

BMJ Open Healthcare provider perceptions of clinical prediction rules

Safiya Richardson,¹ Sundas Khan,¹ Lauren McCullagh,¹ Myriam Kline,² Devin Mann,³ Thomas McGinn¹

To cite: Richardson S, Khan S, McCullagh L, *et al.* Healthcare provider perceptions of clinical prediction rules. *BMJ Open* 2015;5:e008461. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008461

► Prepublication history for this paper is available online. To view these files please visit the journal online (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008461>).

Received 14 April 2015

Revised 11 July 2015

Accepted 4 August 2015



CrossMark

¹Department of Medicine, Hofstra North Shore—LIJ School of Medicine, Manhasset, New York, USA

²Biostatistics Division, Feinstein Institute for Medical Research, Manhasset, New York, USA

³Department of Medicine, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

Correspondence to
Dr Sundas Khan;
SKhan31@nshs.edu

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To examine internal medicine and emergency medicine healthcare provider perceptions of usefulness of specific clinical prediction rules.

Setting: The study took place in two academic medical centres. A web-based survey was distributed and completed by participants between 1 January and 31 May 2013.

Participants: Medical doctors, doctors of osteopathy or nurse practitioners employed in the internal medicine or emergency medicine departments at either institution.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: The primary outcome was to identify the clinical prediction rules perceived as most useful by healthcare providers specialising in internal medicine and emergency medicine. Secondary outcomes included comparing usefulness scores of specific clinical prediction rules based on provider specialty, and evaluating associations between usefulness scores and perceived characteristics of these clinical prediction rules.

Results: Of the 401 healthcare providers asked to participate, a total of 263 (66%), completed the survey. The CHADS2 score was chosen by most internal medicine providers (72%), and Pulmonary Embolism Rule-Out Criteria (PERC) score by most emergency medicine providers (45%), as one of the top three most useful from a list of 24 clinical prediction rules. Emergency medicine providers rated their top three significantly more positively, compared with internal medicine providers, as having a better fit into their workflow ($p=0.004$), helping more with decision-making ($p=0.037$), better fitting into their thought process when diagnosing patients ($p=0.001$) and overall, on a 10-point scale, more useful ($p=0.009$). For all providers, the perceived qualities of useful at point of care, helps with decision making, saves time diagnosing, fits into thought process, and should be the standard of clinical care correlated highly (≥ 0.65) with overall 10-point usefulness scores.

Conclusions: Healthcare providers describe clear preferences for certain clinical prediction rules, based on medical specialty.

INTRODUCTION

Evidence-based medicine was announced as a fundamental paradigm shift in medicine in the early 1990s and predicted to

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This is the first study to examine healthcare provider perceptions of usefulness of CPRs in the hospital setting.
- Providers consistently rated CHADS2, the Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction (TIMI) Score (NSTEMI), Wells Score for Pulmonary Embolism, Alcohol Abuse CAGE and the Ottawa Ankle Rule highly. These CPRs would be ideal candidates for integration into an electronic health record (EHR).
- Emergency medicine providers consistently rated CPRs more positively and may serve as early adapters to CPRs integrated into electronic health records.
- For all providers, the qualities of CPRs being useful at point of care and that these help with decision-making, save time diagnosing, fit well with one's thought process, and should be the standard of clinical care correlated highly (≥ 0.65) with usefulness scores.
- A significant limitation of the results of this study is that mean ratings for CPR characteristics reflect only the opinion of healthcare providers who selected the CPR as one of the top three most useful.

de-emphasise intuition, clinical experience and pathophysiological rationale in favour of hard scientific evidence.¹ Decades later, the accessible body of clinical research has grown exponentially, but translation into common clinical practice has been protracted and inconsistent.

The seamless integration of clinical prediction rules (CPRs) into the point of care will aid in transferring evidence-based medicine into daily clinical practice. CPRs can be defined as validated tools that quantify the individual contributions that components of history, physical and laboratory results make towards a diagnosis, prognosis or treatment response.² A few commonly used CPRs include the CENTOR criteria, which predicts the likelihood of *Streptococcal pharyngitis*,³ the CAGE score, which serves as a screening test

for alcoholism;⁴ and the CHADS2 score, which predicts the risk of stroke in patients with atrial fibrillation.⁵

CPRs integrated into electronic clinical decision support tools have demonstrated the ability to shape healthcare provider behaviour towards more evidence-based clinical practice.⁶ However, provider adoption continues to be a significant barrier to widespread use of clinical decision support as a whole, which is reported at 10–20%.⁷ Efficiency, usefulness, information content, user interface and workflow have been reported by clinicians to be the keys to effective decision support.⁷ These are likely to be large determinants of clinician adoption rates.

In light of the growing interest in integrated clinical decision support, and CPRs in particular, this study sought to help address the biggest challenge of implementation, poor provider adoption. The study focuses on provider perceptions of usefulness of CPRs in an effort to illuminate preferences, attitudes and thoughts that might be relevant to all types of clinical decision support. We examine healthcare provider perceptions of usefulness based on specialty and level of training with the ultimate goal of discovering which CPRs might be better adopted by these providers.

METHODS

A web-based survey platform was distributed to 401 healthcare providers between 1 January and 31 May 2013 in two academic medical centres, Hofstra North Shore—LIJ School of Medicine and Boston University, in the USA.

The survey content and structure were informed by qualitative interviews with physicians, a literature review and feedback received after pilot testing. The survey was piloted for approximately 1 month and after minor modifications, for instruction clarity and reduced length, distributed via email to attending physicians, nurse practitioners and residents training in the fields of internal medicine (IM) and emergency medicine (EM).

Providers were included in this study if they were credentialed as medical doctors, doctors of osteopathy or nurse practitioners, and were currently employed in either the IM or EM departments at each institution. Providers were excluded if they were currently involved in the study.

Participants were recruited, consented and asked to complete the survey via email. Additionally, providers were approached during grand rounds and resident afternoon conferences to encourage them to complete the survey. Laptops with the survey preloaded were placed at meetings to encourage completion. In addition, providers were sent reminder emails twice a month throughout the study period.

