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Abstract

Electronic Health Records (EHR) promise improvement for patient care and also offer great value for biomedical research including clinical, public health, and health services research. Unfortunately, the full potential of EHR big data research has remained largely unrealized.

The purpose of this study was to identify rate limiting factors, and develop recommendations to better balance unrestricted extramural EHR access with legitimate safeguarding of EHR data in retrospective research. By exploring primary, secondary, and tertiary sources, this review identifies external constraints and provides a comparative analysis of social influencers in retrospective EHR-based research.

Results indicate that EHRs have the advantage of reflecting the reality of patient care but also show a frequency of between 4.3-86% of incomplete and inaccurate data in various fields. The rapid spread of alternative analytics for health data challenges traditional interpretations of confidentiality protections. A confusing multiplicity of controls creates barriers to big data EHR research.

More research on the use of EHR big data is likely to improve accuracy and validity. Information governance and research approval processes should be simplified. Comprehensive regulatory policies that do not exclusively cover health care entities, are needed. Finally, new computing safeguards are needed to address public concerns, like research access only to aggregate data and not to individually identifiable information.
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Introduction

The vast amount of clinical data accumulating in Electronic Health Records (EHRs), or big data EHRs, represents an unprecedented opportunity to discover unrecognized risk factors, study the epidemiology of diseases, calculate life expectancy, distinguish best practices from superior outcomes and recognize opportunities for better health care.

The review of patient charts has been the cornerstone of clinical research for centuries. Historically, many landmark discoveries have originated from analyses of retrospective data. The relationship between smoking and lung cancer was first discovered by Müller in 1941 based on an analysis of patient records [1]. From these simple beginnings, recognition of smoking as a health hazard continued to evolve, ultimately becoming one the greatest public health achievements of the 20th century [2]. More contemporary examples include the relationship between thalidomide and birth defects [3], cancer epidemiology and pathophysiology, and vaccine development [4-6].

Facilitating biomedical research is one of the most important, but unrealized promises of introducing EHRs [7]. Researchers interested in conducting needs analysis, process, and outcome evaluations utilizing EHRs often run into seemingly insurmountable barriers.

Extramural access to big data represents a particular challenge (e.g., researcher of institution A trying to study big data of institution B). An illustrative case from a recent personal communication:

A professor of one of the world’s top ranked universities wanted to get a large EHR data set for research from a leading hospital nearby. The request for an anonymized data set and the study plan was approved by the institutional IRB. In spite of regulatory compliance, ethics clearance, and stellar personal scientific track record, the professor was unable to obtain the EHR data over a period of 18 months and finally gave up.

With the advancement of computer hardware and software, access to and analysis of clinical data is no longer a primarily technical issue. Today, the principal obstacles to EHR use in research are essentially social, ethical and regulatory.

Significant gaps exist for researchers in requesting, accessing, analyzing, and applying EHR data [8]. The Institute of Medicine reports that disappointment in the lack of EHR improvements has tempered enthusiasm for continuing research efforts [9]. Patients/consumers are increasingly participating in their own care and in care decisions, and most report being open to sharing their data for research [10, 11]. Their priorities regarding use and re-use of data will need to be taken into consideration.

Ideally, EHR-based research should meet the simultaneous but somewhat conflicting requirements of both unrestricted extramural access to the EHR by meritorious, innovative biomedical researchers with minimal administrative requirements and guaranteed zero access to EHRs by unauthorized, unnecessary or potentially harmful users of health data. Obviously, unnecessary and unjustified limitations on the access to EHR big data also represents a serious ethics violation in terms of denied care, lost public health improvement, and unrealized research discoveries benefiting patients.

