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# 1 Introduction

As part of the work of the WHO/ITU Focus Group (FG) AI for health (AI4H), this document specifies a suite of standardized benchmarking for AI-based symptom assessment (AISA) applications.

The document is structured in seven chapters:

* Chapter 1 introduces the topic and outlines its relevance and the potential impact that a benchmarking will have.
* Chapter 2 provides an overview of the Topic Group that created this document and will implement the actual benchmarking as part of the AI4H Focus Group.
* Chapter 3 collects all benchmarking-relevant background knowledge on the state-of-the-art of existing AI-based symptom assessment systems.
* Chapter 4 describes the approaches for assessing the quality of such systems and details that are likely relevant to set up a new standardized benchmarking.
* Chapter 5 specifies for both subtopics the actual benchmarking methodology at a level of detail that includes technological and operational implementation.
* Chapter 6 summarizes the results of the different iterations to perform benchmarking according to the specified methods.
* Chapter 7 discusses learnings from working on this document, the implementation of the methods and the performed benchmarking. It also discusses insights from using the benchmarking results.

The paper has been developed by interested subject matter experts and leading companies in the field during a series of virtual and face-to-face group sessions. Its objective is to provide clinical professionals, consumers and innovators in this area with internationally recognised baseline standards for the fields of diagnosis, next-steps advice and triage.

## 1.1 AI-based Symptom Assessment

Why is this needed?

There is a huge potential for AISA applications, and the opportunities laid out below are examples of how people could benefit from the successful implementation of this technology. With the speed of development and adoption globally, it is also critical to ensure that there are clear and rigorous methods to test for safety and quality. The WHO/ITU is committed to working with organisations to develop this.

### 1.1.1 Relevance

The World Health Organization estimates the shortage of global health workers to increase from 7.2 million in 2013 to 12.9 million by 2035.[[1]](#footnote-1) This shortage is driven by several factors including growing population, increasing life expectancy and higher health demands. The *2017 Global Monitoring Report* by the WHO and the World Bank reported that half of the world’s population lacks access to basic essential health services.[[2]](#footnote-2) The growing shortage of health workers is likely to further limit access to proper health care, reduce doctor time, and worsen patient journeys to a correct diagnosis and proper treatment.

While the problem in low and middle income countries (LMIC) is worse, in more developed countries health systems face challenges such as increased demand due to increased life expectancy. Additionally, available doctors have to spend considerable amounts of time on patients that do not always need to see a doctor. Up to 90% of people who seek help from primary care have only minor ailments and injuries[[3]](#footnote-3). The vast majority (>75%) attend primary care because they lack an understanding of the risks they face or the knowledge to care for themselves. In the United Kingdom alone, there are 340 million consultations at the GP every year and the current system is being pushed to do more with less resources.

The challenge is to provide high-quality care and prompt, adequate treatment if necessary, develop mechanisms to avoid overdiagnosis and focus the health system resources for the patients in need.

### 1.1.2 Current Solutions

The gold standard for correct differential diagnosis, next step advice and adequate treatment is the evaluation of a medical doctor who is an expert in the respective medical field, which is based on many years of university education and structured training in hospitals. Depending on context, steps such as triage preceding diagnosis are responsibilities of other health workers. Decision making is often supported by clinical guidelines and protocols or by consulting literature, the internet or other experts.

In recent years, individuals have increasingly begun to use the internet to find advice. Recent publications show that one in four Britons use the web to search their symptoms instead of seeing a doctor[[4]](#footnote-4). Meanwhile, other studies show that internet self-searches are more likely to incorrectly suggest conditions that may cause inappropriate worry (e.g. cancers)

### 1.1.3 Impact of AI-based Symptom Assessment

In recent years, one promising approach to meet the challenging shortage of doctors has been the introduction of AI-based symptom assessment applications that have become widely available. This new class of system provides both consumers and doctors with actionable advice based on symptom constellations, findings and additional contextual information like age, sex and other risk factors.

Definition

The exact definition of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is controversial. In the context of this document it refers to a field of computer science working on machine learning and knowledge based technology that allows the user to *understand* complex (health related) problems and situations at or above human (doctor) level performance and providing corresponding insights (differential diagnosis, triage) or solutions (next step advice).

Sub-types

The available systems can be divided into consumer facing tools sometimes referred to as “symptom checkers” and professional tools for doctors sometimes described as “diagnostic decision support systems”. In general, these systems allow users to state an initial health problem, usually medically termed as the presenting complaint (PC) or chief complaint (CC). Following the collection of PCs, the collection of additional symptoms is performed either proactively - driven by the application using some interactive questioning approach - or passively - allowing the user to enter additional symptoms. Finally, the applications provide an assessment that contains different output components ranging from a general classification of severity (triage), possible differential diagnoses (DD), and advice on what to do next.

AI-powered symptom assessment applications have the potential to improve patient and health worker experience, deliver safer diagnoses, support health management, and save health systems time and money. This could be by empowering people to navigate to the right care, at the right time and in the right place or by enhancing the care that healthcare professionals provide.

### 1.1.4 Impact of Introducing a Benchmarking Framework for AI-based Symptom Assessment

The case for Benchmarking

While systems for AI-based symptom assessment have great potential to improve health care, the lack of consistent standardisation makes it difficult for organizations like the WHO, governments, and other key players to adopt such applications as part of their solutions to address global health challenges. Very few papers exist, which are usually based on limited retrospective studies or use case vignettes instead of real cases. Therefore, there is a lack of scientific evidence available that assesses the impact of applying such technologies in a healthcare setting (see Chapter 4).

The implementation of a standardized benchmarking for AISA applications by the WHO/ITU’s AI4H-FG will therefore be an important step towards closing this gap. Paving the way for the safe and transparent application of AI technology will help improve access to healthcare for many people all over the globe. It will enable earlier diagnosis of conditions, more efficient care-navigation through the health systems and ultimately better health as it is currently pursued by UN’s sustainable development goal (SDG) number 3.[[5]](#footnote-5)

According to the current version of the thematic classification scheme document C-027 of the FG, the categorization of the Topic “AI-based symptom assessment” is applicable as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level 1 | Public Health(Level-1A) | 1.5 Health surveillance 1.6. Health emergencies1.9. Communicable diseases1.10. Non-communicable diseasessub-classes applicable:* 1 epidemiology
* 3 biostatistics
* 4 health services delivery
* 6 community health
* 8 health economics
* 9 informatics
* 10 public health interventions
 |
| Clinical Health(Level-1B) | 1.2. Diagnosissub-classes applicable:1-35 (potentially all specialities) |
| Level 2 (Artificial Intelligence) | 3. Knowledge representation and reasoning* 3.1. default reasoning
* 3.3. ontological engineering

4. Artificial Intelligence* 4.1. generative models
* 4.2. autonomous systems
* 4.3. distributed systems
 |
| Level 3 (nature of data types) | 1. Anonymized electronic health record data3. Non-medical data (socio economic, environmental, etc)4. lab test results (later)-. structured medical information (e.g. based on ontology) |
| Level 4 (origin of the data) | 3. PHR (Personal health record)4. Medical Device  |
| Level 5 (data collectors) | 1. Service provider |

## 1.2 Ethical Considerations

This section needs review and amendment by a health-AI-ethics field experts

Ethical implications using AI systems in health

Currently there is insufficient evidence that AISA applications are safe to use and can in any way compete with the gold standard of medical professional assessment. At the same time such systems are used by millions of smartphone users every day. While the majority of users receive appropriate advice, these systems also fail on some cases. This may lead to users being influenced to act while there is no need, or stopped from acting e.g. by not seeing a doctor when they should see one. However, it is also a reality that large parts of the world have little to no access to basic healthcare, and using this technology could help improve this. It is also noteworthy that even doctors have a high variance in their performance. So far there is no reliable data available to compare the ethical implications of using AI-based symptom assessment with the consultation of doctors or not having access to health care at all. Setting up benchmarking of AI-based symptom assessment will help in making the quality of AI systems more transparent and allow better assessment of the ethical implications.