The survey consisted of three distinct sections. In the first section, participants were asked for demographic information, including hospital affiliation, professional degree, current position (attending vs resident),

percentage of time devoted to clinical responsibilities, primarily outpatient versus inpatient practice, years of practice, medical specialty, race, gender and age. Demographic information, including race and gender, was assessed to determine the extent to which findings could be generalised to other medical communities.

In the second section, providers were asked to pick from a list of 24 CPRs: National Emergency X-Radiography Utilization Study (NEXUS) C-Spine Rule,⁸ Canadian C-Spine Rule,⁹ Ottawa Knee Rule,¹⁰ Walsh,¹¹ Lee Index,¹² The Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction (TIMI) Risk Score (NSTEMI),¹³ CHADS2,⁵ 4T Score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia (HIT),¹⁴ Ottawa Ankle Rule,¹⁵ Pulmonary Embolism Rule-Out Criteria (PERC),¹⁶ Wells Score for deep venous thrombosis (DVT),¹⁷ Wells Score for Pulmonary Embolism (PE),¹⁸ Alcohol Abuse CAGE,⁴ Model for End-Stage Liver Disease (MELD) Score,¹⁹ San Francisco Rule for Syncope,²⁰ Modified Early Warning System (MEWS),²¹ CURB 65,²² Ranson's Criteria,²³ Pittsburgh Knee Rule,²⁴ Predicting Tuberculosis (TB) in Patients,²⁵ Pneumonia Severity Index (PSI)/Pneumonia Patient Outcomes Research Team (PORT) Score,²⁶ Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE II),²⁷ Mortality in Emergency Department Sepsis (MEDS)²⁸ and Ventilator Associated Pneumonia (VAP).²⁹ They were asked to select all of the CPRs that were familiar to them. Of those CPRs, participants were then asked to select three that they found most useful.

The last section of the survey applied only to those three CPRs. They were asked questions about their perception of the utility and favourability of the CPRs. Statements such as “The 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia is easy to use” were rated on a Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The last question in this section asked the provider to rate the CPR on a 10-point scale in terms of overall usefulness.

Statistical methods

Descriptive statistics, such as means and SDs for continuous variables, and frequencies and proportions for categorical variables, were used to describe the respondent characteristics.

The χ^2 test or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate, was used to explore the association between each of the categorical questionnaire items and the key variables of interest (eg, IM vs EM). The Mann-Whitney test was used to compare the target groups on the ordinal and continuous variables. Finally, the Spearman correlation was used to measure the correlation between selected ordinal variables and the usefulness of the CPR.

RESULTS

Of the 401 healthcare providers distributed the web-based survey, 22 individuals declined participation,

111 respondents agreed to participate but did not finish the survey, 1 individual completed the survey but left the agreement field blank, and 4 individuals left the agreement field blank and did not finish the survey. A total of 263 individuals, 66% of those asked to participate, agreed to respond, provided written informed consent and completed the survey. No stipend was provided.

Demographic characteristics

The IM and EM groups were compared on a number of demographic characteristics (table 1). There were significant differences between the two groups in terms of the institution they represented. Whereas a greater proportion of IM respondents were from Hofstra North Shore-LIJ School of Medicine (77% vs 63%), a greater proportion of the EM respondents were from Boston University (37% vs 22%; $p<0.01$). Significant differences were also noted when comparing the IM and EM groups on position occupied. Attending physicians in EM were over-represented compared with IM attending physicians (54.2% vs 28%, respectively; $p<0.001$).

Participants were diverse in terms of age, race and total years of practice. There was a male predominance (61%), which paralleled that seen in national US physician data where only about one-third of medical doctors are women.³⁰ Compared with national US physician data, our sample included slightly less Caucasians, 62% vs 75%; and less African-Americans, 3.3% vs 6%; and more Asian, 27% vs 12.8% physicians. The majority (75%) of the physicians were between 25 and 39 years of age, and had nine or fewer years of practice.

Most familiar and most useful CPRs

Participants were asked to select an unlimited number of CPRs that they were familiar with and of those choose three they felt were the most useful (table 2). The Alcohol Abuse CAGE,⁴ CHADS₂,⁵ TIMI Score (NSTEMI)¹³ and Wells Score for PE¹⁸ were in the top five most frequently chosen as familiar and useful. Ranson's criteria²³ was one of the top five most selected as familiar but not as useful and vice versa for the MELD score.¹⁹ The CHADS₂ score was chosen as most useful by most participants (63%).

When the list of CPRs most frequently selected as most useful is evaluated by specialty, the rankings diverge. EM providers were more likely to choose CPRs commonly used in emergency departments like PERC,¹⁶ NEXUS C-Spine Rule,⁸ Ottawa Ankle Rule¹⁵ and Canadian C-Spine.⁹ IM providers were more likely to choose CPRs commonly used on inpatient services like CHADS₂,⁵ TIMI score (NSTEMI),¹³ Alcohol CAGE⁴ and MELD.¹⁹ Of note, both lists for CPRs rated as most useful included the Wells Score for PE.¹⁸

EM versus IM healthcare provider perceptions of CPRs

Providers were then asked specific questions about each of the three CPRs they rated as most useful. EM

providers, compared with IM providers, rated their CPRs significantly more positively as having a better fit into their workflow ($p=0.004$), helping more with decision-making ($p=0.037$) and better fitting into their thought process when diagnosing patients ($p=0.001$) (table 3). There was a trend observed, although not meeting statistical significance, where EM providers consistently reported higher Likert scores for positive CPR qualities, such as easy to use, and IM providers consistently reported higher Likert scores for negative CPR qualities, such as limits independent decision. Lastly, compared with IM providers, EM providers rated their CPRs on a 10-point scale as overall significantly more useful ($p=0.009$).

Specific CPR overall usefulness score by provider type

The overall usefulness score was considered to be the ultimate indicator of strength of provider preference for the CPR. Scores for each CPR's usefulness were compared across provider specialty, resident versus attending position, and primary outpatient versus inpatient practice.

