

2022-03-24 - SLPG Meeting

Date & Time

20:00 to 21:00 UTC Thursday 24th March 2022

Goals

- ECL v2.0 feedback and finalisation
- ECL v2.1 - Proposals for new features

Location

[Zoom meeting link](#) (password: 764978)

Attendees

- Chair: [Linda Bird](#)
- Project Group: [Andrew Perry](#), [Kai Kewley](#), [Michael Lawley](#), [Rob Hausam](#), [Alejandro Lopez Osornio](#), [Anne Randorff Højen](#), [Roger Jane](#), [Wayde Shipman](#)

Agenda and Meeting Notes

Description	Owner	Notes
Welcome and agenda	All	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Next meeting - 7th April 2022??<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ Meeting next week to finalize ECL 2.0?◦ Consider changing regular meeting time?
ECL v2.0 - Access to refsets and historical supplements	All	<p>Expression Constraint Language 2.0 WIP</p> <p>Finalize feedback - Michael, B2i, Jeremy, Daniel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Field Name from File: ^ 447562003 ICD-10 complex map reference set {{ M mapGroup = #2, mapPriority = #1, mapTarget = "J45.9" }}◦ Field names come directly from the international RF2 specification (if they're there), else directly from the RF2 files <p>Please review updates to the following pages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1. Introduction (History)• 3.2 Expression Constraint and Query Requirements• 4. Logical Model• 4.1 Details• 5.1 Brief Syntax (Normative)• 5.2 Long Syntax (Informative)• 5.3 Informative Comments• 5.4 Order of Operation• 6.1 Simple Expression Constraints (Member Of) **• 6.8 Description Filters (Module, Effective Time, Active Filters)• 6.10 Member Filters **• 6.11 History Supplements• Appendix D - ECL Quick Reference
ECL v2.1 - Requirement proposals	All	Potential requirements for ECL v2.1 - Discussion and brainstorming

- **Daniel's comments**

- An explanation of the results of this ECL: <<766918008 |Product containing microbial agent (product) | MINUS (763158003 |Medicinal product (product)) | : { 127489000 |Has active ingredient (attribute)| = 412232009 |Microbial agent (substance)) | }) (right identities vs. ECL, has been raised before)
- Cardinality of focus concepts is not supported (Example use case: which concepts have 2 or more stated IsAs)
- (Related) Using 116680003 |Is a (attribute)| in refinement/dotted expressions, e. g. 395026007.116680003, 395026007:[2..*]116680003=*
Snowstorm and Ontoserver give different results for dotted expressions.
[https://snowstorm-alpha.ihtsdotools.org/snowstorm/snomed-ct/fhir/ValueSet/\\$expand?_format=json&count=10&url=http:%2F%2Fsnomed.info%2Ffhir_vs%3Decl%2F395026007.116680003](https://snowstorm-alpha.ihtsdotools.org/snowstorm/snomed-ct/fhir/ValueSet/$expand?_format=json&count=10&url=http:%2F%2Fsnomed.info%2Ffhir_vs%3Decl%2F395026007.116680003)
[https://r4.ontoserver.csiro.au/fhir/ValueSet/\\$expand?_format=json&count=10&url=http:%2F%2Fsnomed.info%2Ffhir_vs%3Decl%2F395026007.116680003](https://r4.ontoserver.csiro.au/fhir/ValueSet/$expand?_format=json&count=10&url=http:%2F%2Fsnomed.info%2Ffhir_vs%3Decl%2F395026007.116680003)
- We've done history for concepts but not for any other components...

Realizing the information on inactive concepts is different and more extensive from other components, {{ + HISTORY... }} is (just) sugar and maybe just maybe there might be reasons to sprinkle other components with this sweetness (or not).

Examples: previously active refset members (and their fields), previously active descriptions (e.g. Refers to association refset), ...