Ethical implications of benchmarking and data acquisition

Even with introducing a benchmarking process that proves a certain overall quality, systems may still be inaccurate on individual cases. While providing a more sound and transparent foundation for decision making the introduction of benchmarking will lead to a broader application of such systems. While this will help many, this will also increase the overall number of people that will experience a sub-optimal performance of such systems.

Benchmarking of AI-based symptom assessment systems requires labeled test data. Depending on the approach for creating the data set this might involve real anonymized patient cases. In this case the high standards for privacy and protection of the personal health data need to be met. Since this is an issue of high importance, the Focus Group actively works on making sure that the used data meets high standards for ethics and protection of the personal health data.

Implications of using AI systems in inappropriate contexts

When compared to medical professional assessment and conventional diagnostics, an AI system should in the end lead to an increase in both specificity and sensitivity in the context of diagnosis. In certain contexts, a trade-off of specificity against sensitivity is possible. This context has to be made clear before establishing a benchmark.

For example, in emergency settings it might be advisable to increase sensitivity even if specificity is slightly reduced. An effective benchmark will be adapted to these settings. In order to be judged as “better” than conventional diagnostics, an AI system (or medical professionals using this system) must prove superiority to the prior gold standard.

Additionally, the risk of misinterpreting and misusing the benchmarking results for justifying the application of AI in an inappropriate context has to be addressed by the Focus Group.

# 2 AI4H Topic Group on “AI-based Symptom Assessment”

The first chapter highlighted the potential of AISA to help solving important health issues and that the creation of a standardized benchmarking would provide decision makers with the necessary insights to successfully address these challenges. To develop this benchmarking framework, the AI4H Focus Group decided at the January 2019 meeting C in Lausanne to create the Topic Group “AI-based symptom assessment”. It was based on the “symptom checkers” use case, which was accepted at the November 2018 meeting B in New York building on proposals by Ada Health:

* [A-020](https://extranet.itu.int/sites/itu-t/focusgroups/ai4h/docs/FGAI4H-A-020.docx?d=we280696f99e945f8894a510ff75eeed0): Towards a potential AI4H use case "diagnostic self-assessment apps"
* [B-021](https://extranet.itu.int/sites/itu-t/focusgroups/ai4h/docs/FGAI4H-B-021-R1.docx?d=w501a8384bf674f8c909d2ab13f52a173): Proposal: Standardized benchmarking of diagnostic self-assessment apps
* [C-019](https://extranet.itu.int/sites/itu-t/focusgroups/ai4h/docs/FGAI4H-C-019.docx?d=w0a5639a0e26f474f88c76d7b889dd3eb): Status report on the “Evaluating the accuracy of ‘symptom checker’ applications” use case

and on a similar initiative by Your.MD:

* [C-025](https://extranet.itu.int/sites/itu-t/focusgroups/ai4h/docs/FGAI4H-C-025.docx?d=w6a05e1d093fe4a50915c3f58a299eeb8): Clinical evaluation of AI triage and risk awareness in primary care setting

In addition to the “AI-based symptom assessment” Topic Group, the ITU/WHO Focus Group created nine other Topic Groups for additional standardized benchmarking of AI:

* Cardiovascular disease risk prediction
* Dermatology
* Falls among the elderly
* Histopathology
* Neuro-cognitive diseases
* Ophthalmology (retinal imaging diagnostics)
* Psychiatry
* Snakebite and snake identification
* Tuberculosis

As the work by the Focus Group continues, new Topic Groups will be created. To organize the Topic Groups, for each topic the Focus Group chose a topic driver. The exact responsibilities of the topic driver are still to be defined and are likely to change over time. The preliminary and yet-to-confirm list of the responsibilities includes:

* Creating the initial draft version(s) of the topic description document.
* Reviewing the input documents for the topic and moderating the integration in a dedicated session at each Focus Group meeting.
* Organizing regular phone calls to coordinate work on the topic description document between meetings.

During meeting C in Lausanne, Henry Hoffmann from Ada Health was selected topic driver for the “AI-based Symptom Assessment” Topic Group.

## 2.1 General Mandate of the Topic Group

The Topic Group is a concept specific to the AI4H-FG. The preliminary responsibilities of the Topic Groups are:

1. Provide a forum for open communication among various stakeholders
2. Agree upon the benchmarking tasks of this topic and scoring metrics
3. Facilitate the collection of high quality labeled test data from different sources
4. Clarify the input and output format of the test data
5. Define and set-up the technical benchmarking infrastructure
6. Coordinate the benchmarking process in collaboration with the Focus Group management and working groups

## 2.2 Topic Description Document

The primary output of each Topic Group is the topic description document (TDD) specifying all relevant aspects of the benchmarking for the individual topics. **This document is the TDD for the Topic Group on “AI-based symptom assessment” (AISA)**. The document will be developed cooperatively over several FG-AI4H meetings starting from meeting D in Shanghai. Suggested changes to the document will be submitted as input documents for each meeting. The relevant changes will then be discussed and integrated into an official output document until the TDD ready for the first official benchmarking.

## 2.3 Sub-topics

Topic groups summarize similar AI benchmarking use cases to limit the number of use case specific meetings at the Focus Group meetings and to share similar parts of the benchmarking. However, in some cases, it is expected that inside a Topic Group different Sub-topic Groups can be established to pursue different topic-specific specializations. The AISA Topic Group originally started without separate sub-topic Groups. With Baidu joining in meeting D in Shanghai, the Topic Group was split into the subtopics “self assessment” and “clinical symptom assessment”. The first group addresses the symptom-checker apps used by non-doctors while the second group focuses on symptom-based diagnostic decision support systems for doctors. This document will discuss both sub-topics together. In chapter 5 where the benchmarking method will be described, the specific requirements for each sub-topic will be described following [FGAI4H-D-022](https://extranet.itu.int/sites/itu-t/focusgroups/ai4h/docs/FGAI4H-D-022.docx?d=w8980136edaed424a845f6e3a74a2f3a0).

## 2.4 Topic Group Participation

The participation in both the focus and Topic Group is generally open and free of charge. Anyone who is from a member country of the ITU may participate. On the 14. of March 2019 the ITU published an official “call for participation” document outlining the process for joining the Focus Group and the Topic Group. For this topic, the corresponding call can be found [here](https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-T/focusgroups/ai4h/Pages/symptom.aspx).

## 2.5 Status of this Topic Group

With the publication of the “call for participation” the current Topic Group members, Ada Health and Your.MD, started to share it within their networks of field experts. Some already declared general interest and are expected to join official via input documents at meeting D or E. Before the initial submission of the first draft of this TDD it was jointly edited by the current Topic Group members. Some of the approached experts started working on own contributions that will soon be added to the document. For the missing parts of the TDD where input is needed the Topic Group will reach out to field experts at the upcoming meetings and the in between.

## 2.6 Next Meetings

The Focus Groups meets about every two months at changing locations. The upcoming meetings are:

* E: Geneva, Switzerland; ​29 May-1 June ​2019
* F: Zanzibar, Tanzania; 2-5 September 2019
* G: New Delhi, India; November 2019
* H: Brasilia, Brazil; January 2020

An up to date list can be found at the official [ITU FG AI4H website](https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-T/focusgroups/ai4h/Pages/default.aspx).

* Tools/process of TG cooperation - to be filled out according to FG regulations
* TG interaction with WG, FG- to be filled out according to FG regulations

# 3 Existing AI Solutions

* Some words on the history of expert systems for diagnostic decision support and how it lead to the new generation of AI systems (INTERNIST, EXPERT, GLAUCOM, CASNET, … )

## 3.1 Existing Systems for AI-based Symptom Assessment

This section presents a table with the providers currently available and known to the Topic Group. The table summarizes the inputs and outputs relevant for benchmarking. It also presents relevant details concerning the scope of the systems that will affect the definition of categories for benchmarking reports, metrics and scores. Because the field is rapidly changing, this table will be updated before every Focus Group meeting and is currently a draft. The table is split into members of the Topic Group and non-members since the initial benchmarking will most likely start with the providers that joined the Topic Group.