The only CPR with a significant difference between usefulness scores between specialties was the Ottawa Ankle Rule¹⁵ and the Wells Score for PE,¹⁸ both preferred by providers in EM. Of note, many of the 24 CPRs could not be compared by specialty because these were not selected by any EM providers as one of the top three most useful, including the 4T Score for HIT,¹⁴ APACHE II,²⁷ Lee Index,¹² MELD,¹⁹ MEWS,²¹ Predicting TB,²⁵ Ranson's,²³ Ventilator Associated Pneumonia²⁹ and MEDS.²⁸

Two differences were observed between usefulness scores of providers working in mostly or all inpatient versus outpatient settings. Inpatient providers rated the 4T Score for HIT¹⁴ as significantly more useful, while providers working in mostly or all outpatient settings rated the Walsh score¹¹ as significantly more useful. There were no differences between resident versus attending ratings of overall usefulness for any CPR.

CPR characteristics and overall usefulness score

Ratings for perceived qualities of each CPR were analysed in terms of their correlation with usefulness score (table 4). For all providers, EM and IM, the perceived qualities of being useful at point of care and helps with decision-making, saves time in diagnosing, fits into one's thought process, and should be the standard of clinical care correlated highly (≥ 0.65) with usefulness scores.

DISCUSSION

Perceived utility of clinical decision support tools and clinical guidelines have been previously studied,^{31–32} however, this is the first study to examine healthcare provider perception of usefulness of CPRs in the hospital setting. Providers surveyed in this study reported clear

Table 1 Demographics of survey participants

	Total N=298	Internal medicine N=215 (72%)	Emergency medicine N=83 (28%)	p Value
Institution				0.01
Hofstra North Shore-LIJ School of Medicine	176 (59%)	137	39	
Boston University	119 (40%)	75	44	
Other	3 (1%)	3	0	
Degree				0.22
Medical degree	274 (92%)	199	75	
Doctor of osteopathy	20 (7%)	12	8	
Nurse practitioner	4 (1%)	4	0	
Role				<0.0001
Attending	105 (35%)	60	45	
Hospitalist	16 (5%)	16	0	
House staff	167 (56%)	129	38	
Nurse practitioner	5 (2%)	5	0	
Other	5 (2%)	5	0	
Practice location				<0.0001
All outpatient	69 (23%)	38	31	
Mostly outpatient	31 (11%)	22	9	
Equal	15 (5%)	11	4	
Mostly inpatient	124 (42%)	117	7	
All inpatient	57 (19%)	26	31	
Years of practice				0.06
1–4	183 (61.4%)	140	43	
5–9	43 (14.4%)	23	20	
10–14	22 (7.4%)	16	6	
15–20	21 (7%)	15	6	
>20	29 (9.7%)	21	8	
Age (years)				0.34
25–29	108 (36%)	85	23	
30–39	116 (39%)	76	40	
40–49	44 (15%)	31	13	
50–59	20 (7%)	16	4	
60–69	6 (2%)	4	2	
70+	4 (1%)	3	1	
Race (may select >1)				NA
Caucasian	185 (62%)	119	66	
African-American	10 (3.3%)	8	2	
Asian	80 (27%)	71	9	
Hispanic	11 (3.8%)	7	4	
Native American	1 (0.3%)	1	0	
Other	11 (3.7%)	8	3	
Gender				0.38
Female	117 (39%)	88	29	
Male	180 (61%)	127	53	

*Attending—physician who has completed postgraduate medical training. House Staff—physician who is undergoing postgraduate medical training. Hospitalist—internal medicine physician who works only in an inpatient setting. Doctor of osteopathy—medical doctor who completed osteopathic medical school.

NA, not available.

preferences for certain CPRs. Participants consistently rated CHADS₂,⁵ TIMI Score (NSTEMI),¹³ Wells Score for PE,¹⁸ Alcohol Abuse CAGE⁵ and the Ottawa Ankle Rule¹⁵ highly. These CPRs would be ideal candidates for integration into an electronic health record (EHR).

Interestingly, EM providers consistently rated their chosen CPRs more positively. We found as well that qualities like ease of use, saves time, helps with decision-making, and should be standard of clinical care had a

strong relationship to providers' perception of utility. These qualities should be considered as requirements for a CPR considered for integration into an electronic health record.

Improved clinical care as well as decreased costs and decreased waste are potential results of provider preferred integrated CPRs. Although the USA spends nearly double the average, \$3923, of all of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

Table 2 All 24 CPRs, frequency of selection as familiar and top 3 most useful, ordered by mean 10-point usefulness score

All 24 CPRs	Familiar N (%)	Useful N (%)	Useful score mean
NEXUS C-Spine Rule ⁸ <i>Imaging in patients at risk for c-spine fracture</i>	14 (4.6)	33 (11)	8.54
Canadian C-Spine Rule ⁹ <i>Imaging in patients at risk for c-spine fracture</i>	85 (29)	28 (9)	8.5
Ottawa Knee Rule ¹⁰ <i>Imaging in patients with knee trauma</i>	77 (26)	9 (3)	8.5
Walsh ¹¹ <i>Likelihood of Streptococcal pharyngitis</i>	110 (37)	27 (9)	8.39
Lee Index ¹² <i>Perioperative cardiovascular risk</i>	30 (10)	10 (3)	8.38
TIMI Score (NSTEMI) ¹³ <i>Mortality in patients with NSTEMI</i>	253 (85)	89 (30)	8.12
CHADS2 ⁵ <i>Stroke risk in patients with atrial fibrillation</i>	255 (86)	184 (62)	8.01
4T Score for HIT ¹⁴ <i>Likelihood of HIT</i>	76 (26)	19 (6)	7.91
Ottawa Ankle Rule ¹⁵ <i>Imaging in patients with ankle trauma</i>	170 (57)	55 (18)	7.84
PERC ¹⁶ <i>Rules out pulmonary embolism</i>	78 (26)	38 (13)	7.84
Wells Score for DVT ¹⁷ <i>Estimates likelihood of DVT</i>	212 (71)	43 (14)	7.48
Wells Score for PE ¹⁸ <i>Calculates risk of pulmonary embolism</i>	232 (78)	82 (28)	7.29
Alcohol Abuse CAGE ⁴ <i>Screen for alcohol abuse</i>	271 (91)	64 (21)	7.27
MELD ¹⁹ <i>Estimates mortality in end-stage liver disease</i>	211 (71)	56 (19)	7.26
San Francisco Rule for Syncope ²⁰ <i>Risk stratification of patients with syncope</i>	62 (21)	10 (3)	7.22
MEWS ²¹ <i>Identifies clinically deteriorating patients</i>	96 (32)	7 (2)	7
CURB 65 ²² <i>Mortality in patients with pneumonia</i>	192 (64)	41 (14)	6.88
Ranson's Criteria ²³ <i>Mortality in patients with pancreatitis</i>	262 (88)	33 (11)	6.53
Pittsburgh Knee Rule ²⁴ <i>Imaging in patients with knee trauma</i>	17 (6)	2 (1)	6.5
Other (please list)	19 (6)	6 (2)	6.33
Predicting TB in Patients ²⁵ <i>Predicts likelihood of tuberculosis</i>	15 (5)	1 (0)	6
PSI/PORT Score ²⁶ <i>Mortality in patients with pneumonia</i>	148 (50)	18 (6)	5.83
APACHE II ²⁷ <i>Estimates mortality in ICU patients</i>	193 (65)	12 (4)	5.8
MEDS ²⁸ <i>Estimates mortality in septic ED patients</i>	100 (34)	6 (2)	NA
VAP ²⁹ <i>Predicts risk of VAP</i>	48 (16)	2 (1)	NA

