Are Students Less Likely to Report Pertinent Negatives in Post-encounter Notes?
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BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES: In completing post-encounter notes (PENs), students are believed to under-report about 30% of the important information obtained in the medical history. The resulting incomplete clinical notes can contribute to adverse patient care and medicolegal outcomes. We hypothesized that pertinent negative items would be more likely to be under-reported than positive items. We compared reporting rates for pertinent positive and negative items on two cases in a clinical skills assessment (CSA) taken by all 55 third-year students. Based on standardized patient (SP) checklists, students obtained 87% of both positive and negative items. Scoring of PENs found significant differences in the reporting rates for positive (75%) and negative (52%) items. These results were consistent for each case. Students appear to be able to elicit pertinent negative information from patients but, although these items may be crucial in the medical history, they are significantly more likely than positive items to be omitted from the clinical note.

(Fam Med 2012;44(1):22-5.)

The value of including post-encounter notes (PENs) in clinical assessments of students is well established.1,2 PENs provide unique information that is complementary to other data such as checklist scores completed by standardized patients (SPs) or assessments by observing faculty.3 Psychometric studies show high correlation between scores in data gathering (obtaining key items by history and physical examination) and written communication (PENs).4,5 Despite the clinical and educational significance, student notes consistently fail to report all the pertinent information obtained during clinical encounters, even in high-stakes examinations.6-8 One study found that students failed to report 32% of 13 key elements of the medical history in one case during a clinical skills examination (CSA).7 On a study of four CSA cases, we found that students failed to report 27% of key history items.8

Few studies have commented on which items are most likely to be omitted from clinical notes by students or clinicians.7,9,10 In our previous study, we noted that pertinent negative items appeared less likely to be reported than other key items, but the study included too few pertinent negative items for a valid comparison.8 We therefore used data from a subsequent formative mid-third year CSA to compare the reporting of pertinent negative and pertinent positive items in two SP cases. One case concerned abdominal pain and the other headache.

We limited the study to the medical history as these items can be more reliably validated than physical examination items. Physical examination may be technically difficult to view on camera or video-recordings and/or require judgment by SPs or observers as to how well a student performed against an established standard technique.11,12 These problems may contribute to the very high rates of inaccurate documentation reported for physical examination items in some studies.13,14 Our hypothesis was that students are more likely to report pertinent positive than pertinent negative items from the medical history, ie, that under-reporting would be significantly higher for pertinent negative items.

Methods

During the end of the first semester CSA, 55 mid-third-year students were assessed on the two cases portrayed by SPs. Faculty measured student performance on 15 key items from the medical history. After each SP encounter, students recorded information in the PEN, and SPs used checklists to score obtained/not obtained for each key item. Independently trained observers monitored the accuracy of SP performance. Upon completion of the PEN, the 15 key items selected by faculty were
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scored and recorded as reported/not reported. A single faculty member, who was blinded from the SP report, scored and reported all PENs. Overall performance validity was evaluated by subsequently reviewing recordings for approximately 20% of the encounters and making comparisons to SP checklists.

Two faculty members, who were not involved in evaluating the formative CSA and were blinded to student scores, classified items as pertinent negatives or pertinent positives. Pertinent negatives were defined as key items whose absence was significant to the case. Examples included significant risk factors (such as smoking) or symptoms (such as blood in the stool) that the SP denied if asked. Of the 30 items (15 per case), eight pertinent negative and 18 pertinent positive items were identified by consensus. The remaining four questions were qualitative or descriptive and were excluded from the study.

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize results and compare proportions of information obtained per the SP checklist and reported per the PEN by case and in total. Binomial two-sample proportion z-tests were conducted to assess significant differences. The retrospective analysis of these data was determined to be an exempt study by the Institutional Review Board's Human Subjects Committee.

**Results**

Table 1 compares and summarizes results from SP checklists and student PENS. Overall congruence between checklists and PENS was similar to that reported in previous studies. For all 30 items, students obtained 84.8% and reported 66.7% of items performed. They under-reported (obtained but did not report) 23.8% of the items performed. They under-reported (obtained but did not report) 23.8% of the items performed. Students obtained high rates of both pertinent negative (87.7%) and pertinent positive (87%) items. Students were significantly more likely to report positive items than negative items, 75.1% compared to 52.3% respectively, z=8.53, P<.001. Conversely, in under-reporting, the proportion of positive items was significantly lower than negative items, 17.6% compared to 40.7%, z=9.35, P<.001.

Overall, results were similar between cases (Table 2). Students were significantly more likely to report pertinent positive items than negative items, 74.1% (abdominal) and 76.0% (headache) compared to 53.9% (abdominal) and 50.9% (headache), respectively. Detailed examination of the question content showed the highest reporting of a negative item was for smoking, whereas the lowest was for radiation of pain. For positive items, the highest reporting was for specific location of abdominal pain and the lowest was for use of prescription medication.

**Discussion**

Despite obtaining almost all of the pertinent positive and negative items, students tended to omit from the PEN (under-report) pertinent negative items significantly more than positive items.

