

# INFORMATION SOCIETY TECHNOLOGIES (IST) PROGRAMME



**507231**

**WP3.1**

Deliverable No.		<b>D3.1.1 “List of requirements and proposed standards”</b>	
SubProject No.	<b>SP3</b>	SubProject Title	<b>Medical &amp; Neurological Applications</b>
Workpackage No.	<b>WP3.1</b>	Workpackage Title	<b>Benchmarking of relevant applications</b>
Activity No.	<b>A3.1.1 A3.1.2 A3.1.3</b>	Activity Title	<b>Literature Review Interviews Focus Group</b>
Authors		<b>Christos Papadelis, Irimi Lekka, Nicos Maglaveras, Vassilis Koutkias (AUTH) Lambrini Soufleri (UoA) Stavroula Maglavera (Pouliadis)</b>	
Status		<b>Quality Control</b>	
File Name:		<b>SENSATION-D3_1_1-QCB.doc</b>	
Project start date and duration		<b>01 January 2004, 48 Months</b>	

## PROCEDURES USED FOR PEER REVIEW

The **SENSATION** Consortium uses the **Peer Review** process for its internal quality assurance for deliverables to assure consistency and high standard for documented project results.

The Peer Review is processed individually by selected reviewers. The allocated time for the review is about two weeks. The author of the document has the final responsibility to collect the comments and suggestions from the Peer Reviewers and decide what changes to the document and actions are to be undertaken.

### Reviewers:

Dr. Angelos Amditis (Quality Assurance Manager) – ICCS

Dr. Winni Hofman (Quality expert) – Medcare

Prof. Dr. Claus Vogelmeier (Quality expert) – Marburg

Mr. Guido Baten (External expert) – REVA

### Overall Peer Review Result:

Deliverable is:

<input type="checkbox"/> Fully accepted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted with reservation	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected unless modified as suggested	<input type="checkbox"/> Fully rejected
---	---	--	---

Please give an overall rating of this deliverable in a scale from (1: very poor to 5: very good) :  
\_\_\_3.5\_\_\_

### Suggested actions:

1. The following changes should be implemented:
  - a) The definition of distant monitoring should be included in the report, along with the advantages of the use of such a system, in respect with currently used techniques.  
*Author's response:* Addition has been made in the beginning of chapter 4. The advantages of the use of such a system were already mentioned in 4.1
  - b) It is suggested that the review should have the following structure:
    1. Identification of clinical problems that need physiological monitoring.
    2. Identification of other sleep-related problems that also need physiological monitoring.
    3. Argued selection of above for the relevance of SENSATION.
    4. Definition of those clinical problems that need distant physiological monitoring.
    5. Description of which innovation can be achieved by distant monitoring that is not possible by local-monitoring.
      - a. Technological costs, labour-costs, patient's comfort, expert's comfort. reliability, enhancing clinical protocol.
    6. Definition of specific requirements for different type of clinical problems in terms of number of signals, throughput of signals, need for remote control, off-line or on-line monitoring.
    7. Definition of functions and processes of distant monitoring.

8. Analysis of above that helps to generate benchmarks and requirements of distant monitoring.
9. Review of analysis to conclude with challenges and need within the context of Sensation.

*Author's response:* Selection of medical applications to be realized and tested in Sensation is not finalized at this point. The proposed medical applications are now presented in the current document in chapter 5, following as close as possible the structure mentioned above.

2. Specify missing chapters / subjects      No

3. Required changes on deliverable essence and contents      No

4. Further relevant required improvements: It is suggested that a political outlook should be included in the report. Political implications may vary in the different European countries and this should be reflected in the document.

*Author's response:* In paragraph 4.9 re-imburement policies and their implications in the use of such systems are now presented. At this point the presentation of the topic is brief, as this issue will be covered in more detail in D3.1.3 (List of policies and procedures to be followed).

## COMMENTS OF PEER REVIEWERS

<b>Consolidated Comments</b>
<b>General comment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The requirements and standards are not very specific, possible due to the fact that the applications are at this moment not in detail described.</li></ul> <b>Author response</b> <p>Requirements could not be very specific at this point, only an initial set of requirements is proposed here. According to the annex, the tasks that have to be performed, in chronological order, are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Month 6: Performance of literature review.</li><li>Month 12: User requirements and scenarios.</li><li>Month 15: Transcription of the focus group discussions.</li><li>Month 17: Workshop on selection of clinical application priorities/scenarios.</li></ul> <p>The first task in WP3.1 has been to perform literature review in order to assess the current status of distance monitoring in sleep disorder applications. Definition of user requirements and scenarios are planned for month 12. Therefore the current document focuses on the literature review for ambulatory monitoring systems for in-home assessment on sleep disorders as well as for existing guidelines for the use of such systems. Since the first interviews and focus group have already been conducted, initial user requirements have also been included. Starting from this list, as well as from requirements collected from other WPs, more interviews will be conducted in the following six months in order to define in detail user requirements and pilot application protocols that will be presented in D3.1.2, in project month 12.</p>
<b>Specific comments</b>
<b>Topic A: Relevance</b>  <b>Reviewer comment</b> <p>The relevance is good.</p> <b>Author response</b>
<b>Topic B: Response to user needs</b>  <b>Reviewer comment</b> <p>Physicians as potential users were contacted. Patients as potential end users were not contacted.</p> <b>Author response</b> <p>Survey to patients has been planned for the following six months, since the Report on the Definition of patient home care needs, literacy and educational level and attitudes of average patients in the target groups is due in month 12.</p>
<b>Topic C: Methodological framework soundness</b>  <b>Reviewer comment</b>

Literature search and interview with experts are adequate tools.

***Author response***

**Topic D: Quality of achievements**

***Reviewer comment***

The quality of achievement is satisfactory.

***Author response***

**Topic E: Quality of presentation of achievements**

***Reviewer comment***

The quality of presentations is satisfactory.

***Author response***

**Topic F: Deliverable Layout / Spelling / Format**

***Reviewer comment Ok***

The deliverable layout needs improvement. The spelling and format is satisfactory.

***Author response***

Corrected errors in layout.