APACHE II, Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation; CPR, clinical prediction rule; ED, emergency department; HIT, Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia; ICU, intensive care unit; MEDS, Mortality in Emergency Department Sepsis; MELD, Model for End-Stage Liver Disease; MEWS, Modified Early Warning System; NA, not available; NEXUS, National Emergency X-Radiography Utilization Study; PE, pulmonary embolism; PERC, Pulmonary Embolism Rule-Out Criteria; PORT, Pneumonia Patient Outcomes Research Team; PSI, Pneumonia Severity Index; TIMI, Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction; VAP, Ventilator Associated Pneumonia.

countries³³ on healthcare, American patients receive about 55% of recommended clinical care.³⁴ Overtreatment and failures in execution of care

processes are partially responsible for waste in healthcare spending, estimated as exceeding 20%.³⁵ Meta-analysis of the effect of clinical decision support has shown that

Table 3 Mean ratings of all chosen CPRs by EM versus IM

CPR characteristic	EM mean (SD)	IM mean (SD)	p Value
Easy to use	3.93 (1.04)	3.77 (1.00)	0.112
Useful at point of care	3.94 (1.03)	3.78 (1.01)	0.141
Currently look-up electronically	2.98 (1.21)	2.91 (1.17)	0.583
Would use if electronic	3.49 (1.18)	3.57 (1.13)	0.659
Fits into workflow	3.92 (1.06)	3.65 (0.99)	0.004
Helps with decision-making	3.96 (1.07)	3.79 (0.98)	0.037
Saves time diagnosing	3.50 (1.05)	3.33 (1.01)	0.088
Limits independent decision	1.96 (0.82)	2.12 (0.88)	0.242
Patient too complex to use CPR	2.05 (0.77)	2.25 (0.83)	0.118
Fits into thought process	3.85 (1.03)	3.63 (0.94)	0.001
Many colleagues use	3.61 (1.01)	3.54 (0.96)	0.572
Should be standard clinical care	3.52 (1.02)	3.57 (0.97)	0.588
Overall usefulness scale	7.43 (1.87)	6.84 (2.03)	0.009

CPR, clinical prediction rule; EM, emergency medicine; IM, internal medicine.

Table 4 Correlations between CPR characteristics and the overall usefulness rating

CPR characteristic	Emergency medicine	Internal medicine	p Value
Easy to use	0.734	0.581	0.07
Useful at POC	0.767	0.681	0.219
Currently look-up electronically	0.267	0.383	0.379
Would use if electronic	0.480	0.656	0.077
Fits into workflow	0.768	0.634	0.072
Helps with decision-making	0.763	0.677	0.222
Saves time diagnosing	0.704	0.660	0.569
Limits independent decision	0.200	0.188	0.936
Patient too complex to use CPR	0.074	0.165	0.535
Fits into thought process	0.725	0.668	0.453
Many colleagues use	0.630	0.556	0.435
Should be standard clinical care	0.778	0.748	0.631

CPR, clinical prediction rule; POC, point of care.

providers with decision support were more likely to provide preventive care services and order appropriate treatments.⁷

Limitations

A significant limitation of the results of this study is that mean ratings for CPR characteristics reflect only the opinion of healthcare providers who selected the CPR as one of the top three most useful. However, the structure of the survey also ensures that CPR characteristic ratings were made only by providers who were likely to use the CPR in daily practice.

Additionally, participants were recruited during academic conferences, including grand rounds as well as afternoon conferences for residents. This may have increased the number of participants who attend academic conferences, and who are more familiar with CPRs.

Implications for clinical practice and research

Meaningful clinical decision support requires not just understanding healthcare provider perceptions, but also choosing tools that are strongly evidence-based and have

been tested for their effectiveness. Future trials should focus on evaluating the clinical impact of healthcare provider preferred CPRs.

CONCLUSION

Healthcare providers describe clear preferences for certain characteristics and disease-specific CPRs. EM providers consistently rated CPRs more positively and may serve as early adapters for CPRs integrated into EHRs. Understanding provider perceptions may help to address limiting factors in meaningful integration of clinical decision support into our electronic health systems.

Acknowledgements The authors would like to acknowledge the contributions of Megan Knaus, research coordinator affiliated with Hofstra North Shore—LIJ who helped in survey development and Dr Ambili Ramachandran, Internal Medicine resident affiliated with Boston University, who led data collection at that site. The abstract from this work was previously presented as a poster at the EDM Forum Symposium in San Diego California on 7 June 2014.

Collaborators Ambili Ramachandran, Megan Knaus.

Contributors TM and DM were involved in study concept and design, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content and study

supervision. SR was involved in acquisition of data. SR, TM, LM, SK and MK were involved in analysis and interpretation of data and drafting of the manuscript. SR, SK, LM and MK were involved in statistical analysis. LM and SK were involved in administrative, technical and material support.