### 3.1.1 Topic Group member Systems for AI-based Symptom Assessment

<Add header line to introduce the table>

| Provider | System | Input | Output | Scope |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Ada Health GmbH](https://ada.com/) | Ada app | Age, sex, risk factorsFree text PC searchDiscrete answers to dialog questions for additional symptoms including attribute details like intensity | Differentials for PCPre-clinical triageShortcuts in case of immediate danger | WorldwideEnglish, German, Spanish, Portuguese, FrenchTop 1300 conditionsFor smartphone usersAndroid/iOS |
| [Babylon Health](https://www.babylonhealth.com/) | Babylon App | Age, sex, risk factors, countryChatbot free text input and free text search (multiple inputs are allowed)Answers to dialog questions for additional symptoms and risk factors including duration of symptoms, intensity | Pre-clinical triagePossible causes (“differentials”)Condition informationRecommendation of appropriate local services and productsText information about treatments or next stepsShortcuts in case of immediate danger | WorldwideEnglish80% of medical conditionsFor smartphone/web usersAndroid/iOS/Web |
| Baidu |  |  |  |  |
| [Isabel Healthcare](https://www.isabelhealthcare.com/) | Isabel Symptom Checker | AgeGenderPregnancy StatusRegion/Travel HistoryFree text input of multiple symptoms all at once | List of possible diagnosesDiagnoses can be sorted by ‘common’ or ‘Red flag’Each diagnosis linked to multiple reference resources If triage function selected, patient answers 7 questions to obtain advice on appropriate venue of care  | 6,000 medical conditions coveredUnlimited number of symptomsResponsive design means website adjusts to all devicesAPIs available allowing integration into other systemsCurrently English only but professional site available in Spanish and Chinese and model developed to make available in tmost languages |
| [Your.MD Ltd](https://www.your.md/) | Your.MD app | Age, sex,medical risk factors,Chatbot free text inputUser consultation output (report) | Differentials for PCPre-clinical triageShortcuts in case of immediate dangerCondition informationRecommendation of appropriate local services and productsMedical factors | WorldwideEnglish, Top 370 conditions (building to 500).For smartphone users Android /iOS and web and messaging groups Skype etc |

### 3.1.2 Other Systems for AI-based Symptom Assessment

The list of systems of providers that have not joined the Topic Groups is most likely incomplete. Suggestions for systems to add are appreciated. The same applies for suggestions for the missing columns. The list is limited to systems that actually have some kind of AI that could be benchmarked. Systems that e.g. show a static list of conditions for a given finding or pure tele-health services have not been included.

| Provider | System | Input | Output | Scope | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Aetna](https://www.aetna.com/individuals-families.html) | [Symptom checker](https://www.healthwise.net/aetna/Content/CustDocument.aspx?XML=STUB.XML&XSL=CD.FRONTPAGE.XSL) |  |  |  |  |
| AHEAD Research | [Symcat](http://www.symcat.com/) |  |  |  |  |
| [Buoy Health, Inc](https://www.buoyhealth.com) |  |  |  |  |  |
| [DocResponse](https://www.docresponse.com/) | [DocResponse](https://www.docresponse.com/) |  |  | for doctors |  |
|  | Doctor Diagnose |  |  | Android |  |
| [Drugs.com](https://www.drugs.com) | [Symptom Checker](https://www.drugs.com/symptom-checker/) |  |  | Triage | Harvard Health decision guide used |
| [EarlyDoc](https://www.earlydoc.com/) |  |  |  | Web |  |
| [FamilyDoctor.org](https://familydoctor.org/) | [Symptom Checker](https://familydoctor.org/your-health-resources/health-tools/symptom-checker/) |  |  | Web |  |
| [Healthline](https://www.healthline.com/) | [Symptom Checker](https://www.healthline.com/symptom-checker) |  |  |  |  |
| [Healthtap](https://www.healthtap.com/) | [Symptom Checker](https://www.healthtap.com/member/login) (for members)  |  |  |  |  |
| [Infermedica](https://infermedica.com/) | (Symptomate) |  |  | worldwideArabic, English, French, German, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, Portuguese (Brazilian), Simplified Chinese, Slovak, Spanish, Russian, Ukrainian |  |
| [Isabel Healthcare](https://symptomchecker.isabelhealthcare.com/) | [Isabel Symptom Checker](https://symptomchecker.isabelhealthcare.com/suggest_diagnoses_advanced/landing_page) |  |  |  |  |
| [K Health](https://www.khealth.ai/) | K app chatbot |  |  |  |  |
| [Mayo Clinic](https://www.mayoclinic.org/) | [Symptom Checker](https://www.mayoclinic.org/symptom-checker/select-symptom/itt-20009075) |  |  |  |  |
| [MDLive](https://www.mdlive.com/) | Symptom checker on MDLive app |  |  |  |  |
| [MEDoctor](https://www.medoctor.io/) | [Symptom Checker](https://www.medoctor.com/Freemium/interview) |  |  |  |  |
| [Mediktor](https://www.mediktor.com/en) | [Web-based symptom checker,](https://www.mediktor.com/en) or Mediktor app |  |  |  |  |
| [NetDoktor](https://www.netdoktor.de/) | [Symptom Checker](https://www.netdoktor.de/symptom-checker/) |  |  |  |  |
| [PingAn](http://www.pingan.cn/en/index.shtml)  | Good Doctor app |  |  |  |  |
| [Sharecare, Inc.](https://www.sharecare.com/) | [AskMD](https://www.sharecare.com/askmd/get-started) |  |  |  |  |
| [Symptify](https://symptify.com/) | [Symptom Checker](https://symptify.com/) |  |  |  |  |
| [WebMD](https://www.webmd.com/) |  |  |  |  |  |

## 3.2 Input Data

AI systems in general are often described as functions mapping an input space to an output space. To define a widely accepted benchmarking it is important to collect the different input and output types relevant for symptom assessment systems.

### 3.2.1 Input Types

The following table gives an overview of the different input types used by the listed AI systems.

| Input Type | Short Description | Number of Systems |
| --- | --- | --- |
| General Profile Information  | General information about the user/patient like age, sex, ethnics and general risk factors.  |  |
| Presenting Complaints | The health problems the users seeks advice for. Usually entered in search as free text.  |  |
| Additional Symptoms | Additional symptoms answered by the use if asked.  |  |
| Lab Results | Available results from lab tests that the user could enter if asked. |  |
| Imaging Data (MRI, etc.) | Available imaging data that the use could upload if available digitally. |  |
| Photos | Photos of e.g. skin lesions. |  |
| Sensor Data | Data from self tracking sensor devices like scales, fitness trackers, 1-channel ECG |  |
| Genomics | Genetic profiling information from sources like 23andMe. |  |
| ... |  |  |

### 3.2.2 Ontologies for encoding input data

For benchmarking the different input types need to be encoded in a way that allows each AI to “understand” its meaning. Since natural language is intrinsically ambiguous, this is achieved by using a terminology or ontology defining concepts like symptoms, findings and risk factors with a unique identifier, the most commonly used names in selected languages and often a set of relations describing e.g. the hierarchical dependencies of “pain at the left hand” and “pain in the left arm”.

There is a large number of ontologies available (e.g. at <https://bioportal.bioontology.org/>). However most ontologies are specific for a small domain, not well maintained, or have grown to a size where they are not consistent enough for describing case data in a precise way. The most relevant input space ontologies for symptom assessment are described in the following sub sections

#### 3.2.2.1 SNOMED Clinical Terms

SNOMED CT (<http://www.snomed.org/>) describes itself with the following five statements:

* Is the most comprehensive, multilingual clinical healthcare terminology in the world
* Is a resource with comprehensive, scientifically validated clinical content
* Enables consistent representation of clinical content in electronic health records
* Is mapped to other international standards
* Is in use in more than eighty countries

Maintenance and distribution is organized by the SNOMED International (trading name for the International Health Terminology Standards Development Organisation). SNOMED CT is seen to date as the most complete and detailed classification for all medical terms. SNOMED CT is only free of charge in member countries. In non-member countries the fees are prohibitive. While being among the largest and best maintained ontologies, it is partially not precise enough for encoding symptoms, findings and their details in a unified unambiguous way. Especially for phenotyping rare disease cases it is has not high enough resolution yet (e.g. Achromatopsia and Monochromatism are not separated, or “Increased VLDL cholesterol concentration” is not as explicit as e.g. “increased muscle tone”). SNOMED CT is also currently adapted to fit the needs of ICD-11 to link both classification systems (see below).