- **Context supplements - e.g.**
 - << 56265001 |Heart disease| {{ + CONTEXT }} – probably exclude due to risk of absent finding, not-done procedure and family history
 - OR {{ + CONTEXT-DEFAULT }} ?
 - ▪ **Expansion of [[@ecl_query]] {{ + Context (Temporal = [[@temporal_value]] }}**
 - [[@ecl_query]] OR (< 243796009 |Situation with explicit context|:
 - { (246090004 |Associated finding| = ([[@ecl_query]])
 - OR |Associated procedure| = ([[@ecl_query]])
 - (|Procedure context| = |Done| OR |Finding context| = |Known present|),
 - |Subject relationship context| = |Subject of record|,
 - |Temporal context| = [[@temporal_value]]))
 - **Example 1: << |Heart procedure| {{ + Context (Temporal = *) }}**
 - • << |Heart procedure| OR (< 243796009 |Situation with explicit context|:
 - { 246090004 |Associated finding| = << 56265001 |Heart disease|,
 - |Procedure context| = |Done|,
 - |Subject relationship context| = |Subject of record|,
 - |Temporal context| = *))
 - **Example 2: (<< |Heart disease| OR << |Heart procedure|) {{ + Context (Temporal = *) }}**
 - << |Heart procedure| OR (< 243796009 |Situation with explicit context|:
 - { (246090004 |Associated finding| = (<< |Heart disease| OR << |Heart procedure|)
 - OR |Associated procedure| = (<< |Heart disease| OR << |Heart procedure|))
 - (|Procedure context| = |Done| OR |Finding context| = |Known present|),
 - |Subject relationship context| = |Subject of record|,
 - |Temporal context| = *))
 - << 56265001 |Heart disease| {{ + Context (Temporal = *, FindingContext=<<|Known present|) }}
 - Will return all types of heart disease, plus concepts like 394886001 |Suspected heart disease (situation)|, and 429007001 |History of cardiac arrest (situation)|
 - Expands to:
 - << 56265001 |Heart disease| OR
 - (< 243796009 |Situation with explicit context|:
 - { 246090004 |Associated finding| = << 56265001 |Heart disease| })
 - However, you may want to exclude (or include) specific contexts - for example:
 1. To ensure that the finding was about the subject of the record (and not a family history, e.g. to exclude 429959009 |Family history of heart failure (situation)|), you could say:
 - << 56265001 |Heart disease| {{ + CONTEXT (relationship = 410604004 |Subject of record|) }}
 2. To ensure that the finding was 'Known present' (e.g. to exclude 394926003 |Heart disease excluded (situation)|), you could say:
 - << 56265001 |Heart disease| {{ + CONTEXT (finding_context = << 410515003 |Known present|) }}
 3. To ensure that the finding was about the subject of the record AND known present, you could say:
 - << 56265001 |Heart disease| {{ + CONTEXT (relationship = 410604004 |Subject of record|,
 - finding_context = << 410515003
 - |Known present|) }}
 4. ?? Is there any use case for restricting adding temporal context? (e.g. temporal != << 410513005 |In the past|)
 - Is any more syntactic sugar required? E.g.
 - {{ + CONTEXT (relationship = self, finding context = present, temporal != past) }}
 - {{ + CONTEXT (self, present, ! past) }}
 - Other ideas? Common profiles?
- -----
- **Ability to return attribute types** (see proposal below)
 - [attributes] << 125605004 |Fracture of bone (disorder)|
 - << 125605004 |Fracture of bone (disorder)| . Attributes
 - << 125605004 |Fracture of bone (disorder)| . (<< 125605004 |Fracture of bone (disorder)| . Attributes)
 - [attribute, value] << 125605004 |Fracture of bone (disorder)|
- -----
- **Reverse membership** (see below)
 - Which reference sets "contain" the given concept(s) - e.g. 421235005 |Structure of femur|?
 - 421235005 |Structure of femur| . Refsets
 - 421235005 |Structure of femur| . Refsets [referencedComponentId]
 - 421235005 |Structure of femur| . Refsets [targetComponentId]
- -----
- Other?