Competing interests None declared.

Ethics approval North Shore—LIJ Health System IRB.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data sharing statement Additional data can be accessed by emailing MK, Associate Research Statistician, Biostatistics Unit, Feinstein Institute for Medical Research, North Shore-LIJ Health System.

Open Access This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

REFERENCES

1. Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group. Evidence-based medicine. A new approach to teaching the practice of medicine. *JAMA* 1992;268:2420–5.
2. Laupacis A, Sekar N. Clinical prediction rules: a review and suggested modifications of methodological standards. *JAMA* 1997;277:488–94.
3. Centor RM, Witherspoon JM, Dalton HP, *et al.* The diagnosis of strep throat in adults in the emergency room. *Med Decis Making* 1980;1:239–46.
4. Ewing JA. Detecting alcoholism: the CAGE questionnaire. *JAMA* 1984;252:1905–7.
5. Gage BF, Waterman AD, Shannon W, *et al.* Validation of clinical classification schemes for predicting stroke: results from the National Registry of Atrial Fibrillation. *JAMA* 2001;285:2864–70.
6. McGinn TG, McCullagh L, Kannry J, *et al.* Efficacy of an evidence-based clinical decision support in primary care practices: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Intern Med* 2013;173:1584–91.
7. Bright TJ, Wong A, Dhurjati R, *et al.* Effect of clinical decision-support systems: a systematic review. *Ann Intern Med* 2012;157:29–43.
8. Hoffman JR, Wolfson AB, Todd K, *et al.* Selective cervical spine radiography in blunt trauma: methodology of the National Emergency X-Radiography Utilization Study (NEXUS). *Ann Emerg Med* 1998;32:461–9.
9. Stiell IG, Wells GA, Vandemheen KL, *et al.* The Canadian C-spine rule for radiography in alert and stable trauma patients. *JAMA* 2001;286:1841–8.
10. Stiell IG, Wells GA, Hoag RH, *et al.* Implementation of the Ottawa Knee Rule for the use of radiography in acute knee injuries. *JAMA* 1997;278:2075–9.
11. Walsh BT, Bookheim WW, Johnson RC, *et al.* Recognition of streptococcal pharyngitis in adults. *Arch Intern Med* 1975;135:1493–7.
12. Boersma E, Kertai MD, Schouten O, *et al.* Perioperative cardiovascular mortality in noncardiac surgery: validation of the Lee cardiac risk index. *Am J Med* 2005;118:1134–41.
13. Antman EM, Cohen M, Bernink PJ, *et al.* The TIMI risk score for unstable angina/non–ST elevation MI: a method for prognostication and therapeutic decision making. *JAMA* 2000;284:835–42.
14. Lo G, Juhl D, Warkentin T, *et al.* Evaluation of pretest clinical score (4 T's) for the diagnosis of heparin-induced thrombocytopenia in two clinical settings. *J Thromb Haemost* 2006;4:759–65.
15. Stiell IG, Greenberg GH, McKnight RD, *et al.* A study to develop clinical decision rules for the use of radiography in acute ankle injuries. *Ann Emerg Med* 1992;21:384–90.
16. Kline J, Mitchell A, Kabrhel C, *et al.* Clinical criteria to prevent unnecessary diagnostic testing in emergency department patients with suspected pulmonary embolism. *J Thromb Haemost* 2004;2:1247–55.
17. Wells PS, Anderson DR, Bormanis J, *et al.* Value of assessment of pretest probability of deep-vein thrombosis in clinical management. *Lancet* 1997;350:1795–8.
18. Wells PS, Anderson DR, Rodger M, *et al.* Derivation of a simple clinical model to categorize patients probability of pulmonary embolism-increasing the models utility with the SimpliRED D-dimer. *Thromb Haemost* 2000;83:416–20.
19. Kamath PS, Wiesner RH, Malinchoc M, *et al.* A model to predict survival in patients with end-stage liver disease. *Hepatology* 2001;33:464–70.
20. Quinn J, McDermott D, Stiell I, *et al.* Prospective validation of the San Francisco Syncope Rule to predict patients with serious outcomes. *Ann Emerg Med* 2006;47:448–54.
21. Morgan R, Williams F, Wright M. An early warning scoring system for detecting developing critical illness. *Clin Intensive Care* 1997;8:100.
22. Lim W, Van der Eerden M, Laing R, *et al.* Defining community acquired pneumonia severity on presentation to hospital: an international derivation and validation study. *Thorax* 2003;58:377–82.
23. Ranson J. Prognostic signs and the role of operative management in acute pancreatitis. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1974;139:69–81.
24. Seaberg DC, Jackson R. Clinical decision rule for knee radiographs. *Am J Emerg Med* 1994;12:541–3.
25. Wisnivesky JP, Kaplan J, Henschke C, *et al.* Evaluation of clinical parameters to predict Mycobacterium tuberculosis in inpatients. *Arch Intern Med* 2000;160:2471–6.
26. Fine MJ, Auble TE, Yealy DM, *et al.* A prediction rule to identify low-risk patients with community-acquired pneumonia. *N Engl J Med* 1997;336:243–50.
27. Knaus WA, Draper EA, Wagner DP, *et al.* APACHE II: a severity of disease classification system. *Crit Care Med* 1985;13:818–29.
28. Carpenter CR, Keim SM, Upadhye S, *et al.* Group BEIEMI. Risk stratification of the potentially septic patient in the emergency department: the Mortality in the Emergency Department Sepsis (MEDS) score. *J Emerg Med* 2009;37:319–27.
29. Klompas M. Does this patient have ventilator-associated pneumonia? *JAMA* 2007;297:1583–93.
30. Castillo-Page L. *Diversity in the physician workforce: facts & figures 2010*. Association of American Medical Colleges, 2010:1–115.
31. Davis F. Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Q* 1989;13:319–40.
32. Putzer GJ, Park Y. Are physicians likely to adopt emerging mobile technologies? Attitudes and innovation factors affecting smartphone use in the Southeastern United States. *Perspect Health Inf Manag* 2012;9:1b.
33. Squires DA. The US health system in perspective: a comparison of twelve industrialized nations. *Issue Brief (Commonw Fund)* 2011;16:1–14.
34. McGlynn EA, Asch SM, Adams J, *et al.* The quality of health care delivered to adults in the United States. *N Engl J Med* 2003;348:2635–45.
35. Berwick DM, Hackbarth AD. Eliminating waste in US health care. *JAMA* 2012;307:1513–16.

