

Development of a standards-based city-wide health information exchange for public health in response to COVID-19

Authors:

Bala Hota MD MPH¹, Paul Casey MD MBA¹, Anne F. McIntyre PhD MPH², Jawad Khan¹, Shafiq Rab MBBS¹, Aneesh Chopra³, Omar Lateef DO¹, Jennifer E. Layden MD PhD⁴

¹Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, IL, 60612 ²Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA ³Care Journey, ⁴Chicago Department of Public Health, Chicago, IL

Corresponding Author:

Bala Hota MD, MPH

VP, Chief Analytics Officer

Associate CMO

Professor, Medicine/Infectious Diseases

bala_hota@rush.edu

Abstract:

Background: Disease surveillance is a critical function of public health, provides essential information about disease burden, clinical and epidemiologic parameters of disease, and is an important element to effective and timely case and contact tracing. The COVID-19 pandemic has demonstrated the essential role these functions have to preserve public health. Syndromic surveillance, electronic laboratory reporting in the meaningful use program, and the growth of the National Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN) have created linkages between hospitals, commercial labs, and public health that can collect and organize data, often through EHR and order workflows, to improve the timeliness and completeness of reporting. In theory, the standard data formats and exchange methods provided by meaningful use should enable rapid healthcare data exchange in the setting of disruptive healthcare events like a pandemic. In reality, access to data remains challenging, and even if available, often lack conformity to regulated standards.

Objective: We sought to use regulated interoperability standards already in production to generate regional bed capacity awareness, enhance the capture of epidemiological risk factors and clinical variables among COVID-19 tested patients, and reduce the administrative burden of reporting for stakeholders in a manner that could be replicated by other public health agencies.

Methods: Following a public health order mandating data submission, we developed technical infrastructure to combine multiple data feeds from electronic health record systems. We measured the completeness of each feed, and the match rate between feeds.

Results: A cloud-based environment was created that received data from electronic lab reporting, consolidated clinical data architecture, and bed capacity data feeds from sites. Data governance was planned from the project beginning to aid in consensus and principles for data use. 88,906 total persons from CCDA data among 14 facilities, and 408,741 persons from ELR records among 88 facilities, were submitted. Fields routinely absent from ELR feeds included travel histories, clinical symptoms, and comorbidities. CCDA data provided an improvement in the quality of data available for surveillance and was highly complete with <5% for all records types with the exception of patient cell phone. 90.1% of records could be matched between CCDA and ELR feeds.

Conclusions: We describe the development of a city-wide public health data hub for the surveillance of COVID-19 infection. We were able to assess the completeness of existing ELR feeds, augment these feeds with CCDA documents, establish secure transfer methods for data exchange, develop cloud-based architecture to enable secure data storage and analytics, and produced meaningful dashboards for the monitoring of capacity and disease burden. We see this public health and clinical data registry as an

informative example of the power of common standards across electronic records, and a potential template for future extension of the use of standards to improve public health surveillance.

Keywords: SARS-CoV2; COVID-19; Public Health Informatics

Introduction:

Since the emergence of SARS CoV-2 from Wuhan, China (1), a global pandemic has been declared(2) and widespread, sustained transmission has been observed across the United States. It has at the time of this writing infected 10.9 million and caused over 520,000 deaths worldwide, and over 2.7 million cases and over 120,000 deaths in the United States, with recent increased incidence rates in states in the Southern and Southwestern U.S.

COVID-19 is a reportable disease in Illinois, and both the Illinois Department of Public Health (IDPH) and Chicago Department of Public Health (CDPH) mandated the reporting of all patients tested for the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Disease surveillance is a critical function of public health, and provides essential information about disease burden, clinical and epidemiologic parameters of disease, and is an important element to effective and timely case and contact tracing. In addition to individual and aggregate level patient data, this pandemic has required careful monitoring of healthcare capacity and utilization to ensure clinical care needs be met.

Support for the public health functions of the surveillance and epidemiology of disease has been embedded in key national informatics initiatives for nearly two decades. These efforts have included syndromic surveillance(3), electronic laboratory reporting(4) in the meaningful use program(5), and the growth of the National

Healthcare Safety Network (NHSN)(6). These programs have created linkages between hospitals, commercial labs, and public health that can collect and organize data, often through EHR and order workflows, to improve the timeliness and completeness of reporting.

