

Investigating the Clinical Relevance of Patient-Reported Symptoms for Influenza Triage

Jacqueline Dworaczyk¹, Zane Billings², Brian McKay³, Andreas Handel² ¹ School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, Arizona State University; ² Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Georgia; ³ Department of Family and Consumer Sciences, University of Georgia

Introduction

Motivation: During a public health crisis, telemedicine could be used as a tool to triage patients. If a patient can get the same diagnosis without an in-person visit, the burden on the healthcare system could be reduced.

Question: Can a patient symptom questionnaire be used to predict influenza diagnosis by a physician?

- Data were collected in a previous study at UGA's University Health Center during the 2016-2017 flu season (1)
- A symptom questionnaire containing 19 symptoms was given to both patients and clinicians:
 - Patients filled out symptom questionnaire before the appointment
- Clinicians filled out symptom questionnaire during the appointment

Clinical Decision Rules

We applied 5 clinical decision rules:

- CF (Cough-Fever Rule): Influenza diagnosed if cough and fever are both present
- CFA (Cough-Fever-Acute Onset Rule): Influenza diagnosed if cough and fever are both present for \leq 2 days
- CFM (Cough-Fever-Myalgia Rule): Influenza diagnosed if cough, fever and muscle pain are all present



- Weighted Flu Score: 2 points given if cough and fever are both present, 2 points given for muscle pain, 1 point for chills/sweats and 1 point if symptoms are present for <= 2 days (3)
- Decision tree: See upper right figure (2)

Results

We found that the clinical decision rules predicted clinician diagnosis better using the symptoms reported by clinicians rather than by patients.

Table 1: The area under the ROC curve (AUC) is an overall measurement of accuracy. We saw a reduction in AUC using the patient questionnaire instead of the clinician questionnaire.

Decision Rule	Clinician AUC	Patient AUC	Difference	95% CI
CF	0.794	0.703	0.091	(0.07 - 0.11)
CFA	0.705	0.630	0.075	(0.056 - 0.094)
CFM	0.812	0.699	0.113	(0.091 - 0.135)
Score	0.890	0.794	0.096	(0.079 - 0.114)
Tree	0.856	0.760	0.096	(0.076 - 0.116)



Figure 1: The ROC curves for each clinical decision rule.

The clinicians outperformed the patients across multiple performance measures.



Figure 2: The closer F1, MCC, sensitivity and specificity are to 1, the better the prediction performance.

CFA — CFM — Score — Tree

In a sensitivity analysis, we evaluated the clinical decision rules' ability to predict PCR confirmed flu status.

Table 2: Comparing AUCs, we found that the differences between patients and clinicians are smaller.

Decision Rule	Clinician AUC	Patient AUC	Difference	95% CI
CF	0.697	0.688	0.009	(-0.048 - 0.067)
CFA	0.634	0.607	0.027	(-0.027 - 0.08)
CFM	0.731	0.680	0.051	(-0.011 - 0.113)
Score	0.767	0.694	0.073	(0.013 - 0.133)
Tree	0.711	0.689	0.022	(-0.038 - 0.081)

The difference in performance may be explained by the lack of agreement between patients and clinicians.



Figure 3: We used Cohen's Kappa to quantify agreement between the patient and clinician.

• Using a patient symptom questionnaire to predict physician diagnosis seems to lead to a reduction in accuracy • Further studies need to be done to assess the clinical relevance for this reduction in accuracy

- 2. Afonso, et. al. 2012. *Family Practice* 29(6):671–677.





Conclusion

The NSF provided funding through the Population Biology of Infectious Diseases REU site (grant number 1659683).

1. Dale AP, et. al. 2019. The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine 32(2):226–33. 3. Ebell, et. al. 2012. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine* 25(1):55-62.