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Health technology—An accident waiting to happen?

Prescribing IT for health
Harold Thimbleby

Standards and medical equipment
Chris Vincent

Disparately seeking healthy information
Elizabeth Silience

Bringing the creative industries into HCI
Jeffrey Bardzell et al
This issue of Interfaces explores HCI’s role in the development of health technology, from Harold Thimbleby’s very eloquent exploration of the scale and scope of the problems facing the development of IT for the health industry, through the standards explosion to the growing use of both medical information and equipment by older and untrained people.

The medical industry has been slow to adopt user centred approaches, and we still see design errors that we would expect HCI students not to make. Let’s hope that the next time we address this issue in Interfaces we are not still pointing out the problems, poor designs and adverse events that have resulted but are promoting successful design in this area.

While health technology is anchored in risk, safety and rigorous processes, Gilbert Cockton and his workshop attendees explore the role of the Arts and design research in HCI at the more creative end of the spectrum.

Enjoy – and I look forward to seeing you all at the conference at Abertay in September.

Lynne Coventry
Recent alerts and recalls regarding the use of infusion pumps highlight the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to equipment design. HCI specialists are well placed to contribute and there are resources that allow developers to take account of the interaction between users, the tools that they use and the environments in which they live and work. HCI professionals need to make it easy for developers to adopt a user-centred approach and research is underway to establish current practice and future needs.

Each year, members of the UK health service perform approximately 15 million infusions. A small number (about 700) result in an adverse event [1]. Several mechanisms are in place to learn from incidents, protect patients from harm and maintain quality of care [2]. An area of potential concern relates to the users’ inadvertent misprogramming of the device. These types of interaction error can be easily missed [3]. Much has been achieved in safeguarding the public and professionals from poor device design; however, there is still a need to understand where the medical device industry requires support and how HCI professionals can contribute.

For the majority of medical devices used in the European Union, patients, public and clinicians are protected by a statutory framework – the Medical Devices Directive [4]. This sets out essential requirements for audit, inspection, design, production, marketing, risk assessment and post marketing surveillance of a broad range of devices. The regulation comprises core essential requirements in addition to a series of optional harmonised standards. In terms of user interaction, the essential requirements are often non-specific, as in the two examples that follow:

The devices must be designed and manufactured in such a way that, when used under the conditions and for the purposes intended, they will not compromise the clinical condition or the safety of patients, or the safety and health of users...

Devices must be designed and manufactured in such a way as to remove or minimize as far as is possible: the risk of injury, in connection with their physical features, including the volume/pressure ratio, dimensional and where appropriate ergonomic features...

In the US, the Food and Drug Agency (FDA) is more prescriptive in requiring developers to demonstrate how human factors considerations were applied during product development. Consequently, there are several examples of manufacturers adopting a human factors approach [5, 6]. Following an extensive recall of infusion pumps, the FDA has announced an initiative to improve the safety and effectiveness of infusion pumps. In a recent white paper, cause for concern is raised regarding user interface issues, such as “confusing or unclear onscreen user instructions ...” [7].

In the UK, there have been several alerts issued by the National Patient Safety Agency (NPSA). In 2004 a safer practice notice was
released, recommending interventions regarding procurement and equipment management. The resulting purchasing toolkit required buyers to assess usability and requested that user views are fed back to manufacturers [11]. Recently, a series of resources have become available, including guidelines regarding the design of electronic infusion devices [18].

International design standards, such as AAMI HE74, AAMI HE75, ISO/IEC 60601-1-6 and ISO/IEC 62366, recommend an iterative development approach involving phased design reviews and continual user input and evaluation. The cycle includes user research, conceptual development, generation of design requirements, design output (specifications), verification, validation, evaluation, deployment and post-market surveillance (as required by the Medical Devices Directive). Tools such as usability testing and risk analysis may be applied during multiple stages of the cycle.

Conceptual development and user research provides an understanding of the relevant domain. This includes reviewing process and procedures, market research, associated product complaints, adverse incidents, context of use and system constraints. Tools such as scenarios, storyboards, use cases, personas or task analysis may apply and practitioners can conduct focus groups, interviews or literature reviews. This informs usability requirements, for example, “95% of first time users will be able to load a set and program an infusion within two minutes or less”. There are several resources that can aid this process including usability heuristics [9] and formal risk management processes such as ISO 14971. While setting usability requirements is useful, it is not sufficient. The FDA, amongst others, is now asking: What about the 5% who fail to achieve this objective – are they putting patients at risk by not correctly programming the infusion?

Despite the volume of support available, there is still a genuine need to understand how developers apply tools, where there is an absence of resources, and how models of human capability can inform interface design.

How do manufacturers provide for the usability requirements that arise as a result of home use? Do issues like alarm fatigue present opportunities to improve design? Does experience with a legacy device type impact on the use of a new device type? Is there a sufficient understanding of how users react when distracted or when switching between multiple tasks? Do developers design interfaces that mitigate against likely sources of error and are there sufficient behavioural models to support this?

Interdisciplinary teams containing HCI specialists can contribute to many of these questions by recommending specific tools, techniques or measures and by providing clear and accessible advice that directly informs design decisions. HCI professionals can help the development team adopt formal methods to structure testing; they can also help produce tests that consider relevant human capabilities during the iterative process of prototyping, simulation and usability testing.
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