The purpose of this study is to identify rate limiting social factors and develop recommendations to facilitate research on EHR big data. This study focuses on three dimensions: validity, ethical considerations, and security risks of EHR data use in biomedical research, focusing on the US context.
Methods

The project explores relevant studies and methods originating in biomedicine, health informatics, historical research, bioethics, health administration, computer science, public health and other fields. Eligibility criteria: EHR-based original research project of at least 1000 records, or thematic exploration of EHR big data management in research. Peer reviewed literature and policy documents were explored along the following hierarchy:

1. Primary sources (data): original research publications in the peer-reviewed scientific literature on EHR projects, national and international statistical databases, national surveys, and historical documents illustrating important aspects of EHR use in research.
2. Secondary sources (management): thematic scholarly explorations in the scientific literature, critiques, pertinent scholarly books, government documents, and statements of national and international organizations on social actors in big data research.

In processing and synthesizing the information, tertiary sources were used solely to identify primary and secondary sources of information, which serve as the backbone; meanwhile, secondary sources were used to elaborate and enhance the ideas and themes of the primary sources.

PubMed and Web of Science were utilized for full text searches. Search terms included: electronic health records (EHR), electronic medical record (EMR), retrospective health research, ethics of EHR data use, confidentiality of EHR data and HIPAA. We then investigated similar themes and ethical dimensions presented in the literature. A PRISMA framework was applied to the larger systematic review resulting from this analysis [12]. The comparative and discerning analyses generated the list of factors that create external and internal influences on big data EHR use.

Results

Patient data from large EHR databases are increasingly available from multiple sources and often for a price. Efforts to evaluate the availability of these data from a practical and ethical standpoint is ongoing (see Table 1).

Validity - Issues of data integrity

Data integrity is defined as the validity, accuracy, reliability, timeliness, and consistency of the data. It remains the first question of recorded EHR data use in biomedical research. Retrospective analyses need to consider the limitations and appropriate use of data, including potential risks of inaccuracies [8]. Retrospective data are collected in variable circumstances, recorded with inconsistent data definitions, missing data, and without standardized testing. Table 2 lists the frequency of some of the reported deficiencies in EHR-based research.

On the other hand, this patient care data represents the reality of actual practice, as opposed to results of sterile research protocols. In many cases, real data can fill gaps in current evidence and provide evidence in areas where clinical trials will never be carried out. Illustrative and appropriate research uses of retrospective clinical data include exploration of risk factors, cost-effectiveness of care, selection of best practices, and the epidemiology of diseases and health conditions.
special resources and arrangements, RCTs often represent centrally-controlled practices that are not representative of current practices; and also, may never be fully replicated in general use. Furthermore, prospective randomized studies can evaluate only beneficial interventions, as opposed to allocation of patients to a harmful intervention, such as smoking, which would be unethical.

In the assessment of biological phenomena and therapeutic potential, the multicenter RCT cannot be replaced by anything less methodologically rigorous. However, due to the very high rate of negative clinical trial results, the use of retrospective data from EHR is recommended for more effective filtering prior to the evaluation of safety and efficacy of new treatments in prospective studies [25].

The use of large databases requires special statistical techniques as enormous sample sizes can overpower results (i.e., practically meaningless minuita can appear statistically significant). Additionally, appropriate scrutiny of data quality and accuracy variability is needed with reasonable logistical and statistical checking prior to analyses.

**Ethics: Issues of Privacy, Beneficence, and Non-maleficence**

Ethics concerns in big data biomedical research are twofold: wrongdoing in research, and ineffective administration of human subject reviews. In this study, we referred to the DuBois taxonomy of misbehavior in medical research [26]. Out of 15 fundamental kinds of wrongdoings in medical research, two stand out as particularly relevant to big data research (Table 3).

**Table 3. Taxonomy of Misbehavior in Medical Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Area</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violation of privacy or confidentiality</td>
<td>• wrongful disclosure&lt;br&gt;• wrongfully obtaining information&lt;br&gt;• wrongful use of health information&lt;br&gt;• failure to safeguard health information&lt;br&gt;• no need for such consent regarding archived data&lt;br&gt;• advance blanket research approval forms to facilitate future use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure of informed consent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Privacy is the basic human right of limited access by others to aspects of their person, including thoughts, identifying information, and even information in bodily tissues and fluids [27]. Patients are increasingly playing an active role in their care and are often unaware that their health information, de-identified or not, may be used for clinical or community health research in the future. This directly impacts the autonomy of the patient, even if they would have given consent.

