

SEER*DMS Auto-Consolidation and Validation Work Group
Teleconference Summary
October 15, 2020
3:00 to 4:00 p.m. EDT

Representatives from the NCI, IMS, the Scientific Consulting Group, Inc. (SCG), and 11 cancer registries participated in the SEER*DMS Auto-Consolidation and Validation Work Group (WG) conference call on October 15, 2020. Participants included:

REGISTRIES:

Alaska	
California Central	
Connecticut	
Idaho	
Iowa (Bobbi Matt, WG co-chair)	
Kentucky (Frances Ross, WG co-chair)	
Louisiana	
Minnesota	
New Jersey	
Seattle	
Utah	
	NCI: Peggy Adamo, Lois Dickie, Marina Matatova, Serban Negoita
	IMS: Suzanne Adams, Linda Coyle, Fabian Depry, Alex Song
	SCG: Carolyn Fisher, rapporteur

Action Items

Participants agreed to the following action items:

- Linda agreed to review the Idaho and Kentucky registry auto-consolidation rules for the Laterality data element and discuss updates with the WG.
- IMS and the registries should review progress on Squish issue #7719.
- IMS will review the progress in processing subsequent abstracts across the registries.
- Linda agreed to check on progress in applying Type and Date of First Recurrence auto-consolidation rules.

Review of Goals and Objectives

Linda Coyle

The WG last met in June 2020. Linda reminded participants that the primary goal of this WG is to identify tumor-related data fields that can be auto-consolidated, rather than focusing on methods and processes. Members were encouraged to review the 2-page document—[Goals and Objectives 2020–2021](#)—which is posted on the SEER*DMS portal. The 18-month high-level goals of 2020–2021 will focus on reviewing the implementation of the current rules across registries, selecting the next set of data elements for review, developing process steps, performing analyses, and making necessary adjustments. IMS is in the process of reviewing the implementation of the current rules, and a list of these rules is included in Table 1: SEER*DMS Rules for CTC Level Data Items in the Goals and Objectives 2020–2021 document. Initial review will focus on the CTC rules rather than demographic-level rules.

Discussion

Marina asked participants for questions or comments regarding the feasibility of 18-month high-level goals developed by the administrative team consisting of IMS (Suzanne and Linda), WG co-chairs (Bobbi

and Frances), the NCI (Marina), and the California Central registry (Cheryl Moody). Progress has been made toward some of these goals but not at the pace intended, so adjustments likely will be necessary. The upcoming SEER reporting deadlines are keeping the registries busy.

Cheryl asked about the different rules that different registries apply to the same data elements. For example, different rules for Laterality are listed for the Kentucky and Idaho registries in Table 1 of the Goals and Objectives document. The reason for including the rules for both registries is that the Kentucky and Idaho registries already had Laterality rules in place when they implemented SEER*DMS. Linda will review differences in Laterality rules and report her findings in a Squish issue or during a future meeting. The WG might need to consider approaches for standardizing rules in SEER*DMS.

Summary/Minutes and Action Items of Last Meeting

Linda Coyle

IMS and NCI members of this WG met to discuss ways to make the WG meetings more productive and efficient.

Key points from the last IMS/NCI meeting include:

- Nikki Schussler (IMS) is leading efforts to implement the proposed auto-consolidation rules for radiation fields in SEER*DMS and is working with developers to define specifications.
- IMS created a Squish issue to document the progress on applying an auto-consolidation rule for Type and Date of First Recurrence and has been working with Serban to modify this rule. A review of specifications defined in the *Standards for Oncology Registry Entry (STORE)* manual as well as other specifications identified by the NCI has been completed and documentation is being finalized. The NCI has been contacting leading cancer researchers about their experiences collecting recurrence data.
- Registries are actively reviewing Squish issue #7719 data to finalize Date of Diagnosis (DX) auto-consolidation rules. IMS is making adjustments in response to feedback from registries. Linda emphasized the importance of ensuring the accuracy of rules for the core data fields such as Date of DX, Primary Site, and Histology before implementation. IMS will refresh the task and add new data if necessary and will contact registries that have not yet provided feedback in early November 2020.

Processing Subsequent Abstracts

Linda Coyle

The WG will need to consider the processing of subsequent abstracts (resubmissions from a facility for a case). SEER is increasingly interested in subsequent treatment data, which is likely to be submitted on subsequent abstracts. Serban anticipates that the NCI likely will make it optional to submit subsequent TX data. Registries with the technical capabilities to automatically process these data can report them. IMS will be contacting registries to enact a change in the algorithms which would capture the subsequent treatment data instead of ignoring it. No manual task will be created, and the Patient Set will not be updated. This is discussed in Squish #8959.

Processing subsequent abstracts in the SEER*DMS workflow involves: (1) use of the matching algorithm which identifies possible subsequent abstracts, (2) and, if identified as a subsequent abstract, performance of a detailed, field-by-field comparison.

Linda gave examples of field-by-field comparisons. Fields are grouped into one of three categories—compare, ignore, and update—with associated actions.

Compare: Fields are compared; if a conflict, then stop for manual review.

Update: Fields are compared; value on original abstract is updated; record may be restarted in workflow

Ignore: Field is not compared

IMS has been working with individual registries to actively review their lists to verify that fields are moved into the workflow correctly. IMS will contact the remaining 10 registries to complete this review after November 1, 2020.

Discussion

Linda explained that when all fields match, including DOLC, the new record is deleted. If only DOLC changes, the updated record returns to the workflow for re-consolidation, constituting a restart.

Participants asked what would happen if the old record was deleted rather than being updated and the new record was maintained when all fields matched. SEER*DMS retains a history and links to other data structures, which must be preserved by persisting the original record. The Minnesota registry monitors the date of receipt of the CTC and must preserve the original record.

Another participant asked whether the record-level audit log would reflect the updates to an old record resulting from a new record. The audit log reflects this process.

A participant asked whether a deleted record is counted in the total abstracts sent by registries as shown in the abstract dashboard. Linda responded that the deleted NAACCR modified record is removed from the database and likely not included in the total abstract count, and therefore can be considered for reconciliation.

Registries should consider how to handle updates to text changes. Reviewing all text changes would be challenging, especially when vendor-specific information is included. Differences in text could be ignored if there are no differences in coded values

IMS is implementing a matching-to-matching algorithm in the SEER*DMS workflow. A participant asked what happens when values in both the old and new records need to be retained. Linda agreed to discuss this issue at a future meeting.

Next Steps and Upcoming Auto-Consolidation Work Group Call

The next WG call has not yet been scheduled. An outlook event will be sent to meeting participants.