In theory, the standard data formats and exchange methods provided by meaningful use should enable rapid healthcare data exchange in the setting of disruptive healthcare events like a pandemic. In reality, access to data remains challenging, and even if available, often lack conformity to regulated standards(7). The current COVID-19 pandemic has revealed gaps in data liquidity and the resultant difficulty in gathering information quickly(8).

In the early phase of the pandemic, CDPH and health systems aimed to address two major challenges first, the ability to efficiently submit necessary clinical data elements for COVID tested patients, , and second, the ability to capture aggregate capacity data for resource planning in an administratively efficient manner. Despite significant EHR investments among the city's hospitals and health systems, , the inability for electronic health records systems to automate delivery of important data elements to public health surveillance systems meant that providers and health systems had to manually enter data into the public health reporting system. However, the high volume of patients and significant work demands on health systems limited timely, and

complete manual data entry. As the pandemic unfolded, multiple agencies had requested bed and surge capacity information, including NHSN, FEMA, the National guard, the Illinois Department of Public Health, all with slightly varying definitions (Table 1). Locally, an important aspect of capturing the resource capacity data was to monitor surge capacity and assist with coordination of resources. The multiple reporting requirements, varied definitions, and limited mechanisms for automated, real time submission of key resource metrics such as bed capacities raised concern about the ability to locally monitor the resource capacity across our systems.

In response to these challenges the Chicago Department of Public Health issued a public health order requiring electronic data sharing,, and partnered with Rush University Medical Center to leverage existing HIT infrastructure for COVID-19 disease to develop a platform for data exchange. Our goals were to use regulated interoperability standards already in production to generate regional bed capacity awareness, enhance the capture of epidemiological risk factors and clinical variables among COVID-19 tested patients, and reduce the administrative burden of reporting for stakeholders in a manner that could be replicated by other public health agencies. As an example of clinically relevant fields of interest for reporting, we compared available fields in data feeds to the CDC PUI form. We also evaluated the completeness of various data sources supplied to the platform and the capacity to link these sources.

Methods

Setting

Chicago is the third largest city in the country and has witnessed a high disease burden of COVID-19, with over 56,000 lab confirmed cases among Chicago residents as of July 15, 2020. This project was conducted by CPDH in partnership with Rush University Medical Center, which was made a third-party agent of CDPH to develop and support the analytics and provide the infrastructure to support the data collection.

Public health notice

On April 6, 2020, the CDPH issued public health order 2020-4 requiring hospitals in Chicago to share electronic health record data with the public health department(9) for all patients tested for COVID-19. The order outlined a constrained set of data to be submitted for all COVID-19 tested patients. This order was disseminated through CDPH's clinical health alert network, posted on the department's website, and shared with city hospital leadership on calls. CDPH constituted a governance committee comprised of medical directors and informaticists from hospital systems in Chicago.

Data Feeds

Electronic Lab Records (ELR) feeds were accessed from the Illinois' National Electronic Disease Surveillance System (I-NEDSS) to provide baseline information on lab confirmed cases in the city. To meet public health order 2020-4, Chicago hospitals

were provided multiple mechanisms to submit consolidated clinical data architecture (CCDA) records for COVID-19 tested patients. This included: a) via a secure mailbox that used the DIRECT protocol, a recognized data standard by the Office of the National Coordinator, for the one-way transmission of electronic health records from, as an example, to a centralized instance of Epic for the city, or b) directly to CDPH's Azure instance via DIRECT or an API, which could ingest the CCDA records. In either case the CCDAs were parsed into a database within a dedicated tenant in Azure for analytics. Additionally, a third dataset of NHSN patient safety and hospital capacity was included, which hospitals were asked to either enter into a REDCap database or send electronically to the Azure tenant.