#### 3.2.2.2 Human Phenotype Ontology (HPO)

The Human Phenotype Ontology (HPO) (www.human-phenotype-ontology.org) is an ontology focused on phenotyping patients especially in context of hereditary diseases, containing more than 13,000 terms. In context of rare disease it is the most commonly used ontology and was adopted by OrphanNet for encoding the conditions in their rare disease database. Other examples are the 100K Genomes UK, NIH UDP, Genetic and Rare Diseases Information Center (GARD). The HPO is part of the Monarch Initiative, an NIH-supported international consortium dedicated to semantic integration of biomedical and model organism data with the ultimate goal of improving biomedical research[[6]](#footnote-6).

#### 3.2.2.3 Logical Observation Identifiers Names and Codes (LOINC)

LOINC is a standardized description of both, clinical and laboratory terms. It embodies a structure / ontology, linking related laboratory tests / clinical assessments with each other. It is maintained by the Regenstrief Institute. (TODO refine)

#### 3.2.2.4 Unified Medical Language System (UMLS)

The UMLS, which is maintained by the US National Library of Medicine, brings together different classification systems / biomedical libraries including SNOMED CT, ICD, DSM and HPO and links these systems creating an ontology of medical terms. (TODO refine)

## 3.3 Output Types

Beside the inputs, the outputs need to be specified in a precise and unambiguous way too. For every test case the output needs to be clear so that the scores and metrics can assess the distance between the expected results and the actual output of the different AI systems.

### 3.3.1 Output Types

As for the input types, the following table lists the different output types that the systems listed in 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 generate.

| Output Type | Short Description | Number of Systems |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Clinical Triage | Initial classification/prioritization of a patient on arrival in a hospital / emergency department. |  |
| Pre-Clinical Triage | A general advice of the severity of the problem and on how urgent actions need to be taken ranging from e.g. “self-care” over “see doctors within 2 days” to “call an ambulance right now”  |  |
| Differential Diagnosis | A list of diseases that might cause the presenting complaints, usually ranked by some score like probability. |  |
| Next Step Advice | A more concrete advice suggesting doctors or institutions that can help with the specific problem. |  |
| Treatment Advice | Concrete suggestions of how to treat the problem e.g. with exercises, manoeuvres, self medication etc. |  |
| ... |  |  |

The different output types will be explained in detail in the following section:

#### 3.3.1.1 Clinical Triage

The most simple output of symptom based DDSS is a pre-clinical triage. Triage is a term commonly used in clinical context to describe the classification and prioritization of symptoms based on their symptoms. Most hospitals use some kind of triage systems in their emergency department for deciding how long a patient can wait so that people with severe injuries are treated with higher priority than stable patients with minor symptoms. One triage system commonly used is the Manchester Triage System which defines the classes:

| Level | Status | Colour | Time to Assessment |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Immediate | Red | 0 min |
| 2 | Very urgent | Orange | 10 min |
| 3 | Urgent | Yellow | 60 min |
| 4 | Standard | Green | 120 min |
| 5 | Non urgent | Blue | 240 min |

The triage is usually performed by a nurse for every incoming patient in a triage room equipped with devices of measuring the vital signs. While there are some guidelines clinics report a high variance in the classification between different nurses and on different days.

#### 3.3.1.2 Pre-Clinical Triage

As triage helps with the prioritization of patients in an emergency setting, the pre-clinical triage helps users of self-assessment applications independent of a diagnosis to help decide when and where to seek care. In contrast to the clinical triage where there are several methods know, pre-clinical triage is not standardized. Different companies use different in-house classifications. Inside the Topic group for instance the following classifications are used.

Ada Health Pre-Clinical Triage Levels

* Self-care
* Self-care Pharma
* Primary care 2-3 weeks
* Primary care 2-3 days
* Primary care same day
* Primary care 4 hours
* Emergency care
* Call ambulance

Babylon Pre-Clinical Triage Levels

Generally:

* Self-care
* Pharmacy
* Primary care, 1-2 weeks
* Primary care, same day urgently
* Emergency care (usually transport arranged by patient, including taxi)
* Emergency care with ambulance

With additional information provided per condition.

Isabel Pre-Clinical Triage Levels

* Level 1 (Green): Walk in Clinic/Telemedicine/Pharmacy
* Level 2 (Yellow): Family Physician/Urgent Care Clinic/Minor Injuries Unit
* Level 3 (Red): Emergency Services

Isabel does not advocate self care and assumes the patient has decided they want to seek care now but just need help on deciding on which venue of care.

Your.MD Pre-Clinical Triage Levels

* Self-care
* Self-care Pharmacist (being added)
* Self-care Physiotherapy (being added)
* Self-care Dentist (being added)
* Primary care 2 weeks
* Primary care 2 days
* Primary care same day
* Emergency care
* Call ambulance

For a standardized benchmarking the Topic Group has to agree on a subset or superset for annotating test cases and for computing the benchmarking scores.

* existing pre-clinical triage scales
	+ scales used by health systems e.g. NHS
* discussion tradeoff between number of different values and inter-annotator-agreement
* discussion tradeoff between number of different values and helpfulness for the user
* discuss challenge to define an objective ground truth for benchmarking
* available studies, e.g. on the spread among triage nurses

#### 3.3.1.3 Differential Diagnosis

* to be written

#### 3.3.1.4 Next Step Advice

* to be written

#### 3.3.1.5 Treatment Advice

* to be written

## 3.4 Scope Dimensions

The table of existing solutions also lists the scope of the intended application of these systems. Analysing them suggests the following dimensions should be considered as part of the benchmarking:

Regional Scope

Some systems focus on a regional condition distribution and symptom interpretation, whereas others don’t use the regional information. As this is an important distinction between the systems, the benchmark may need to present the results by region as well as the overall results.

Condition Set

With subtypes there are many thousands of known conditions. The systems differ in the range as well in depth of condition they support. Most systems focus on the top 300 to top 1500 conditions while others also include the 6000-8000 rare diseases. The benchmarking therefore needs to be categorized by different condition sets to account for the different system capabilities.

Age Range

Most systems are created for the (younger) adult range and highly based on these conditions. Only few are explicitly created for pediatrics, especially very young children and some try to cover the whole lifespan of humans. The benchmarking therefore needs to be categorized into different age ranges.

Languages

Though there are some systems covering more than one language, common systems are created mostly in English. As it is essential for patient-facing applications to provide low-thresholds for everyone to access this medical information, this dimension may be taken into account as well - especially if at some point the quality of natural language understanding of entered symptoms is assessed.

## 3.4 Additional Relevant Dimensions

Beside scope, technology and structure, the analysis of the different applications revealed several additional aspects that need to be considered to define the benchmarking:

Dealing with “No-Answers” / missing information

Some systems are not able to deal with missing information as they require always a “yes” or “no” answer when asking patients. This may be a challenge for testing with e.g. case vignettes as it won’t be possible to describe the complete health state of an individual with every detail that is imaginable.

Dialog Engines

More modern systems are designed as chatbots engaging in a dialog with the user. The number of questions asked is crucial for the system performance and might be relevant for benchmarking. Furthermore dialog based systems proactively asking for symptoms are challenging if case vignettes are used for benchmarking since the dialog might not ask for the symptoms in the vignettes. Later iterations of the benchmarking might explicitly conduct a dialog to include the performance of the dialog, while first iterations might provide the AIs with complete cases.

Number of Presenting Complaints

The systems differ in the number of presenting complaints the user can enter. This might influence the cases used for benchmarking e.g. by starting with cases having only one presenting complaint.

Multimorbidity

Most systems don’t support the possibility that a combination of multiple conditions is responsible for the users presenting complaints (multi-morbidity). The benchmarking therefore should mark multi-morbid and mono-morbid cases and differentiate the reported performance accordingly. The initial benchmarking might also be restricted to mono-morbid cases.

Symptom Search

Most systems allow to search for the initial presenting complaints. The performance of the search and if the application is able to provide the correct finding given the terms entered by users is also crucial for the system performance and could be benchmarked.