Confidentiality is the mandate to protect information that an individual has disclosed in a relationship of trust [27]. In certain circumstances, personal information may be analyzed without consent when the benefits to society outweigh the individual’s interest in keeping the information confidential [28]. Typically, big data researchers are not involved in data collection and, therefore, confidentiality and security of protected data become the foremost concerns.

Extramural research is much harder to conduct than collaborating with an intramural colleague or being an inside user of local databases. Institutional Review Boards are tasked to protect human subjects in research. Unfortunately, variable interpretations and a lack of coordination among multi-site IRBs creates a challenging health research environment [7]. This has been recognized by the NIH as an area in need of improvement. The recently published draft policy for public comment noted “there is no evidence that multiple IRB reviews enhance protections for human subjects” [29].

**Regulation: Data Security and Alternative Analytics**

In the US, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and subsequent regulations direct covered entities (e.g., a healthcare institutions) in the protection of individually identifiable protected health information in research. Violations of the Privacy Rule can become the basis for both civil and criminal penalties, including fines and possible time in jail.

A particularly controversial part of the HIPAA provisions is use of de-identified data in research. For facilitated research access, the Privacy Rule requires de-identification (i.e., removal of 18 identifiers including names, social security numbers, telephone numbers, and others). However, de-identification creates obstacles to many research projects, particularly cause-effect and time series studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Alternative Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28% of US hospitals</td>
<td>Patient wealth screening</td>
<td>Grateful Patient Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Consumer data</td>
<td>Use of shopping pattern identifies marketing strategies, including based on health behaviors: pregnancy, diabetes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garmin Connect</td>
<td>Athletic performance data</td>
<td>4 billion miles of performance information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM Healthgrades</td>
<td>Aggregate health data</td>
<td>Sells patient lists based on diagnosis, evaluates hospital patient data for non-compliance and QC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolinas HealthCare</td>
<td>Consumer data on 2 million people</td>
<td>Identify high-risk patients. Data aggregated through public records, store loyalty program transactions, and credit card purchases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LexisNexis</td>
<td>Medicaid recipients and consumer data publicly available (vehicle registration, property records, etc.)</td>
<td>Identify Medicaid Fraud and Abuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without an authorization, a covered entity can use and disclose protected health information for treatment, payment and health care operations (TPO). Recently, the American Medical Informatics Association started advocating for the inclusion of observational or non-interventional data research as an appropriate operational use of protected health information [30, 31]. Ultimately, EHR big data should be available not just in the present, but also for improved future decision-making.
The rapid spread of alternative analytics for health records also challenges traditional interpretations of covered entity and confidentiality protections. For example, the recently announced Qualcomm Tricorder XPRIZE is a $10 million global competition to accurately diagnose a set of diseases independent of a healthcare professional or facility. Corporations have discovered algorithms in shopping and browsing patterns, utilizing shopping cards and credit card transactions, to identify health diagnosis or needs – without the need to access a person’s medical record (Table 4). While this is skillful marketing and consumer targeting, it appears that little thought has been given to the ethics of such analysis. Data matching with publicly available records is also becoming possible [32]. While the use of this same consumer data when legitimately coupled with a person’s health record may have genuine positive outcomes, such as warning that purchased food may interact poorly with current medications or reminders to refill prescriptions, the negative consequences are not far-fetched.

The “Grateful Patient Program” model is gaining more support across the country as a way to increase donations to both non-profit and for-profit hospitals [33]. Offices of giving or communication match EHR data with income/wealth data to identify prospective donor patients and families, and then send targeted information, or even organize special visits and contacts when the patients are admitted [34]. Currently, alternative analytics has far fewer regulatory obstacles than big data biomedical research.

In addition to the ever increasing flow of health information with data stored on hard drives and cloud computing, human tissues and cells also challenge the current system of protections as they are also carriers of personally identifiable health information.