The PEN has been described as the “benchmark” for assessing physician competence as well as providing the medicolegal record of the patient encounter. Failure to report all the essential information obtained in a patient history can have many negative consequences, including inaccurate diagnosis, inappropriate follow-up, under-billing, and under-reporting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP Checklist</th>
<th>Obtained (%)</th>
<th>Not Obtained (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>1,007 (61.0)</td>
<td>94 (5.7)</td>
<td>1,101 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>393 (23.8)</td>
<td>156 (9.5)</td>
<td>549 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,400 (84.8)</td>
<td>250 (15.2)</td>
<td>1,650 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pertinent negative: 8 items**

| Reported | 207 (47.0) | 23 (5.3) | 230 (52.3) |
| Not reported | 179 (40.7) | 31 (7.0) | 210 (47.7) |
| Total     | 386 (87.7) | 54 (12.3) | 440 (100.0) |

**Pertinent positive: 18 items**

| Reported | 687 (69.4) | 56 (5.7) | 743 (75.1) |
| Not reported | 174 (17.6) | 73 (7.4) | 247 (24.9) |
| Total     | 861 (87.0) | 129 (13.0) | 990 (100.0) |

CSA—clinical skills assessment  
SP—standardized patient  
PENS—post-encounter notes  
* Note: results are rounded such that only marginal percentages will total appropriately.
and underestimation of the quality of clinical data gathering.\textsuperscript{13,15} Nevertheless, several studies document that students, residents, and physicians substantially under-report important items obtained during the medical interview.\textsuperscript{5-10,13,14,16} Understanding which items get forgotten or ignored in documenting the clinical encounter is an important element in designing strategies to improve clinical care. This study validates the common clinical impression that pertinent negatives are significantly more likely than positive data to be omitted from PENs.

Educationally, the ability to prepare an accurate, complete, yet concise PEN is recognized as a core competency for both medical students and residents,\textsuperscript{17,18} yet little has been published on how to teach this skill.\textsuperscript{19} For educators, analysis of which items are selectively reported (and conversely those that are elicited but not reported) also provides insights on student utilization of clinical knowledge and decision making.\textsuperscript{20,21} Our students elicited the pertinent negative information, but we do not know why they failed to report so much of it in the PEN. The items that were omitted came from all sections of the history, i.e., presenting complaint, review of systems, and social history. The magnitude of the effect and its pervasive nature suggest that simple forgetting does not adequately explain the under-reporting. Students may under-value the significance of negative information in clinical decision making. Pertinent negative information may also be inadequately emphasized in clinical teaching across several clerkships. Such an effect may be too small to be apparent in individual courses and only apparent in a general assessment such as the CSA. Educators have been criticized for underutilizing such curricular-wide feedback from a CSA in improving educational programs.\textsuperscript{22}

This preliminary study has several limitations. Data were only gathered on 55 mid-third-year students and two SP cases. As previously reported, reporting accuracy may vary substantially by case\textsuperscript{8,13} and by student.\textsuperscript{7,21} Studies based on SP checklist reports and faculty scoring of PENs also face several methodological challenges in the design of items on checklists\textsuperscript{6} and the use of scoring instruments.\textsuperscript{24-26} We endeavored to minimize the principal problems by training the SPs and the physician scorer and also by validation of SP performances and checklists by observers. Reliability of PEN scores has not been shown to improve by duplicate scoring by a second trained physician.\textsuperscript{27} The study was also limited as a retrospective analysis of examination data. Some questions could not be classified as either “positives” or “negatives,” and others may have suffered from ambiguity. In editing cases for a future study, greater attention is being paid to design of checklist and PEN scoring rubrics as well as specific SP training in the areas of interest.\textsuperscript{28} The editing process also allows validation of the clinical significance of each item\textsuperscript{29} and a more even distribution of positive and negative items in the cases.

Finally, the study was limited by its role as an end of first semester assessment. Since students had only completed half of the required clerkships, this CSA focused on general attributes of patient assessment and clinical content that could be expected of all students, regardless of clinical experiences. Both students and residents are reported to improve performance on SP assessments with increasing clinical experience.\textsuperscript{30} A larger CSA held at the end of the third year has the potential to include up to 12 cases and to address a much wider scope of clinical information. Future studies could also investigate any relationship between attention to pertinent negatives and other indicators of student performance.
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\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Case Description} & \textbf{Obtained (\%)} & \textbf{Reported (\%)} & \textbf{Under-reported (\%)} & \textbf{Obtained and Reported (\%)} \\
\hline
Negative items, n=220 & & & & \\
Abdominal pain & 194 (88.2) & 118 (53.6) & 93 (42.3) & 101 (45.9) \\
Headache & 192 (87.3) & 112 (50.9) & 86 (39.1) & 106 (48.2) \\
\hline
Positive items, n=495 & & & & \\
Abdominal pain & 419 (84.6) & 367 (74.1) & 88 (17.8) & 331 (66.9) \\
Headache & 442 (89.3) & 376 (76.0) & 86 (17.4) & 356 (71.9) \\
\hline
\textbf{Comparison (z, P)} & & & & \\
Abdominal pain & 1.25 & 0.212 & 5.42 & <.001 & 7.09 & <.001 & 5.29 & <.001 \\
Headache & 0.79 & 0.432 & 6.64 & <.001 & 6.27 & <.001 & 6.13 & <.001 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{CSA Pertinent Items Obtained and Reported, Summarized by Type and by Case (55 Students)}
\end{table}

CSA—Clinical Skills Assessment
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