Natural Language Processing

Some of the systems support full natural language process for both the presenting complaints the dialog in general. While theses systems are usually restricted to few languages, they provide a more natural experience and possible more complete collection of the relevant evidence. Testing the natural language understanding of symptoms might therefore be another dimension to consider in the benchmarking.

## 3.5 Robustness of systems for AI based Symptom Assessment

As meeting D underlined with the introduction of a corresponding ad-hoc group, robustness is an important aspect for AI systems in general. Especially in recent years it could be shown that systems perform well on a reasonable benchmarking test set completely fail if adding some noise or a slight valid but unexpected transformation to the input data. For instance traffic signs might not be recognized any more if a slight modification like a sticker is added that a human driver would hardly notice. Based on the knowledge of such behaviours, the results of AI systems could be deliberately compromised e.g. to get more money from the health insurance for a more expensive disease, or faster appointments.

A viable benchmarking should therefore assess also the robustness. While for e.g. deep learning based image processing technologies robustness is a more important issue, also symptom based assessment can compromised. The reminder of this section gives an overview of the most relevant robustness and stability issues that should be assessed as part of the benchmarking.

Memory Stability & Reproducibility

An aspect of robustness is also the stability of the results. For instance a technology might use data structures like hash maps that depend on the current operating systems memory layout. In this case running the AI on the same case after restart again might lead to slightly different, possible worse results.

Empty case response

TODO

Negative evidence only response

TODO

All symptoms response

TODO

Duplicate symptom response

TODO

Wrong symptom response

TODO

Symptom with wrong attributes response

TODO

Symptom without mandatory attribute response

TODO

# 4 Existing work on benchmarking

To establish a standardized benchmarking for AI-based symptom assessment systems, it is valuable to analyse previous benchmarking work in this field. So far, little work has been performed, which is also a reason that the introduction of a standardized benchmarking framework is important. The current work falls into several sub categories that will be discussed in their own subsections.

## 4.1 Scientific Publications on Benchmarking AI-based Symptom Assessment Applications

Whilst rare, a few publications exist that worked on assessing the performance of AI-based symptom assessment systems. For reviewing, the details of the different approaches and their relevance for setting up a standardized benchmarking the most relevant publications will be discussed in the subsequent sections:

### 4.1.1 “Evaluation of symptom checkers for self diagnosis and triage”[[7]](#footnote-7)

TODO

### 4.1.2 “ISABEL: a web-based differential diagnostic aid for paediatrics: results from an initial performance evaluation”[[8]](#footnote-8)

TODO

### 4.1.3 “Safety of patient-facing digital symptom checkers.”[[9]](#footnote-9)

TODO

### 4.1.4 “Comparison of physician and computer diagnostic accuracy.”[[10]](#footnote-10)

Semigran et al. expounded on their 2015 systematic assessment of online symptom checkers by comparing checker performance—the previous 45 vignettes—to physician (n=234) diagnoses. Physicians reported the correct diagnosis 38.1% more often symptom checkers (72.1% vs. 34.0%), additionally outperforming in the top three diagnoses listed (84.3% vs. 51.2%). Physicians were also more likely to list the correct diagnoses for high-acuity and uncommon vignettes, while symptom checkers were more likely to list the correct diagnosis for low-acuity and common vignettes. While the study is limited by physician selection bias, the significance of the results lies in the vast outperformance of physician diagnoses.

### 4.1.5 “A novel insight into the challenges of diagnosing degenerative cervical myelopathy using web-based symptom checkers.”[[11]](#footnote-11)

Unique algorithms (n=4) from the top 20 web-based symptom checkers were evaluated for their ability to diagnose degenerative cervical myelopathy (DCM): WebMD, Healthline, Healthtools.AARP, and NetDoctor. A single case vignette of up to 31 DCM symptoms derived from 4 review articles was entered into each symptom checker. Only 45% of the 31 DCM symptoms were associated with DCM as a differential by the symptom checkers, and in these cases a majority 79% ranked DCM in the bottom two-thirds of differentials. Insofar as web-based symptom checkers are able to detect symptoms of degenerative disorder, the authors conclude their is technological potential, but an overall lack of acuity.

## 4.2 Clinical Evaluation of AI-based Symptom Assessment

While there is currently a stronger focus on patient-facing symptom assessment systems, some work has also been done on assessing the performance of similar systems in a clinical context. The relevant publications are discussed in the following sub sections.

### 4.2.1 “A new artificial intelligence tool for assessing symptoms in patients seeking emergency department care: the Mediktor application. Emergencias”

One report was published in 2017 assessing a single AI-based symptom assessment in a Spanish Emergency Setting.[[12]](#footnote-12) The tool was used for non urgent emergency cases and users were included who were above 18 years, willing to participate, had a diagnosis after leaving the emergency department and if this diagnosis was part of the Mediktor dictionary at this time. With this setting, the symptom assessment reached an F1 Score of 42.9%, and F3 score of 75.4% and F10 score of 91.3% for a total of 622 cases.

### 4.2.2 “Evaluation of a diagnostic decision support system for the triage of patients in a hospital emergency department”[[13]](#footnote-13)

The results of a subsequent prospective study to the Moreno et al. (2017) evaluation of Mediktor were published in 2019. This study was also conducted in an emergency room setting in Spain, and consisted of a sample of 219 patients. With this setting, the symptom assessment reached an F1 Score of 37.9%, and F3 score of 65.4% and F10 score of 76.5%. It was further determined that Mediktor’s triage levels do not significantly correlate with the Manchester Triage System for emergency care, or with hospital admissions, hospital readmissions and emergency screenings at 30 days.

### 4.2.3 “Evaluation and accurate diagnoses of pediatric diseases using artificial intelligence.”

Recently, a study by Liang et. al. showed a proof of concept of a diagnostic decision support system for (common) pediatric conditions based on a natural language processing approach of EHR. The F1 Score was overall between junior and senior physicians group with an average F1 score of 0.885 for the covered conditions.[[14]](#footnote-14)

### 4.2.4 “Evaluating the potential impact of Ada DX in a retrospective study.”

A retrospective study evaluated the diagnostic decision support system Ada DX in 93 cases of confirmed rare inflammatory systemic diseases. Information from patients' health records was entered in Ada DX in the cases' course over time. The system’s disease suggestions were evaluated with regard to the confirmed diagnosis. The system’s potential to provide correct rare disease suggestions early in the course of cases was investigated. Correct suggestions were provided earlier than the time of clinical diagnosis in 53.8% of cases (F5) and 37.6% (F1) respectively. At the time of clinical diagnosis the F1 score was 89.3%.[[15]](#footnote-15)

### 4.2.5 “Accuracy of a computer-based diagnostic program for ambulatory patients with knee pain.”[[16]](#footnote-16)

The results of a prospective observational study were published in 2016 in which researchers evaluated the accuracy of a web-based symptom checker for ambulatory patients with knee pain in the United States. The symptom checker had the ability to provide a differential diagnosis for 26 common knee-related conditions. In a sample size of 259 patients aged above 18 years, the symptom assessment reached an F10 score of 89%.

### 4.2.6 “How Accurate Are Patients at Diagnosing the Cause of Their Knee Pain With the Help of a Web-based Symptom Checker?”[[17]](#footnote-17)

In a follow up to the Blisson et al. (2014) study investigating the accuracy of a web-based symptom checker for knee pain, a prospective study was conducted across 7 sports medicine clinics to evaluate patient’s ability to self-diagnose their knee pain with the help of the same symptom checker within a cohort of 328 patients aged 18–76 years. Patients were allowed to use the symptom checker, which generated a list of potential diagnoses after patients had entered their symptoms. Each diagnosis was linked to informative content. Patients then self-diagnosed the cause of their knee pain based on the information from the symptom checker. In 58% of cases, one of the patients’ self-diagnoses matched the physician diagnosis. Patients had upto 9 self-diagnoses.