The American Health Information Management Association recommends comprehensive information governance to ensure accuracy, reliability, integrity, timeliness, accessibility, and security of data and information impacting patient care, research studies and public policy. Health care data and information must be governed to meet these imperatives.

Discussion

Big data EHRs have proved to be not only an irreplaceable source of clinical, public health and health services research but also an epicenter of confusing expectations and restrictions. The balance between access to EHRs, validity concerns, ethics safeguards and regulatory protections remains elusive.

To unlock the full potential of big data EHR research, a series of actions are needed:

1) More research on the use of EHR big data is not only a matter of new scientific knowledge but also immediate public interest as more use is likely to discover more errors and stimulate corrective efforts [35]. More EHR big data research is likely to improve accuracy and validity through improved error detections and control mechanisms.

2) The confusing multiplicity of controls creates hindrances in big data EHR research (e.g., IRB for human subject protection, institutional privacy officers for regulatory compliance, multiple IRBs for inter-institutional collaborations). Therefore, information governance and the research approval processes should be integrated and streamlined to be a one-stop research approval process.

3) Considering the rapidly expanding array of health databases outside the health care system, and alternative analytics, there is the risk that academic research and also patient care by licensed clinicians will be outpaced and major ethical and security concerns will be unaddressed. Comprehensive policies are needed for secondary use of all electronic health data, not just those in currently covered health care entities.

4) The many rate-limiting privacy and information security requirements call for new computing safeguards to address public concerns (e.g., creation of access only to aggregate data but not to individually identifiable information, tools for matching big data from diverse sources without revealing individual data).

Trust in the protection and utilization of health data is essential to continued public support. The public must see and believe that their data security is taken seriously and used responsibly. It is reasonable to expect that the larger availability of EHRs and the opportunities to match data from multiple databases should lead to an accelerated rate of valuable research discoveries.
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Introductory Remarks from the Scientific Program Chairs

Fernando Martin-Sanchez\textsuperscript{a}, Kaija Saranto\textsuperscript{b}

\textsuperscript{a} Health and Biomedical Informatics Centre, Melbourne Medical School, The University of Melbourne, Australia
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MEDINFO is the premier international Health and Biomedical Informatics event. MEDINFO 2015 is hosted by SBIS (Brazilian Health Informatics Society) on behalf of the International Medical Informatics Association (IMIA) and will take place in the city of São Paulo from the 19\textsuperscript{th} to 23\textsuperscript{rd} August 2015. MEDINFO 2015 continues a 41-year tradition of bringing together world leaders, policy makers, researchers, practitioners, educators, and students to exchange ideas and contribute to the latest developments, innovations, and global trends in this rapidly advancing, multidisciplinary field of Health and Biomedical Informatics. This is the first MEDINFO that has been organized to reflect the new two-yearly cycle approved by IMIA. We were thus very happy when we reached the submission and registration deadlines with numbers very similar to previous MEDINFOs that had been organized in three-yearly cycles.

Under the theme: “eHealth-enabled Health”, the world leaders in this field will gather in Brazil to share knowledge and analyze how Health and Biomedical Informatics is contributing to address some of the most challenging problems in health care, public health, consumer health and biomedical research. Researchers, clinicians, technologists and managers will attend and share experiences on the use of information methods, systems and technologies to promote patient-centered care, improve patient safety, enhance care outcomes, facilitate translational research, enable precision medicine and improve education and skills in health informatics.

This is an historical event as MEDINFO is hosted in Latin America for the first time. Inclusiveness has been a main goal in MEDINFO 2015 with affordable registration fees for the regional audience and use of Spanish and Portuguese language in tutorials and simultaneous translation in sessions held in the main auditorium. MEDINFO 2015 features a pre-congress offering of an extensive tutorial program by leading experts and a student paper competition that draws the best young talent from all over the world. The main program includes keynote talks, papers, posters, panels, workshops, and scientific demonstrations that span a broad range of topics from emerging methodologies that contribute to the conceptual and scientific foundations of Health and Biomedical Informatics, to successful implementations of innovative application, integration, and evaluation of eHealth systems and solutions.