Returning Attributes	Michael Lawley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently ECL expressions can match (return) concepts that are either the source or the target of a relationship triple (target is accessed via the 'reverse' notation or 'dot notation', but not the relationship type (ie attribute name) itself. <p>For example, I can write:</p> <pre><< 404684003 Clinical finding : 363698007 Finding site = <<66019005 Limb structure </pre> <pre><< 404684003 Clinical finding . 363698007 Finding site </pre> <p>But I can't get all the attribute names that are used by << 404684003 Clinical finding </p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perhaps something like: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? R.type ? (<< 404684003 Clinical finding) This could be extended to, for example, return different values - e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Simple map refset .maptarget ? (^ Simple map refset AND < Fracture)
Reverse Member Of	Michael Lawley	<p>What refsets is a given concept (e.g. 421235005 Structure of femur) a member of?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible new notation for this: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ^ . 421235005 Structure of femur ? X ? 421235005 Structure of femur = ^ X
The items below are currently on hold		
Postcoordination Topics		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss feedback on transformation implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expression transformation service generates the classifiable form and the necessary normal form from a close to user form expression Contribute your expression examples and write your feedback for consideration and discussion Recap of SNOMED on FHIR discussions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the functionality scope of a terminology server that supports postcoordination? For example, does it include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classifying multiple expressions in a single substrate? What are the use cases for this? Assigning (local) identifiers to expressions? What are the use cases for this? Autogenerating or assigning a term to an expression? What are the use cases for this? Does a terminology server that supports postcoordination, include all the functions of an expression repository? What is the relationship between a terminology server that supports postcoordination, and an expression repository? Outstanding questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the pros and cons of extending SCG to allow an expression as the focus of a postcoordinated expression? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: This was raised in context of a NNF generated over a postcoordinated substrate, where the proximal parent is an expression Example of using expressions in focus concept <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (125605004 Fracture of bone :363698007 finding site = 84167007 Foot bone) : 272741003 Laterality = 7771000 Left 125605004 Fracture of bone :363698007 finding site = 84167007 Foot bone , 272741003 Laterality = 7771000 Left What is the expected NNF when classifying an expression that is equivalent to a precoordinated concept? For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expression that is equivalent to 111273006 Acute respiratory disease 64572001 Disease (disorder) : {263502005 Clinical course (attribute) = 424124008 Sudden onset AND/OR short duration (qualifier value) } {363698007 Finding site (attribute) = 89187006 Airway structure (body structure) } Options: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 111273006 Acute respiratory disease : {263502005 Clinical course = 424124008 Sudden onset AND/OR short duration } {363698007 Finding site = 89187006 Airway structure } 50043002 Disorder of respiratory system (disorder) + 2704003 Acute disease (disorder) : {263502005 Clinical course = 424124008 Sudden onset AND/OR short duration } {363698007 Finding site = 89187006 Airway structure } Other? Recap of internal discussions with Content Team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inter-attribute dependencies Grouping rules

Dynamic Templates		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue discussion on dynamic templates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inter-attribute dependencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acute/Chronic and Inflammation - Adding a clinical course requires specializing the inflammation morphology ? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E.g. Pyelonephritis : Clinical course = Chronic should be Pyelonephritis : Clinical course = Chronic , Associated morphology = Chronic inflammation E.g. Pyelonephritis : Clinical course = Sudden onset AND/OR short duration should be Pyelonephritis : { Clinical course = Sudden onset AND/OR short duration }, Associated morphology = Acute inflammation Infectious Causative Agents - Adding a causative agent = Domain Bacteria or Virus requires adding a Pathological process = Infectious process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E.g. Nephritis : Causative agent = Domain bacteria should be Nephritis : Causative agent = Domain bacteria , Pathological process = Infectious process Congenital and Acquired - Adding an Occurrence of Congenital to a focus concept with an abnormal morphology, requires adding a Pathological process of Pathological development process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E.g. Koilonychia : Occurrence = Congenital should be Koilonychia : Occurrence = Congenital , Pathological process = Pathological developmental process Situations with Explicit Context <ol style="list-style-type: none"> if the procedure context = Planned , then the temporal context should be << Current of specified time <ol style="list-style-type: none"> If the procedure context = In progress , then the temporal context should be << Current If the procedure context = Performed or Done , then the temporal context should be << Current or past (actual) Note: for this use case (of Procedure with explicit context) perhaps we just recommend (or require) that the full role group is spelled out. Next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representation of the content rules <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who creates the complete list of rules and how? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What formalism? Determine which are mandatory and which are optional Implementation of content rules - e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guided data entry by pre-populating role groups in expression template based on definition of focus concepts (for design-time use, such as mapping) Mandatory content rules could be added to transform process
Postcoordination Use Case Examples	All	<p>Example 1 - Dentistry / Odontogram</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires an expression template to create expressions. Resulting expression still requires a transformation to make it classifiable <p>Example 2 - Terminology binding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses a fixed expression template to combine codes entered into separate fields The procedure+laterality example still requires a transformation to make it classifiable <p>Example 3 - Mapping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design-time activity Map targets may not be able to be fully represented using concept model attributes In many cases, an extension (with primitive concepts) should be recommended where there are gaps in the mapping There may be some cases in which postcoordination is helpful (e.g. LOINC to SNOMED CT map) <p>Example 4 - Natural Language Processing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Usually run-time activity. May require manual confirmation of coding suggestions (unless low clinical risk, eg for suggesting relevant patient records for manual review)
Postcoordination Guidance	Linda Bird , Anne Randorff Højten , Kai Kewley	Practical Guide to Postcoordination