### 4.2.7 “Are online symptoms checkers useful for patients with inflammatory arthritis?”[[18]](#footnote-18)

A prospective study in secondary care in the United Kingdom evaluated the NHS Symptom Checker for triage accuracy and Boots WebMd for diagnostic accuracy against physician diagnosis of inflammatory arthritis: rheumatoid arthritis (n = 13), psoriatic arthritis (n = 4), unclassified arthritis (n = 4)) and inflammatory arthralgia (n = 13). The study aimed to expand literature into the effectiveness of online symptom checkers in real patients in relation to how the internet is used to search for health information. 56% of patients were suggested the appropriate level of care by the NHS Symptom Checker, while 69% of rheumatoid arthritis patients and 75% of psoriatic arthritis patients had their diagnosis listed amongst the top five differential diagnoses by WebMD. Low triage accuracy led the authors to predict an inappropriate use of healthcare resources as a result of these web-based checkers.

## 4.3 Benchmarking Publications outside Science

In addition to scientific benchmarking attempts, there are several newspaper articles reporting tests of primarily user-facing symptom assessment applications. While not always following scientific standards, they provide relevant insights on how such systems can be compared. The following section gives an overview of some of these articles (without claim of completeness).

**4.3.1 “Can you really trust the medical apps on your phone?”**

The Wired magazine addressed the issue of “symptom checkers” creating a test set for the applications Ada, Babylon and Your.MD for a small sample of common diseases and based on symptoms described by the NHS Choices website. They not only focussed on the result but also on the advice the application gave after the assessment and the questions generated by the apps and how they were asked.[[19]](#footnote-19)

continue with other articles

## 4.4 Existing Regulations

Complementary to explicit benchmarking attempts, in many countries there is strict regulation of health-related products in place. While the original regulatory focus was more on hardware devices, the regulatory environment has been rapidly adapting to the needs of software. This section reviews the existing regulation to collect criteria that could be part of a standardized automatic benchmarking.

* medical product regulation and the upcoming class II requirement
* FDA(C)
* (CE)
* clinical trials, evidence levels (RCT’s etc.)
* scores & metrics used

## 4.5 Internal Benchmarking by Companies

Probably the most sophisticated systems for benchmarking symptom assessment systems are the ones created by the different companies developing such systems for internal testing and quality control. While most of the details are unlikely to be shared by the companies, this section points out insights relevant for creating a standardized benchmarking.

Dataset Shift

In most test sets the distribution of conditions is not the same as the distribution found in the real world. There are usually a few cases for even the rarest conditions while at the same time the number of common cold cases is limited. This gives rare diseases a much higher weight in the aggregation of the total scores. While this is desirable to make sure that all disease models perform well, in some cases it is more important to measure the net performance of systems in real world scenarios. In this case the aggregation function needs to scale the individual cases results with its expected top match prior probability in order to get the mathematically correct expectation-value for the score. For example, errors on common-cold cases need to be punished harder than errors on cases of rare diseases that only a few people suffer from. The benchmarking should include results with and without correction of this effect.

Medical distance of the top matching diseases to the expected ones

In case the expected top match is not the first position and the listed conditions are not in e.g. a set of "expected other conditions", the medical distance between the expected conditions and actual conditions could be included in the measure.

The rank position

In case the expected top-match is not in the first position, the actual position might be part of the scoring. This could include the probability integral of all higher ranking conditions or the difference between the top scores and the score of the expected disease.

The role of the secondary matches

Since AISA systems usually present multiple possible conditions, even if the top match is correct the qualities of the other matches need to be considered as well. For example, the highly relevant differentials that should be ruled out are much better secondary diagnoses than random diseases.

discuss scores & metrics used

## 4.6 Existing AI Benchmarking Frameworks

Triggered by the hype around AI, recent years have seen the development of several benchmarking platforms where AIs can compete for the best performance on a given dataset. Document [C031](https://extranet.itu.int/sites/itu-t/focusgroups/ai4h/docs/FGAI4H-C-031.pptx?d=wda212412d98541f5a4fbb4757b620828) provides a list of the available platforms. While not specific for symptom assessment they provide important examples for many aspects of benchmarking ranging from operational details, over scores & metrics, leaderboards, reports to the overall architecture. Due to high numbers of participants and the prestige associated with a top rank, the platforms have also substantial experience in designing the benchmarking in a way that is hard or impossible to manipulate.

### 4.6.1 General Requirements

While many AI benchmarks also involve tasks in health, the benchmarking for this Topic Group has some specific requirements that will be discussed in this section.

Technology Independence

The AI systems that are a part of this Topic Group run on complex architecture and use a multitude of technologies. In contrast, most benchmarking platforms have been primarily designed for use with Python based machine learning prototypes. One important requirement is therefore that the benchmarking platform is completely technology agnostic e.g. by supporting AIs submitted as docker containers with a specified interface.

Custom Scores & Metrics

For the tasks benchmarked by the common benchmarking platforms the focus is on only a small number of scores. In many cases it is even possible to use common ready-made built-in scores. For benchmarking the performance in our Topic Group we will need to implement a multitude of new scores and metrics to reflect the different aspects of the quality and performance of self-assessment systems. It is therefore important that the benchmarking platform allows to define and add new custom scores - ideally by configuration rather than changing the platform code, to compute them as part of the benchmarking and automatically add them to the generated reports.

Custom Reports & Additional Reporting Dimensions

Together with the many more scores, the platform also needs to support the generation of reports that include all the scores in a readable way. Beside the scores there are also many dimensions to organize the reports by so that it is clear which technologies fit the needs of specific use cases.

Interactive Reports & Data Export

Since the number of dimensions and score will grow fast, it will not always be possible to automatically provide the reports answering all the details for all possible use cases. For this case the platform needs to either provide interactive navigation and filtering of the benchmarking result data or at least an easy way to export the data for further processing e.g. in tools like Tableau.

Support for Interactive Testing

Whilst for the first benchmarking iterations providing cases with all the evidence at once might suffice, later iterations will probably also test the quality of the dialog between the system and the user e.g. only answering questions the AI systems explicitly ask for. The platform should allow a way to implement this dialog simulation.

Stability & Robustness & Performance & Errors

Beside benchmarking using the test data as-is, we also need to assess the stability of the results given a changed symptom order or in a second run. We also need to record the run time for every case or possible error codes, hanging AIs and crashes without itself being compromised. Recording these details in a reliable and transparent way requires the benchmarking platform to perform a case-by-case testing rather than e.g. letting the AI batch-process a directory of input files.

Sand-Boxing

Not specific for this Topic Group but of utmost importance is that the platform is absolutely safe with regard to to blocking any access of the AI on anything outside its sand-box. It must not be possible to access the file-system of the benchmarking machine, databases, network etc. The AI must not be able to leak the test data to the outside world, nor see the correct labels, nor manipulate the recorded benchmarking results, nor access other AIs or their results. The experience with protecting all kinds of manipulation attempts is the biggest advantage that using a ready made benchmarking platform could provide.

Online-Mode

Beside the sand-boxed mode for the actual official benchmarking it would simplify the implementation of the benchmarking wrapper if there would also be a way to submit a hosted version of the AI. This way the developers could test run the benchmarking on some public e.g. synthetic dataset get some preliminary results.

### 4.6.2 AICrowd

In response to the call for benchmarking platforms ([FGAI4H-C-106](https://extranet.itu.int/sites/itu-t/focusgroups/ai4h/docs/FGAI4H-C-106.docx?d=w19fd773712344ed4bbdb6797fd4fa4e2)), in meeting D in Shanghai [FGAI4H-D-011](https://extranet.itu.int/sites/itu-t/focusgroups/ai4h/docs/FGAI4H-D-011.docx?d=w83459290fe0b423abc4f6dabbdc93c50) suggested the use of AICrowd. As discussed in meeting D, the Topic Group had a look at AICrowd to get a first overview if it could be an option for benchmarking the AI systems in this Topic Group.

The general preliminary assessment is that AICrowd has the potential to serve as a benchmarking platform software for the first iteration of the benchmarking in our Topic Group. However, benchmarking and reporting is designed for one primary and one secondary score. Adding the high-dimensional scoring systems with reporting organized by a multitude of additional dimensions is not yet supported and needs to be implemented. This also applies to the automatic stability and robustness testing. The interactive dialog simulation needed for future benchmarking implementations would need to be implemented from scratch. In general we found that the documentation for installing the software, the development process and for extending it is not as detailed and up-to-date as needed and the necessary changes would probably require close cooperation with the developers of the platform.