SECTION A. Demographics

1. What institution are you affiliated with?

- a. North Shore Hospital System- Long Island Jewish Hospital
- b. Boston University/Boston Medical Center
- c. Other

2. Professional Degree

- a. MD
- b. DO
- c. PhD
- d. PA-C
- e. NP
- f. Other

3. Current position

- a. Attending
- b. Hospitalist
- c. House staff (fellows, residents, interns)
- d. NP
- e. PA-C
- f. Other

4. Amount of time spent in each role (0-100%)

- a. Clinical
- b. Research
- c. Education
- d. Administration
- e. Other

5. Where do you practice?

- a. All out patient
- b. Mostly outpatient
- c. Equally outpatient and inpatient
- d. Mostly inpatient
- e. All inpatient

6. Years of clinical experience

- a. 1-4 years
- b. 5-9 years
- c. 10-14 years
- d. 15-20 years
- e. >20 years

7. Please select the specialty you practice.

- a. Allergy and Immunology
- b. Anesthesiology
- c. Cardiology
- d. Dermatology
- e. Emergency Medicine
- f. Endocrinology
- g. Family Medicine
- h. Gastroenterology
- i. General Surgery
- j. Geriatrics
- k. Hematology/Oncology
- l. Internal Medicine
- m. Nephrology
- n. Neurology
- o. Obstetrics and Gynecology
- p. Ophthalmology
- q. Orthopedic Surgery
- r. Otolaryngology
- s. Pediatrics
- t. Pulmonary and Critical Care
- u. Psychiatry
- v. Radiology and Diagnostic Radiology
- w. Urology
- x. Other

8. Ethnicity/Race (may select more than one)

- a. African American or Black, not of Hispanic origin
- b. American Indian or Alaskan Native
- c. Asian or Pacific Islander
- d. Hispanic, Chicano, Mexican American, Latino
- e. White or Caucasian, not of Hispanic origin
- f. Other _____

9. Gender

- a. Female
- b. Male

10. Age

- a. 18-24
- b. 25-29
- c. 30-39
- d. 40-49
- e. 50-59
- f. 60-69

g. 70 or over

SECTION B. Provider Preference

Clinical Prediction Rules (CPRs) are a type of evidence-based medicine that uses validated probability scores to stratify risk level for specific prognoses and/or diagnostic assessments. They are more tailored than other clinical decision support in that they take into account the patient's history, examination, and lab results. One example is the Wells score for pulmonary embolism; other examples are listed in the next question.

Please answer the following set of questions in regards to CPRs in general.

1. I find clinical prediction rules more useful for *high-risk* clinical situations than for *low-risk* clinical situations.

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

2. I find clinical prediction rules more useful for *complex* clinical decisions than for *uncomplicated* clinical decisions.

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. I use clinical prediction rules as something *concrete* to support my clinical decision.

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. Many of my *colleagues* use clinical prediction rules to assist in making decisions at the point of care.

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I value my *colleagues'* decisions to use clinical prediction rules to assist in decision making.

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Which of the following Clinical Prediction Rules are you familiar with? (Select all that apply)

- ☐ 4T Score for Heparin-induced Thrombocytopenia
- ☐ Alcohol Abuse CAGE
- ☐ Apache II (Score for ICU mortality)
- ☐ CHADS2 for Atrial Fibrillation
- ☐ Canadian C-Spine Rule (Cervical spine fracture)
- ☐ CURB 65 (assessment of severity of community-acquired pneumonia)
- ☐ Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery
- ☐ MEDS (Mortality in Emergency Department Sepsis)
- ☐ MELD (Model for end stage liver disease)
- ☐ MEWS (Modified early warning score)

- NEXUS C-Spine Rule (Cervical spine fracture)
- Ottawa Ankle Rule (to determine need for imaging in patients with ankle trauma)
- Ottawa Knee Rule (to determine need for imaging in patients with knee trauma)
- PERC rule for pulmonary embolism
- Pittsburgh Knee Rule (to determine need for imaging in patients with knee trauma)
- Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation
- PSI/PORT score (Pneumonia severity index for adult community-acquired pneumonia)
- Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis
- San Francisco rule for syncope
- TIMI score for non-ST elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI)
- Ventilator Associated Pneumonia (VAP)
- Walsh/Centor score for streptococcal pharyngitis
- Wells score for DVT (Deep vein thrombosis)
- Wells score for PE (Pulmonary embolism)
- Other (please list)

7. (skip logic) Among the CPRs that you identified, which are the top three (3) that you find *most useful*?

CPR Questions:

(Depending on which clinical prediction rules are selected as *the most useful*, the following questions will be prompted)

Please answer the following Questions regarding **4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia** appropriately:

1. How often do you use the 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times *a week*
- c. Once to several times *a month*
- d. Once to several times *a year*
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. The 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia is *easy to use*

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia is a *useful tool at the point of care* (i.e. it is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I *currently* look up the 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia on an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, computer, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I *would use* 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, computer, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia *fits well in to my workflow*

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia is *helpful to my decision making*

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia *limits my ability to make independent decisions*

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia *helps me save time when diagnosing patients*

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are *often too complex* to diagnose using the guidelines of the 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia *fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient*

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. *Many of my colleagues* use the 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia *should be used as standard clinical care.*

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find the 4T score for Heparin-Induced Thrombocytopenia

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8----9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding Alcohol Abuse CAGE appropriately:

1. How often do you use Alcohol Abuse CAGE?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. Alcohol Abuse CAGE is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. Alcohol Abuse CAGE is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up Alcohol Abuse CAGE (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use Alcohol Abuse CAGE if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using Alcohol Abuse CAGE fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. Alcohol Abuse CAGE is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. Alcohol Abuse CAGE limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. Alcohol Abuse CAGE helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of Alcohol Abuse CAGE