- **Proposal - Use syntax (i.e. braces) to distinguish refinement vs new role group**
- There should be a syntactic distinction between refinement and constructive addition (ie adding a new role group). That is:
 1. 83152002 |Oophorectomy| : 405815000 |Procedure device| = 122456005 |Laser device|
 - is classified as (i.e. the refinement is added to the role groups in the definition of the focus concept(s)):
 - 83152002 |Oophorectomy| :
 - { 260686004 |Method| = 129304002 |Excision - action|,
 - 405813007 |Procedure site - Direct| = 15497006 |Ovarian structure|,
 - 405815000 |Procedure device| = 122456005 |Laser device| }
 - 2. 83152002 |Oophorectomy| : { 405815000 |Procedure device| = 122456005 |Laser device| }
 - is classified as:
 - 83152002 |Oophorectomy| :
 - { 260686004 |Method| = 129304002 |Excision - action|,
 - 405813007 |Procedure site - Direct| = 15497006 |Ovarian structure|,
 - { 405815000 |Procedure device| = 122456005 |Laser device| }
- However, for attributes which are **always** self-grouped - i.e. Priority, Due to, After, Before, During, Clinical course, Temporally related to, and all Observable entity attributes (see [Relationship Group](#)), these must always be put into their own role group:
- 1. 125605004 | Fracture of bone |: 42752001 | Due to (attribute) | = 1912002 | Fall |
 - is classified as:
 - 125605004 | Fracture of bone |: { 42752001 | Due to (attribute) | = 1912002 | Fall | }
 - or
 - 125605004 | Fracture of bone |:
 - { 363698007 |Finding site| = 272673000 |Bone structure|,
 - 116676008 |Associated morphology | = 72704001 |Fracture| }
 - { 42752001 | Due to (attribute) | = 1912002 | Fall | }
- **Proposal: Expression forms needed for this** (see [3.4 Transforming Expressions](#))
 - Close to user form - e.g. 83152002 |Oophorectomy| : 405815000 |Procedure device| = 122456005 |Laser device|
 - Canonical close to user form - e.g. 83152002:405815000=122456005
 - Classifiable form (SCG) - e.g. 83152002:{260686004=129304002,405813007=15497006,405815000=122456005}
 - PLUS Classifiable form (OWL) - e.g.
 - EquivalentClasses(:123063
 - ObjectIntersectionOf (:71388002
 - ObjectSomeValuesFrom(:609096000 ObjectIntersectionOf(ObjectSomeValuesFrom(:
 - 260686004 :129304002)
 - ObjectSomeValuesFrom(:405813007 :15497006))))
 - Necessary normal form - e.g. 83152002+416376001:{260686004=129304002,405813007=15497006,405815000=122456005}
 - PLUS Necessary normal form (tables)
 - Relationships:
 - (123063 116680003 83152002) - 0
 - (123063 260686004 129304002) - 0
 - (123063 405813007 15497006) - 1
 - (123063 405815000 122456005) - 1
 - Primitive expressions - "<<<" (only useful in a mapping context) relies on the assigned identifier (which are necessarily semantically unique).
- **Proposed Transformation Rules - Refinements (in valid domain of focus concepts)**
 - Close-to-user-form - IF the grouping of the refinement is **not** concept model valid THEN
 - If there is a single (non-self-grouped) role group in the definition of the focus concept, then any ungrouped (but groupable) refinements are merged with this role group
 - If there is more than one (non-self-grouped) role group in the definition then flag as ambiguous and require refinement
 - NEED TO FIND a realistic clinical example where this may occur // Prevent failing cases from coming up // use template
 - ALTERNATIVE: Refinement is applied to all (non-self-grouped) role groups in the definition
 - Self-grouped attributes in the refinement are grouped on their own - i.e. Priority, Due to, After, Before, During, Clinical course, Temporally related to, and all Observable entity attributes (see [Relationship Group](#))
 - Self-grouped attributes in the definition of the focus concept(s) are left unchanged