The Topic Group will discuss if the strong experience in water-tight sand-boxing and the design of the platform itself outweighs the work of changing an existing platform to the Topic Groups needs, compared to implementing a new specialised solution.

### 4.6.3 Other Platforms

TODO

* analyse kaggle, …

## 4.7 Scores & Metrics

At the core of every AI benchmarking there are scores and metrics that assess the output of the different systems. In context of the Topic Group the scores have to be chosen in a way that can facilitate decision making when it comes to deciding on possible solutions for a given health task in a given context.

TODO

# 5 Minimal Viable Benchmarking

Chapter 5 specifies the methodology, technology and protocols necessary for the benchmarking of AI-based symptom assessment systems. Due to the complexity of a holistic standardized benchmarking framework for AI-based symptom assessment, this specification begins with a **“minimal viable benchmarking”** **(MVB)** that will iteratively extend based on the insights learned from each benchmarking iteration. The focus of chapter 5 is on specifying a concrete benchmarking. Theoretical background and the different options for the numerous decisions to be taken are supposed to be discussed in chapter 4.

Since meeting D the Topic Group has the two sub topics “self assessment” and “clinical symptom assessment”. For the V2.0 of this document we follow the approach of [FGAI4H-D-022](https://extranet.itu.int/sites/itu-t/focusgroups/ai4h/docs/FGAI4H-D-022.docx?d=w8980136edaed424a845f6e3a74a2f3a0) to specify the MVB for both subtopics together and elaborate on the specific details at the end of each subtopic.

## 5.1 Architecture and Methodology Overview

Fig. 1 shows the general generic benchmarking architecture defined by the Focus Group that will serve as the basis for the symptom assessment topic. The different components will be explained in the following sections (figure will be adapted to Topic):



Fig. 1: General framework proposed by Prof. Marcel Salathé, Digital Epidemiology Lab, EPFL during workshop associated to FG Meeting A[[20]](#footnote-20)

**(2)** Every benchmarking participant creates its own system based on its technology of choice. This will likely involve machine learning techniques relying on private and/or public data sets **(1)**. In contrast to other Topic Groups, there are currently no public training datasets available. Given the large number of conditions and that some are very rare, it is unlikely that large public training data sets will soon be available.

As part of the benchmarking process, participants have to implement an application program interface (API) endpoint that accepts test cases and returns the corresponding computed output **(3)**.

The actual benchmarking will then be performed by the United Nations International Computing Centre (ICC) benchmarking infrastructure by sending test cases **(4)** without the labels to the AI and recording the corresponding results. To generate a report for each system, **(5)** the benchmarking system will then compute the previously agreed-upon metrics and scores based on the output datasets. The results of the different DSAAs can finally be presented in a leaderboard **(6)**.

In addition to official benchmarking on undisclosed datasets and submission of AI for testing, there will also be a continuous benchmarking process **(7)** that uses an open test dataset and API endpoints hosted by the AI providers on their systems. This will facilitate the testing of API endpoints and required data format transformations, while also providing a rough estimate of performance before the official benchmarking.

The general architecture for both subtopics is the same.

## 5.2 AI Input Data to use for the MVB

Section 3.2 outlined the different input types of the known symptom assessment systems. For the MVB the following input types will be selected:

* **Profile information** - General background information on the user including age and sex (and later additional information e.g. location).
* **Presenting complaints** - The initial health problem(s) that the user seeks an explanation for in form of symptoms with detailing attributes e.g. “side: left” or “intensity: moderate”
* **Additional symptoms** - Additional symptoms and factors including detailing attributes and ability to answer with “no” and “don’t know”

To make this information usable for the MVB the Topic Group or the Focus Group, respectively will have to agree on a standardized way to describe these inputs. Currently there are various classification systems for these medical terms available, each with own Pros and Cons.

The following list gives an overview of some of these classification systems and will be extended in more detail (without claim of completeness):

## 5.3 AI Output Data to use for the MVB

Of the output types listed in 3.3 Output Types the MVB we benchmark the following types:

* **Differential Diagnosis** - The most likely explanations for the initial presenting complaints of the patient.
* **Pre Clinical Triage** - The general classification of what to to next e.g. “see doctor today”

As for the Input data, the output data has to be described in a standardized way for the MVB. The following list presents main established classification systems and describes the main features and usage of these

International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD)

The ICD system is the worldwide mostly used system for coding and describing diagnoses. It dates back until the 19th century and it was under revision from 2007 on from ICD-10 to ICD-11 which was accomplished recently. The coding system is based on agreement of a huge network of experts and working groups. The version ICD-11 holds a complex underlying semantic network of terms and thus connects the different entities in a new way and is referred to as “digital ready”.

Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM)

This system (currently DSM-5) is widely used in the US and worldwide for the classification of mental disorders. It is maintained by the American Psychiatric Association.

**Triage / Advice - Scales**: to be defined / agreed upon

## 5.4 Symptom Assessment AI Benchmarking Interface

* TODO: specify an JSON REST API endpoint for benchmarking
* version

## 5.5 API Input Data Format

* TODO: JSON Format

## 5.6 API Output Data Format

* TODO: JSON Format

## 5.7 Benchmarking Dataset Collection

* raw data acquisition / acceptance
* test data source(s): availability, reliability,
* labelling process / acceptance
* bias documentation process
* quality control mechanisms
* discussion of the necessary size of the test data set for relevant benchmarking results
* specific data governance derived by general data governance document (currently C-004)

## 5.8 Benchmarking Dataset Format

* TODO: JSON Format
* mainly the JSON format for the API
* additional metadata

## 5.9 Scores & Metrics

* which metrics & scores to use for benchmarking
	+ probability to see the right diagnosis among the first N results
	+ consider the probability reported by AI
	+ consider not only the probability of the correct one but also probability of the other wrong ones
	+ consider conditions explicitly ruled out by e.g. sex/age
	+ consider how far a diagnosis is off and how dangerous this is
	+ consider if all relevant questions have been asked
	+ should the response time be measured?
* considering relation to parameters stakeholders need for decision making
	+ some stakeholders ask for PPV, FP, TP, F-Score, etc.
* considering scores that providers use
* considering the scope providers designed their solutions for
	+ group by all dimensions from 3.4 Scope Dimensions
* considering the state of the art in RCT, statistics, AI benchmarking etc.
* considering bias transparency
	+ group results by source of dataset parts in case we use different datasets

## 5.10 Reporting Methodology

* Report publication in papers or as part of ITU documents
* identify journals that could be interest in publication (to be discussed)
* Online reporting
* interactive dashboards (it might be that due to the large number of dimensions to consider an interactive dashboard is the only way to fully understand all details.
* public leaderboards vs. private leaderboards
* collect opinion on this once more AI providers joined the Topic Group
* Credit-Check like on approved sharing with selected stakeholders
* Report structure including an example
* Frequency of benchmarking
* once per quarter?

## 5.11 Technical Architecture of the Official Benchmarking System

* TODO
* servers, systems,
* IIC infrastructure
* implementation
	+ publishing the benchmarking software on github would be transparent

## 5.12 Technical Architecture of the Continuous Benchmarking System

* TODO
* in comparison to the official system
* possibility to test benchmarking before an official benchmarking (“test submission”)

## 5.13 Benchmarking Operation Procedure

* protocol for performing the benchmarking (who does what when etc.)
* AI submission procedure including contracts, rights, IP etc. considerations
* how long is the data stores
* how long are AI systems stored

# 6 Results

Chapter 6 will outline the results from performing the benchmarking based on the methodology specified in this document. Since the benchmarking is still in its specification phase, there are no results available yet. Depending on the progress made on this document, first preliminary test benchmarking results on small public data sets are expected by the end of 2019. The first official results form a MVB are expected in early 2020.

# 7 Discussion

This chapter will discuss the insights from the first MVB results described in chapter 6 as soon as they are available.
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***Ada Health GmbH***

[Ada Health GmbH](https://ada.com/) is a digital health company based in Berlin, Germany, developing diagnostic decision support systems since 2011. In 2016 Ada launched the Ada-App, a DSAA for smartphone users, that since then has been used by more than 5 million users for about 10 million health assessments (beginning of 2019). The app is currently available in 6 languages and available worldwide. At the same time, Ada is also working on Ada-Dx, an application providing health professionals with diagnostic decision support, especially for complex cases. While Ada has many users in US, UK and Germany, it also launched a Global Health Initiative focusing on impact in LMIC where it partners with governments and NGOs to improve people's health.