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using Alcohol Abuse CAGE fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use Alcohol Abuse CAGE

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of Alcohol Abuse CAGE

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. Alcohol Abuse CAGE should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find Alcohol Abuse CAGE

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8----9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding Apache II appropriately:

1. How often do you use Apache II?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. Apache II is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. Apache II is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up Apache II (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use Apache II if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using Apache II fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. Apache II is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. Apache II limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. Apache II helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of Apache II

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using Apache II fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use Apache II

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of Apache II

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. Apache II should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find Apache II

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8---9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding CHADS2 for atrial fibrillation appropriately:

1. How often do you use CHADS2?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. CHADS2 is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. CHADS2 is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up CHADS2 (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use CHADS2 if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using CHADS2 fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. CHADS2 is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. CHADS2 limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. CHADS2 helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of CHADS2

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using CHADS2 fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use CHADS2

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of CHADS2

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. CHADS2 should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find CHADS2

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8---9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding Canadian C-Spine Rule appropriately:

1. How often do you use the C-Spine Rule?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. The C-Spine Rule is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. The C-Spine Rule is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up the C-Spine Rule (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use the C-Spine Rule if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using the C-Spine Rule fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. The C-Spine Rule is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. The C-Spine Rule limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. The C-Spine Rule helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the C-Spine Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using the C-Spine Rule fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use the C-Spine Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of the C-Spine Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. The C-Spine Rule should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find the C-Spine Rule

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8----9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding CURB 65 appropriately:

1. How often do you use CURB 65?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. CURB 65 is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. CURB 65 is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up CURB 65 (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use CURB 65 if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using CURB 65 fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. CURB 65 is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. CURB 65 limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. CURB 65 helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of CURB 65

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using CURB 65 fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use CURB 65

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of CURB 65

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. CURB 65 should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find CURB 65

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8---9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding the Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery appropriately:

- 1. How often do you use the Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery?**
 - a. Daily
 - b. Once to several times a week
 - c. Once to several times a month
 - d. Once to several times a year
 - e. In the past but not recently
 - f. Never

- 2. The Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery is easy to use**
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

- 3. The Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)**
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

- 4. I currently look up the Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery (e.g. CPRs) online**
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

- 5. I would use the Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)**
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

- 6. Using the Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery fits well in to my workflow**
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

- 7. The Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery is helpful to my decision making**
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

- 8. The Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery limits my ability to make independent decisions**
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

- 9. The Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery helps me save time when diagnosing patients**
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

- 10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of the Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery**
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using the Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use the Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of the Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. The Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find the Lee index for cardiovascular risk before surgery

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8---9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding MEDS appropriately:

1. How often do you use MEDS?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. MEDS is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. MEDS is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up MEDS (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use MEDS if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using MEDS fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. MEDS is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. MEDS limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. MEDS helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of MEDS

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using MEDS fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use MEDS

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of MEDS

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. MEDS should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find MEDS

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8---9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding MELD (model for end stage liver disease) appropriately:

1. How often do you use MELD?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. MELD is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. MELD is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up MELD (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use MELD if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using MELD fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. MELD is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. MELD limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. MELD helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of MELD

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using MELD fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use MELD

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of MELD

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. MELD should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find MELD

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8---9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding MEWS appropriately:

1. How often do you use MEWS?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. MEWS is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. MEWS is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up MEWS (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use MEWS if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using MEWS fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. MEWS is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. MEWS limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. MEWS helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of MEWS

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using MEWS fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use MEWS

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of MEWS

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. MEWS should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find MEWS

0---1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9---10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding NEXUS C-Spine Rule appropriately:

1. How often do you use NEXUS C-Spine Rule?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. NEXUS C-Spine Rule is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. NEXUS C-Spine Rule is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up NEXUS C-Spine Rule (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use NEXUS C-Spine Rule if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using NEXUS C-Spine Rule fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. NEXUS C-Spine Rule is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. NEXUS C-Spine Rule limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. NEXUS C-Spine Rule helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of NEXUS C-Spine Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using NEXUS C-Spine Rule fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use NEXUS C-Spine Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of NEXUS C-Spine Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. NEXUS C-Spine Rule should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find NEXUS C-Spine Rule

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8----9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding the Ottawa Ankle Rule appropriately:

1. How often do you use the Ottawa Ankle Rule?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. The Ottawa Ankle Rule is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. The Ottawa Ankle Rule is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up the Ottawa Ankle Rule (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use the Ottawa Ankle Rule if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using the Ottawa Ankle Rule fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. The Ottawa Ankle Rule is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. The Ottawa Ankle Rule limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. The Ottawa Ankle Rule helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of the Ottawa Ankle Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using the Ottawa Ankle Rule fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use the Ottawa Ankle Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of the Ottawa Ankle Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. The Ottawa Ankle Rule should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find the Ottawa Ankle Rule

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8---9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding the Ottawa Knee Rule appropriately:

1. How often do you use the Ottawa Knee Rule?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. The Ottawa Knee Rule is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. The Ottawa Knee Rule is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up the Ottawa Knee Rule (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use the Ottawa Knee Rule if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using the Ottawa Knee Rule fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. The Ottawa Knee Rule is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. The Ottawa Knee Rule limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. The Ottawa Knee Rule helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of the Ottawa Knee Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using the Ottawa Knee Rule fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use the Ottawa Knee Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of the Ottawa Knee Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. The Ottawa Knee Rule should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find the Ottawa Knee Rule

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8----9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding PERC rule for pulmonary embolism appropriately:

1. How often do you use PERC rule for pulmonary embolism?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. PERC rule for pulmonary embolism is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. PERC rule for pulmonary embolism is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up PERC rule for pulmonary embolism (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use PERC rule for pulmonary embolism if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using PERC rule for pulmonary embolism fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. PERC rule for pulmonary embolism is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. PERC rule for pulmonary embolism limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. PERC rule for pulmonary embolism helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of PERC rule for pulmonary embolism

