# Minutes for Advisory Council Meeting

## Committee on Credible Practice of Modeling & Simulation in Healthcare

**Date:**       November 13, 2013
**Time:**       11:00 AM CST

**Means:**   Conference Call

**Attendees:**         Jeffrey Bischoff
Ahmet Erdemir
Ronald Germain
Anthony Hunt
Wing Kam Liu
Vasilis Marmeralis
Lealem Mulugeta
Pras Pathmanathan
Grace Peng
Martin Steele

**Not Available:**   David Eckmann
Donna Lochner
James Thomas
Marlei Walton

## Agenda:

1. Review of actions from last meeting and progress to date – 10 minutes
2. Ten Simple Rules survey – 30 minutes
   a. Summary of initial results from the three task teams
   b. Current "Beta Test" activity – closes November 13th midnight US/Pacific
   c. Internal anonymous survey – official responses
   d. Preparations for public launch
   e. General feedback from Advisory Council on Ten Simple Rules effort
3. Recap of roles and expectations – 5 Minutes
4. Mechanisms to evaluate performance of Co-Chairs, Executive Committee members, and Advisory Council members – 10 minutes
5. Other items – 5 minutes

## Key Points:

See Notes for details.

1. **Ten Simple Rules development is on track, including upcoming deployment of a survey to acquire feedback from the global community.**
   ◦ Phase 1 Trial of the survey within the Committee was launched and will be completed soon.
   ◦ Phase 2 Trial of the survey within the Committee will be launched soon and will allow reproducibility of the responses from the Committee members.
   ◦ Global launch of the survey is expected to happen in upcoming weeks with a targeted distribution to ~50,000 people. The survey will be open throughout the first quarter of 2014.

2. **A formal mechanism to evaluate the Committee performance will NOT be prioritized.** Committee Chairs can bring any issues immediately to the Advisory Council to address problems effectively.

**Action Items:**

See Notes for details.

1. ***Advisory Council and Executive Committee members will do the following, if they have not already done so.***
   - Register to SimTk.org and send their username to Co-Chairs. Lealem will pass information about SimTk.org registration to relevant Advisory Council members.
   - Provide biosketches.
   - Provide photos.
2. ***The Executive Committee will relaunch an updated Ten Simple Rules survey for internal assessment.***
3. ***The Executive Committee will setup a data analysis group for interpretation of Ten Simple Rules survey.*** Lealem will lead establishing this group, including Lu Tian (of the Executive Committee) as the biostatistician and Martin Steele (of the Advisory Council).

**Notes:**

1. **Review of actions and progress up to date.** Lealem went over action items of the previous Advisory Council meeting.
   - Advisory Council members were reminded to become SimTk.org accounts to become official team members at the project site, to provide photos, and also biosketches, if they have not done so. ***Lealem will pass information about SimTk.org registration to Ron and Wing Kam.*** Members were asked to e-mail their SimTk.org username to co-chairs after signing up for an account there.
   - Ahmet summarized the progress report.
   - Grace asked about using Zotero, which is used to accumulate a database of relevant literature. Zotero needs a separate login, an invitation needs to be sent to allow members to join. Wing Kam asked current number of documents listed in Zotero database. Lealem estimated this as around 50.
2. **Ten Simple Rules survey.** Lealem started the discussion on Ten Simple Rules survey. The goal is to engage the global community to highlight broadly applicable and relatively more important rules to guide good practice. Other rules and principles may be incorporated into individual rules within focal ten.
   - A survey form was developed and will be launched soon to get feedback from the community. Deadline for the first trial run within the Committee was the day of this meeting. At the time of this meeting, there were 13 responders (as compared to 22 expected). Some members did not get the link for the first trial run. ***Lealem will resend the link again and allow a day for feedback.*** *The feedback from members will be used to refine the survey.* ***The updated survey will be relaunched internally to assess reproducibility of results within the Committee.*** It will also provide the opportunity for members to provide feedback, if they have not done so.
   - Grace asked if the survey is on SimTk.org. Lealem noted that the survey is provided through Google forms. Some government servers, e.g., FDA, seem to block Google accounts. Ahmet note that the survey is actually public yet not visible nor easy to find, only those with the link will access it.
   - The survey will be distributed to an estimated population of ~50,000 people. The survey will be open through the first quarter of 2014.
   - Advisory Council members provided their feedback on the current Survey format.
     - Jeff thinks that the biggest challenge with this survey is to decide what rules are most important and what are less. With the current format it may be hard to identify the top ten. With divided pages, the responder does not know what is coming up. ***The possibility to provide all the rules in the same page should be explored.*** The current format of questions may result in a long page. Jeff