Involved people: Henry Hoffmann (henry.hoffmann@ada.com), Andreas Kühn (andreas.kuehn@ada.com), Johannes Schröder (johannes.schroeder@ada.com), Shubhanan Upadhyay (shubs.upadhyay@ada.com)

***Babylon Health***

Babylon Health is a London-based digital health company which was founded in 2013. Leveraging the increasing penetration of mobile phones, Babylon has developed a comprehensive, high-quality, digital-first health service. Users are able to access Babylon health services via three main routes: i) Artificial Intelligence (AI) services, via our chatbot, ii) “Virtual” telemedicine services and iii) physical consultations with Babylon’s doctors (only available in the UK as part of our partnership with the NHS). Babylon currently operates in the U.K., Rwanda and Canada, serving approximately 4 million registered users. Babylon’s AI services will be expanding to Asia and opportunities in various LMICs are currently being explored to bring accessible healthcare to where it is needed the most.

Involved people: Saurabh Johri (saurabh.johri@babylonhealth.com), Nathalie Bradley-Schmieg (nathalie.bradley1@babylonhealth.com)

***Baidu***

TODO

***Isabel Healthcare***

[Isabel Healthcare](http://www.isabelhealthcare.com) is a social enterprise based in the UK. Founded in 2000 after the near fatal misdiagnosis of the co-founder’s daughter, the company develops and markets machine learning based diagnosis decision support systems to clinicians, patients and medical students. The Isabel DDx Generator has been used by healthcare institutions since 2001.Its main user base is in the USA with over 160 leading institutions but also has institutional users around the world, including emerging economies such as Bangladesh, Guatemala and Somalia . The DDx Generator is also available in Spanish and Chinese. The Isabel Symptom Checker and Triage system has been available since 2012. This system is freely available to patients and currently receives traffic from 142 countries. The company makes its APIs available so EMR vendors, health information and telehealth companies can integrate Isabel into their own systems. The Isabel system has been robustly validated since 2002 with several articles in peer reviewed publications.

Involved people: Jason Maude (jason.maude@isabelhealthcare.com)

***Your.MD Ltd***

[Your.MD](https://www.your.md/) is a Norwegian company based in London. We have four years’ experience in the field, a team of 50 people and currently delivers next steps health advice based on symptoms and personal factors to 650,000 people a month. Your.MD is currently working with Leeds University’s eHealth Department and NHS England to scope a benchmarking approach that can be adopted by organisations like the National Institute of Clinical Excellence to assess AI self-assessment tools. We are keen to link all these initiatives together to create a globally recognised benchmarking standard.

Involved people: Jonathon Carr-Brown (jcb@your.md), Matteo Berlucchi(matteo@your.md)

# Appendix B:Glossary

This section lists all the relevant abbreviations and acronyms used in the document. If there is an external source

* **AI** - [Artificial Intelligence](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Artificial_intelligence) - While the exact definition is highly controversial, in context of this document it refers to a field of computer science working on machine learning and knowledge based technology that allows to *understand* complex (health related) problems and situations at or above human (doctor) level performance and providing corresponding insights (differential diagnosis) or solutions (next step advice, triage).
* **AuI** - Augmented Intelligence
* **AI4H** - AI for health - An [ITU-T SG16 Focus Group](https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-T/focusgroups/ai4h/Pages/default.aspx) founded in cooperation with the WHO in July 2018.
* **AISA** - AI-based symptom assessment - The abbreviation for the topic of this Topic Group.
* **API** - [Application Programming Interface](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Application_programming_interface) - the software interface systems communicate through.
* **DD** - Differential Diagnosis -
* **PC -** [Presenting Complaint](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Presenting_problem) - The health problems the user of an symptom assessment systems seeks help for.
* **FG** - [Focus Group](https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-T/focusgroups/Pages/default.aspx) - An instrument created by ITU-T providing an alternative working environment for the quick development of specifications in their chosen areas.
* **IIC** - International Computing Centre - The United Nations data center that will host the benchmarking infrastructure.
* **ITU** - [International Telecommunication Union](https://www.itu.int) - The United Nations specialized agency for information and communication technologies – ICTs.
* **LMIC** - Low and Middle Income Countries
* **MVB** - minimal viable benchmarking
* **NGO** - [Non Governmental Organization](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non-governmental_organization) - NGOs are usually non-profit and sometimes international organizations independent of governments and international governmental organizations that are active in humanitarian, educational, health care, public policy, social, human rights, environmental, and other areas to affect changes according to their objectives. (from Wikipedia.en)
* **SDG** - [Sustainable Development Goals](https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/) - The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals are the blueprint to achieve a better and more sustainable future for all. Currently there are 17 goals defined. SDG 3 is to “Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages” and is therefore the goal that will benefit from the AI4H Focus Groups work the most.
* **TDD** - Topic Description Document - Document specifying the standardized benchmarking for a topic FG AI4H Topic Group works on. This document is the TDD for the Topic Group “AI-based symptom assessment”.
* **Triage** - A [medical term](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Triage) describing a heuristic scheme and process for classifying patients based on the severity of their symptoms. It is primarily used in emergency settings to prioritize patients and to determine the maximum acceptable waiting time until actions need to be taken.
* **TG** - Topic Group - Structures inside AI4H FG summarizing similar use cases and working on a TDD specifying the setup of a standardized benchmarking for the corresponding topic. The Topic Groups have been first introduced by the FG at the Meeting C, January 2019 in Lausanne. See protocol FG-AI4H-C-10x for details.

**WHO** - [World Health Organization](https://www.who.int) - The United Nations specialized agency for international public health.

A new term should be introduced “... this is a text with a new term (NT) ...” and then added to the glossary list in the format “NT - new term - Description of the new term.”, possibly with a link e.g. Wikipedia.
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# Appendix DSystems not considered in chapter 3

Chapter 3 lists currently existing symptom based AI decision support systems. Systems that for some reason could not be added are listed in the following table. The table is supposed to be checked on a regular basis. If there is evidence that systems still exist and offer a non-trivial AI bases symptom based decision support, they might be moved to the chapter 3 tables.

| Provider/System | Last Check | Exclusion Reason |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Amino | 01.2019 | could not find any more |
| BetterMedicine (www.bettermedicine.com/symptom-checker/) | 01.2019 | do they still exist? |
| Doctor on Demand | 01.2019 | no AI symptom checker? |
| Everyday Health Symptom Checker | 01.2019 | Infermedica white label |
| First Opinion | 01.2019 | no AI symptom checker, just chatting online with a doctor |
| FreeMD | 01.2019 | IP address could not be found |
| GoodRX | 01.2019 | no AI symptom checker |
| Harvard Medical School Family Health Guide (USA) | 01.2019 | could not find |
| Heal | 01.2019 | no AI symptom checker, only booking doctor home visits |
| Healthwise | 01.2019 | no AI symptom checker, seems like it’s a “patient education” platform |
| Healthy Children | 01.2019 | there is a symptom checker, but it’s not AI-based |
| iTriage | 01.2019 | got bought by Aetna, and then the iTriage app was taken off the iOS and Android app stores. ([source](https://www.mobihealthnews.com/content/itriage-early-mobile-health-success-shuts-down-aetna-preps-new-flagship-app)) |
| NHS Symptom Checkers | 01.2019 | looks like these are not available anymore. Only the NHS Conditions list exists, where you can look up conditions. |
| Onmeda.de | 01.2019 | only symptom lookup, no AI output |
| Oscar | 01.2019 | only a telemedicine/tech-focused health insurance provider, no symptom checking |
| Practo | 01.2019 | only a telemedicine app, no symptom checking |
| PushDoctor | 01.2019 | only a telemedicine app, no symptom checking |
| Sherpaa | 01.2019 | looks like tele only |
| Steps2Care | 01.2019 | maybe not available anymore  |
| Teladoc | 01.2019 | looks like tele only |
| Zava (Dr Ed) | 01.2019 | no AI symptom checker? |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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