The conference program features five keynote presentations, 178 paper presentations, 248 poster abstract presentations, 27 panels, 30 workshops and 17 scientific demonstrations.

The contributions and presentations included in the program were carefully selected through a rigorous review process involving almost 400 reviewers for a large number of submissions (793) sent by 2500 authors from 59 countries all over the world. The Scientific Program Committee Co-Chairs are grateful to the four Track Chairs, the members of the Scientific Program Committee and all the reviewers who have contributed to the process, and thank the Editorial Committee, the Local Organizing Committee and the IMIA officers (in particular CEOs and VP Medinfo) for assisting us in putting this program together.

The conference participants come to São Paulo from all continents and 60 different countries. We hope that you will enjoy the published proceedings and the overall program!

Sincerely,

Fernando Martin-Sanchez, PhD, FACHI, FACMI &
Kaija Saranto, PhD, FACMI, FAAN
Co-Chairs, MEDINFO 2015 Scientific Program Committee
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Introductory Remarks from the Editorial Committee Chair

Indra Neil Sarkar*

*Center for Biomedical Informatics, Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

Let me join the rest of the organizing committees in welcoming you to MEDINFO 2015 in São Paulo. As the Editorial Committee Chair, I had the distinct honor to review every accepted submission to this year’s congress. I personally wish to extend a thanks to the authors for their fine contributions. Together with the meeting participants, MEDINFO 2015 is positioned to be an unprecedented exposition of the finest biomedical informatics innovations with global impact.

Appreciating the international scope of the MEDINFO congresses, it is essential to embrace principles to support scientific inclusivity. Therefore, in contrast to many scientific meetings, the general criteria used for selection into the MEDINFO proceedings is based mostly on scientific merit; language issues are not reason alone for a submission to be not selected. The cost of this inclusivity is that each accepted submission must be carefully reviewed and edited to adjust for language that does not impact the scientific contribution. It is important to note that even submissions from native English speakers may require editing due to variance from the required template, typographical errors, or grammatical issues.

Building on the framework developed by Christoph Lehmann for MEDINFO 2013, Assistant Editors (AEs) were recruited from biomedical informatics training programs (Table 1). The minimum criterion for selection as an AE was at least one first author peer-reviewed English publication (ideally in an informatics conference or journal). Poster submissions were reviewed by one AE; paper submissions by two AEs. The edits were then finalized and assembled into the final proceedings that are in front of you now.

It is important for authors to understand the costs associated with the editing and overall production efforts to ensure the MEDINFO proceedings are of the highest quality possible. Following my esteemed colleagues who served as Editorial Committee Chairs for previous MEDINFOS, I make a plea to each of you to consider the work that is involved when aiming to circumvent the standards established by the organizing committees.

Even more so than in previous MEDINFOS, strict adherence to the template guidelines was deemed an essential criterion for inclusion in the proceedings. Nonetheless, a number of submissions did clear the peer-review process that still required formatting edits to ensure consistency in font size, spacing, and overall style. In some instances, text had to be significantly edited or figures drastically shrunken or eliminated all together to ensure page limits were respected. Even with such edits, a good faith effort was still made for preserving the scientific message of the contributions. I am thankful for the dedication and hard work of 26 AEs that worked, word-by-word, through each submission and made edits that were ultimately vetted and approved by me.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the other members of the Editorial Committee (Paulo Mazzoncin de Azevedo Marques and Andrew Georgiou), along with Alvaro Margolis (IMIA Vice President for MEDINFO), Peter Murray (Immediate Past IMIA CEO), Elaine Huesing (Interim IMIA CEO), the leadership of the Local Organizing Committee (Beatriz de Faria Leão and Claudio Giuliano Alves da Costa) and the Scientific Program Committee Co-Chairs (Fernando Martin Sanchez and Kaija Saranto). These proceedings and this meeting are a product of a true team effort– I hope you enjoy MEDINFO 2015 in São Paolo!

Sincerely,

Indra Neil Sarkar, PhD, MLIS, FACMI
Chair, Editorial Committee