wondered if a table can be created to tightly show and respond to all the rules and maybe ask for ranking of the rules. Pras noted that the current survey is easy to fill in; if ranking is asked, it may be cumbersome. An alternative, as suggested by Grace, is to give a summary of results and the opportunity to change. Current survey has back buttons to allow the responder evaluate their previous selections. This may need to be emphasized. ***Grace also asked that the survey introduction should mention the goal to reach top ten rules.***

- Ron noted that some survey questions seem to be repeated and asked whether this is intentional. Lealem responds as yes & no. Yes, as this may allow us to assess consistency of the responses. No, as some of rules, which may be perceived as similar, may have differences based on the context of model use. Grace wondered if any inconsistencies in the responses are observed, how those will be dealt with. Lealem told that biostatistician help may be necessary.

- Grace wondered about the potential bias towards first set of questions vs the latter sets of questions. In that regard, she asked for randomization. ***The current survey infrastructure do not allow randomization.*** Some web scripting may need to be done for this, yet this seems to be beyond the Committee's current capacity. An alternative is to create multiple forms (with different orders of questions) that can be sent to different groups, e.g. six forms.

- Grace also asked if an importance of resolution between 0 and 5 is necessary. The survey originally started with an importance from 0 to 10. Per Joy's advise, it was reduced to 0 to 5 to accomplish a decent granularity which is not too coarse. Grace personally feels that she considers only three levels of importance. Ahmet confirms that the responsibility is on the responder to find the grade of importance for a given rule. Normalization of responders' grades based on their range may resolve this issue.

  ○ A biostatistician in the Executive Committee will help interpretation of the survey results. Martin worries about normalization (if employed) as it may distort the results. ***Martin was kindly asked to volunteer for the data analysis group, which will work on the interpretation of survey results.*** Setting up a data analysis group should be an agenda item in upcoming Committee meetings.

3. **Recap of roles and expectations.** Lealem reminded the Advisory Council about roles and expectations.
   ○ Executive Committee members were asked to spend about 8 hours a month.
   ○ Advisory Council members were asked to spend about 1 hour a month.
   ○ In relation to contributions, one area where all can contribute is the development of glossary.

4. **Mechanisms to evaluate performance of Committee.** Lealem asked for a mechanism to evaluate performance of Co-Chairs, Executive Committee Members, and Advisory Council. Ahmet described the potential need and a possible mechanism, e.g. anonymous reviews.
   ○ Ron noted that the Co-Chairs should do this evaluation as they are more aware of individual contributions. In this context, Ahmet and Lealem can do general evaluation of the Executive Committee and Advisory Council members and the members can evaluate Co-Chairs.
   ○ Grace wondered if a structured evaluation is needed. The products of the Committee, e.g., Ten Simple Rules, its function as a team, its behavior, and communications between members should illustrate whether the Committee is working or not.
   ○ Grace also noted that to be effective, it may be the best for the Co-Chairs bring any issues immediately to the Advisory Council for resolution. There is indeed the separation of powers, i.e. three-way communication between Co-Chairs, Executive Committee, and Advisory Council is a resource.
   ○ ***The consensus was that a formal implementation of performance evaluation should not be a priority.*** Yet, it may be good to think about. Issues can be dealt on a need basis in order not to impede operations.

5. **Other items.** None noted.