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using PERC rule for pulmonary embolism fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use PERC rule for pulmonary embolism

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of PERC rule for pulmonary embolism

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. PERC rule for pulmonary embolism should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find PERC rule for pulmonary embolism

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8----9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding the Pittsburgh Knee Rule appropriately:

1. How often do you use the Pittsburgh Knee Rule?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. The Pittsburgh Knee Rule is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. The Pittsburgh Knee Rule is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up the Pittsburgh Knee Rule (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use the Pittsburgh Knee Rule if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using the Pittsburgh Knee Rule fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. The Pittsburgh Knee Rule is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. The Pittsburgh Knee Rule limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. The Pittsburgh Knee Rule helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of the Pittsburgh Knee Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using the Pittsburgh Knee Rule fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use the Pittsburgh Knee Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of the Pittsburgh Knee Rule

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. The Pittsburgh Knee Rule should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find the Pittsburgh Knee Rule

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8----9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation appropriately:

1. How often do you use Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation is easy to use
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation (e.g. CPRs) online
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation fits well in to my workflow
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation is helpful to my decision making
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation limits my ability to make independent decisions
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation helps me save time when diagnosing patients
Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find Predicting TB in patients being considered for respiratory isolation

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7----8----9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding the PSI/PORT score appropriately:

1. How often do you use the PSI/PORT score?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. The PSI/PORT score is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. The PSI/PORT score is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up the PSI/PORT score (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use the PSI/PORT score if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using the PSI/PORT score fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. The PSI/PORT score is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. The PSI/PORT score limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. The PSI/PORT score helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of the PSI/PORT score

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using the PSI/PORT score fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use the PSI/PORT score

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of the PSI/PORT score

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. The PSI/PORT score should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find the PSI/PORT score

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8----9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis appropriately:

1. How often do you use Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find Ranson's criteria for acute pancreatitis

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8----9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding the San Francisco rule for syncope appropriately:

1. How often do you use the San Francisco rule for syncope?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. The San Francisco rule for syncope is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. The San Francisco rule for syncope is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up the San Francisco rule for syncope (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use the San Francisco rule for syncope if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using the San Francisco rule for syncope fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. The San Francisco rule for syncope is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. The San Francisco rule for syncope limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. The San Francisco rule for syncope helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of the San Francisco rule for syncope

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using the San Francisco rule for syncope fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use the San Francisco rule for syncope

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of the San Francisco rule for syncope

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. The San Francisco rule for syncope should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find the San Francisco rule for syncope

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8---9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding TIMI for non-ST elevation myocardial infarction appropriately

1. How often do you use TIMI?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. TIMI is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. TIMI is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up TIMI (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use TIMI if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using TIMI fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. TIMI is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. TIMI limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. TIMI helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of TIMI

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using TIMI fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use TIMI

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of TIMI

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. TIMI should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find TIMI

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8---9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding Associated pneumonia (VAP) appropriately:

1. How often do you use Associated pneumonia (VAP)?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. Associated pneumonia (VAP) is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. Associated pneumonia (VAP) is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up Associated pneumonia (VAP) (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use Associated pneumonia (VAP) if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using Associated pneumonia (VAP) fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. Associated pneumonia (VAP) is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. Associated pneumonia (VAP) limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. Associated pneumonia (VAP) helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of Associated pneumonia (VAP)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using Associated pneumonia (VAP) fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use Associated pneumonia (VAP)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of Associated pneumonia (VAP)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. Associated pneumonia (VAP) should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find Associated pneumonia (VAP)

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8----9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding Walsh for strep appropriately:

1. How often do you use Walsh for strep?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. Walsh for strep is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. Walsh for strep is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up Walsh for strep (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use Walsh for strep if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using Walsh for strep fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. Walsh for strep is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. Walsh for strep limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. Walsh for strep helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of Walsh for strep

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using Walsh for strep fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use Walsh for strep

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of Walsh for strep

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. Walsh for strep should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find Walsh for strep

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8---9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding Wells for DVT appropriately:

1. How often do you use Wells for DVT?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. Wells for DVT is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. Wells for DVT is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up Wells for DVT (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use Wells for DVT if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using Wells for DVT fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. Wells for DVT is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. Wells for DVT limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. Wells for DVT helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of Wells for DVT

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using Wells for DVT fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use Wells for DVT

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of Wells for DVT

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. Wells for DVT should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find Wells for DVT

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8---9----10

CPR Questions:

Please answer the following Questions regarding Wells for PE appropriately:

1. How often do you use Wells for PE?

- a. Daily
- b. Once to several times a week
- c. Once to several times a month
- d. Once to several times a year
- e. In the past but not recently
- f. Never

2. Wells for PE is easy to use

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

3. Wells for PE is a useful tool at the point of care (i.e. is appropriate/improves quality of patient care)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

4. I currently look up Wells for PE (e.g. CPRs) online

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

5. I would use Wells for PE if it was integrated into an electronic device (e.g. smartphone, EHR)

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

6. Using Wells for PE fits well in to my workflow

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

7. Wells for PE is helpful to my decision making

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

8. Wells for PE limits my ability to make independent decisions

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

9. Wells for PE helps me save time when diagnosing patients

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

10. My patients' health problems are often too complex to diagnose using the guidelines of Wells for PE

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

11. Using Wells for PE fits into my thought process when diagnosing a patient

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

12. Many of my colleagues use Wells for PE

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

13. I value my colleagues' decisions on their use of Wells for PE

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

14. Wells for PE should be used as standard clinical care

Strongly Disagree-1----Disagree-2----Neutral-3----Agree-4----Strongly Agree-5

15. On a scale of 0 to 10, 0 being least useful and 10 being most useful, please rank how useful you find Wells for PE

0----1----2----3----4----5---6---7---8---9----10

Section D: Closing Questions: (everyone answers)

- 1. What CPRs do you think are best suited to being integrated into the EMR?**

- 2. For which clinical conditions not already mentioned would you find a clinical prediction rule useful?**

- 3. Do you have any other comments?**

Thank you for participating in the survey. We appreciate your time.