- 1. **Single refinement**
 - 83152002 |Oophorectomy| : 405815000 |Procedure device| = 122456005 |Laser device|
 - 83152002 |Oophorectomy| :
 - { 260686004 |Method| = 129304002 |Excision - action| ,
 - 405813007 |Procedure site - direct| = 15497006 |Ovarian structure| ,
 - 405815000 |Procedure device| = 122456005 |Laser device| }
- 2. **Two groupable refinements**
 - 83152002 |Oophorectomy| : 405815000 |Procedure device| = 122456005 |Laser device| , 36370000
 - 3 |Direct morphology| = 367643001 |Cyst |
 - 83152002 |Oophorectomy| :
 - { 260686004 |Method| = 129304002 |Excision - action| ,
 - 405813007 |Procedure site - direct| = 15497006 |Ovarian structure| ,
 - 405815000 |Procedure device| = 122456005 |Laser device| ,
 - 363700003 |Direct morphology| = 367643001 |Cyst | }
- 3. **One groupable refinement with one self-grouped refinement**
 - 83152002 |Oophorectomy| : 405815000 |Procedure device| = 122456005 |Laser device| , 26087000
 - 9 |Priority| = 394849002 |High priority|
 - 83152002 |Oophorectomy| :
 - { 260686004 |Method| = 129304002 |Excision - action| ,
 - 405813007 |Procedure site - direct| = 15497006 |Ovarian structure| ,
 - 405815000 |Procedure device| = 122456005 |Laser device| }
 - { 260870009 |Priority (attribute)| = 394849002 |High priority| }
- 4. **Refinement attribute matches (or subsumed by) attribute in focus concept's definition**
 - 83152002 |Oophorectomy| : 260686004 |Method| = 277261002 |Excision biopsy (qualifier value)|
 - 83152002 |Oophorectomy| :
 - { 260686004 |Method| = 129304002 |Excision - action| ,
 - 260686004 |Method| = 277261002 |Excision biopsy (qualifier value)| ,
 - 405813007 |Procedure site - direct| = 15497006 |Ovarian structure| }
- 5. **Refinement explicitly in role group**
 - 83152002 |Oophorectomy| : { 260686004 |Method| = 281615006 |Exploration - action| , 405813007 |Procedure site - direct| = 367643001 |Cyst | }
 - 83152002 |Oophorectomy| :
 - { 260686004 |Method| = 129304002 |Excision - action| ,
 - 405813007 |Procedure site - direct| = 15497006 |Ovarian structure| } ,
 - { 260686004 |Method| = 281615006 |Exploration - action| ,
 - 405813007 |Procedure site - direct| = 367643001 |Cyst | }
- **Proposed Transformation Rules - Refinements (NOT in valid domain of focus concepts)**

Close-to-user-form - IF the refinement's attribute is **not** valid for the domain of the focus concept THEN

If there is a single role group in the definition of the focus concept, which has an attribute value in the domain of the refinement's attribute THEN nest the relevant attribute value with the refinement added to the attribute value

(Note: It doesn't matter if the role group is self-grouped or not (see example 1 below)

If there is more than one role group in the definition of the focus concept, which has an attribute value in the domain of the refinement's attribute THEN (non-self-grouped) role group in the definition then flag as ambiguous and require refinement

- 1. **Left aural temperature**
 - 415974002 |Aural temperature|: 272741003 |Laterality| = 7771000 |Left|
 - 415974002 |Aural temperature|: {704327008 |Direct site| = (42859004 |Ear drum|: 272741003 |Laterality| = 7771000 |Left|)}
- 2. **Malignant tumor of right ovary**
 - 363443007 |Malignant tumor of ovary|: 272741003 |Laterality| = 24028007 |Right|
 - 363443007 |Malignant tumor of ovary|:
 - { 116676008 |Associated morphology| = 367651003 |Malignant neoplasm of primary, secondary or uncertain origin| ,
 - 363698007 |Finding site| = (15497008 |Ovarian structure| : 272741003 |Laterality| = 24028007 |Right|) }
- **Other Example - Emergency excision of appendix**
 - 1. 80146002 |Excision of appendix| :
 - 260870009 |Priority| = 25876001 |Emergency|
- **Other Example - Fracture of bone**
 - 1. 125605004 |Fracture of bone|: 363698007 |finding site| = 84167007 |Foot bone|
 - 2. 125605004 |Fracture of bone|: {363698007 |finding site| = 84167007 |Foot bone| }
 - 3. 125605004 |Fracture of bone|: {116676008 |Associated morphology| = 72704001 |Fracture| , 363698007 |finding site| = 84167007 |Foot bone| }
 - 4. 64572001 |Disease|: {116676008 |Associated morphology| = 72704001 |Fracture| , 363698007 |finding site| = 84167007 |Foot bone| }

