always asking medical learners, "But what is the strength of the evidence?"^{3,4} My mental schemata for making clinical decisions has always been based on probabilities, not categories.⁵ I authored a book outlining the process of searching for, appraising, and applying clinical research literature.⁶ I have also written about the limitations of evidence-based medicine.⁷

I have been active in the clinical care of patients for twenty-five years and none of the skills described above help me to use clinical evidence when I'm in an exam room, trying to help a patient decide what is best for them. Don't get me wrong—I am quite comfortable appraising and applying evidence, and I'm certain many other physicians are, too. Yet, I have no idea how those other physicians accomplish these tasks. I have difficulty teaching how to do it. There is a knowledge gap about how to describe physicians' cognitive processes and behaviors that connect patients with evidence.

We have decided to use the label Clinical Decision Science to describe the scholarship needed to understand that knowledge gap. Information Mastery⁸ is necessary but insufficient to explore the ability to collect and evaluate evidence and apply it for the use of a specific patient, with specific needs. That decision making happens within the doctor-patient relationship.⁹

Clinical decision science explores how the complex interacting aspects of clinical care are described, understood, shared, and explained. This includes both biomedical and medical social sciences¹⁰, in addition to other ways of understanding human experience. This is a unique area of scholarship that has not previously been recognized, explored, studied, or published.

Since its inception, this journal has published papers that describe the use of clinical research in the decision-making process for a specific patient. By including an individual patient, we came to realize that the social context of the patient is equally as important to clinical decision-making as the actual results of clinical research. Clinical decision science incorporates the "critical appraisal" of what is commonly known as "Evidence-based Medicine" (EBM), but is much more expansive in its scope of inquiry. We hope to achieve the original intent of the Evidence-based Medicine movement by extending it into the realm of clinical practice.¹¹⁻¹⁴ In clinical practice, doctors must discern the meaning of clinical evidence for a specific patient; the same evidence means different things to different patients. Evidence learned from a population of patients must be applied in the specific clinical context of a single patient.

We readily admit that Clinical Decision Science is in its infancy. Like all new areas of scholarship, we start with rich descriptions—case reports. We do not publish case reports of rare diseases; we hope to publish case reports that illuminate how clinical decisions are made. In addition to case reports, we use narrative to illustrate how to talk to patients in our "Informed Consent" publications. In this issue, John Geddes points out that Clinical Decision Science changes the research questions necessary to understand the informed consent process.¹⁵ We encourage reflections on the experiences of clinical decisions.¹⁶

Clinical Research in Practice Editor JAMES P. MEZA, MD, PhD teaches Translational Medicine and Evidence Based Practice at Wayne State University School of Medicine. He is also the Director of Research at Oakwood Annapolis Hospital Family Medicine Residency.



In this issue, we've taken the next step in advancing this area of scholarship: publishing an original research article that uses descriptive data to differentiate "Clinical Decision Science" from "Evidence-based Medicine."¹⁷ We intend to continue exploring the scholarship of Clinical Decision Science with all types of scientific inquiry.

References

1. Guyatt G, Sackett D, Cook D, et al. Users' guides to the medical literature. II. How to use an article about therapy or prevention. B. What were the results and will they help me in caring for my patients? The Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group. *JAMA*. 1994 Jan 5;271(1):59-63. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.271.1.59>
2. Jaeschke R, Guyatt G, Sackett D, et al. Users' guides to the medical literature. III. How to use an article about a diagnostic test. B. What are the results and will they help me in caring for my patients? The Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group. *JAMA*. 1994 Mar 2;271(9):703-7. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.271.9.703>
3. Riegelman R, Hirsch R. *Studying a Study and Testing a Test: How to read the medical literature*. 2nd ed. Boston: Little Brown and Company; 1989.
4. Ebell MH, Siwek J, Weiss BD, et al. Strength of recommendation taxonomy (SORT): a patient-centered approach to grading evidence in the medical literature. *J Am Board Fam Pract*. 2004 Jan-Feb;17(1):59-67. <https://doi.org/10.3122/jabfm.17.1.59>
5. Sackett D, Haynes RB, Guyatt G, Tugwell P. *Clinical Epidemiology: A basic science for clinical medicine*. 2nd ed. Boston: Little Brown and Company; 1991.
6. Meza J, Passerman D. *Integrating Narrative Medicine and Evidence-based Medicine: the everyday social practice of healing*. New York: Radcliffe Publishing; 2011.
7. Meza JP, Yee NH. Editorial: Clinical practice can save evidence-based medicine from itself. *Clin Res Prac*. 2018 Sep 14;4(2):eP1833. <https://doi.org/10.22237/crp/1535414460>
8. Ebell M. *Information mastery*. FP Essentials, AAFP Home Study Edition No 318. Leawood, KS: American Academy of Family Physicians; 2005.
9. Beach MC, Inui T, Relationship-Centered Care Research Network. Relationship-centered care. A constructive reframing. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2006 Jan;21 Suppl 1:S3-8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2006.00302.x>
10. Kleinman A. *The Illness Narratives: Suffering, Healing, and the Human Condition*. New York: Basic Books; 1988.
11. Eddy D. Reflections on science, judgment, and value in evidence-based decision making: a conversation with David Eddy by Sean R. Tunis. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2007 Jul-Aug;26(4):w500-15. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.26.4.w500>
12. Sackett DL, Rosenberg WM, Gray JA, Haynes RB, Richardson WS. Evidence based medicine: what it is and what it isn't. *BMJ*. 1996 Jan 13;312(7023):71-2. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.312.7023.71>
13. Haynes RB, Devereaux PJ, Guyatt GH. Physicians' and patients' choices in evidence based practice. *BMJ*. 2002 Jun 8;324(7350):1350. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.324.7350.1350>
14. Masic I, Miokovic M, Muhamedagic B. Evidence based medicine - new approaches and challenges. *Acta Inform Med*. 2008;16(4):219-25. <https://doi.org/10.5455/aim.2008.16.219-225>
15. Geddes JK. Reflection on Clinical Decision Science: Clinical Decision Science suggests different research questions need to be asked related to informed consent. *Clin. Res. Prac*. 2020;6(1):eP2388. <https://doi.org/10.22237/crp/1586476800>
16. Hopper CA, Bahae M. Reflection on Clinical Decision Science: When rationing becomes part of clinical decision-making. *Clin. Res. Prac*. 2020;6(1):eP2390. <https://doi.org/10.22237/crp/1586476920>
17. Weaver K, Diebold M, Rizk Z, et al. Clinical Decision Science emphasizes unique social context in a way that Evidence-Based Medicine does not. *Clin. Res. Prac*. 2020 Apr 21;6(1):eP2384. <https://doi.org/10.22237/crp/1586477100>