The items below are currently on hold

URIs for Extended Editions		<p>ON HOLD - How to refer to an 'extended edition' using a URI - e.g. "International Edition plus the following 2 nursing modules: 733983009 IHTSDO Nursing Health Issues module and 733984003 IHTSDO Nursing Activities module </p> <p>Use Case - Need to execute an ECL, that refers to "^ 733991000 Nursing Health Issues Reference Set (foundation metadata concept) " and/or "^ 733990004 Nursing Activities Reference Set (foundation metadata concept) ", where the substrate includes the international edition, plus the modules that include these reference sets</p> <p>July 2020 International Edition URI: http://snomed.info/sct/900000000000207008/version/20200731</p> <p>July 2020 International Edition + nursing modules URI ?? - For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://snomed.info/sct/900000000000207008/version/20200731/module/733983009/time/20200131/module/733984003/time/20200131 • http://snomed.info/sct/900000000000207008/version/20200731/modules/733983009:733984003 • http://snomed.info/sct/900000000000207008:733983009:733984003/version/20200731:20190731:20200131 • Canonical order? Or order doesn't matter? • Constraints on what can go in the additional packages (only refsets and their metadata)
Expression Templates	Peter G. Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ON HOLD WAITING FROM IMPLEMENTATION FEEDBACK FROM INTERNAL TECH TEAM • WIP version - https://confluence.ihtsdotools.org/display/WIPSTS/Template+Syntax+Specification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Added a 'default' constraint to each replacement slot - e.g. default (72673000 Bone structure (body structure)) ▪ Enabling 'slot references' to be used within the value constraint of a replacement slot - e.g. <code>[[+id (<< 123037004 Body structure MINUS << \$findingSite2) @findingSite1]]</code> ▪ Allowing repeating role groups to be referenced using an array - e.g. <code>\$rolegroup[1]</code> or <code>\$rolegroup [!=SELF]</code> ▪ Allow reference to 'SELF' in role group arrays ▪ Adding 'sameValue' and 'allOrNone' constraints to information slots - e.g. <code>sameValue (\$site)</code>, <code>allOrNone (\$occurrence)</code> ▪ See changes in red here: 5.1. Normative Specification <p>Examples:</p> <p><code>[[+id]: [[1..*] @my_group sameValue(morphology)] { Finding site = [[+id (<<123037004 Body structure (body structure) MINUS << \$site! SELF]) @site] , Associated morphology = [[+id @my_morphology]] }</code></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation feedback on draft updates to Expression Template Language syntax <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Use cases from the Quality Improvement Project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multiple instances of the same role group, with some attributes the same and others different. Eg same morphology, potentially different finding sites. <p>Note that QI Project is coming from a radically different use case. Instead of <i>filling</i> template slots, we're looking at existing content and asking "exactly <i>how</i> does this concept fail to comply to this template?"</p> <p>For discussion:</p> <p><code>[[0..1]] { [[0..1]] 246075003 Causative agent = [[+id (< 410607006 Organism) @Organism]] }</code></p> <p>Is it correct to say either one of the cardinality blocks is redundant? What are the implications of 1..1 on either side? This is less obvious for the self grouped case.</p> <p>Road Forward for SI</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generate the parser from the ABNF and implement in the Template Service 2. User Interface to a) allow users to specify template at runtime b) tabular (auto-completion) lookup STL 3. Template Service to allow multiple templates to be specified for alignment check (aligns to none-off) 4. Output must clearly indicate exactly what feature of concept caused misalignment, and what condition was not met. <p>Additional note: QI project is no longer working in subhierarchies. Every 'set' of concepts is selected via ECL. In fact most reports should now move to this way of working since a subhierarchy is the trivial case. For a given template, we additionally specify the "domain" to which it should be applied via ECL. This is much more specific than using the focus concept which is usually the PPP eg Disease.</p> <p>FYI Michael Chu</p>

Description Templates	Kai Kewley	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ON HOLD• Previous discussion (in Malaysia)<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Overview of current use▪ Review of General rules for generating descriptions<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Removing tags, words• Conditional removal of words• Automatic case significance• Generating PTs from target PTs• Reordering terms▪ Mechanism for sharing general rules - inheritance? include?▪ Description Templates for translation▪ Status of planned specification
--------------------------	----------------------------	--

File **Modified**

No files shared here yet.

Agenda and Meeting Notes