Technical Evaluation

At the project start, we developed the requirements of a solution to collect data from sites and produce the required analytics. We evaluated the gap between the existing CDC PUI form fields and the electronic data elements available in federal standards based data feeds, and developed a crosswalk of reporting requirements to ensure that the data set could function as a reporting gateway for sites and reduce the burden of reporting. Feeds evaluated were electronic laboratory reporting, consolidated clinical data architecture, and Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources fields. Comparisons were made based on the latest specifications documents and potential field presence for each. Missingness and usefulness were evaluated among CCDA and

ELR feeds. Missingness refers to the presence of data in the field. Usefulness refers to clean, complete information in data field; <100% indicates “unknown” (race, ethnicity, address, etc); for address (PO Boxes, Unknown, Homeless, N/A); phone (no phone, bad number/not enough numbers); ZIP codes <5 digits or 99999 or 00000 or UUUUU etc. Records were deduplicated using name and date of birth. Record match rate between CCDA and ELR data feeds was assessed using last and first name and date of birth.

This investigation was part of the ongoing public health response to COVID-19; thus, was determined to be non-research, public health surveillance and exempt from human subjects’ research regulations.

Results

State surveillance system baseline reporting

In Chicago, a significant proportion of reported cases of SARS CoV-2 infection are reported through ELR. As of June 30, 2020, ELR alone provided 73.7% of cases, while ELR combined with other modalities accounted for 94% of reported cases. ELR data reports key fields requested in the CDC PUI form (Table 2) but not all; fields routinely absent from ELR feeds included travel histories, clinical symptoms, and comorbidities.

Response to public health notice

A public health order was shared via the Health Alert Network in Chicago to all eligible institutions. The order mandated the sharing with CDPH of three main data types: 1) ELR feeds of SARS-CoV-2 tested individuals, which were an existing state mandate; 2) CCDA records from hospitals for SARS-CoV-2 tested patients; and 3) NHSN capacity module reporting, which was asked to be sent centrally to CDPH. These data were requested to be sent at a minimum once per day, by 10 am. Sites were also provided contact information for key Rush University Medical Center personnel who were leading the implementation. A series of calls with hospital technical staff were conducted by the Rush CIO (SR) to introduce the project, review rationale, and describe technical approaches.

An Azure hosted and isolated environment was established, with five individual modalities for connectivity; all feeding into a centralized data hub from more than 40 organizations and hundreds of thousands of transactions per week. Over the next 30 days, sites were approached for data sharing; a CDPH data governance committee composed of chief medical officers and chief medical informatics officers from select institutions was created through which issues could be discussed and additional roadmaps could be generated; collaboration with Epic and Cerner EHR developers was established, and mechanisms for enterprise scale sharing was created; and data was sent centrally to the CDPH azure instance.

Technical Architecture

An overview of the technical architecture of the project is shown in Figure 1, and was designed to maximize security and privacy of data, keeping the CDPH at the center of data use. At a high level, because of the tools from meaningful use adoption, connections existed between stakeholders in the system, and could support secure file sharing with the ability to choose records based on criteria. These tools included: a) standards based representation of clinical data (e.g. CCDA) b) secure methods of data transport both within and external to EHR systems (e.g. CareEverywhere within Epic, Direct mailboxes, and API based authenticated pathways) and c) and existing implementation of complex public health rules within EHRs to identify cases, and submit to public health (e.g. ELR reporting).

A cloud-based environment was created that was totally isolated from the Rush EHR instance and Rush patient records. This environment was built to support over 40 organizations within the city of Chicago and designed to scale across public health departments.

ELR data feeds were the most straightforward to use in the model, as existing connections between hospital systems were present for communicable disease reporting. Hospitals were required to implement new logic at the outset of COVID-19 infections in Chicago to identify and report lab identified cases of COVID-19 to public

health, and tested patients as those are PUIs. ELR feeds are submitted to the state public health agency, which makes these available to the CDPH/local health departments.

To isolate data, Rush created an isolated Azure Data Repository including SQL Warehouse and a CosmosDB for survey forms data was created. We found that not all XDS and direct messages could avoid our EHR instance in our plan, which had to be addressed to enforce separation of data. We addressed this by pulling data from the the Epic staging area. In addition, infrastructure components were created that included an XDS service server, Direct Message communication, a CCD to FHIR service, and integration with Epic via a community health aggregator. Apigee handled the API layer, and services were handled behind Apigee for token control. Data collection via manual entries were handled via REDCap forms with integration via the API into the Azure environment.

Governance

Data governance was planned from the project beginning to aid in consensus and principles for data use. While the local health department, with its public health orders, was a necessary recipient and user of the data, participants recognized the value of a larger sharing initiative, plus site participation to engage on use cases and mechanisms to leverage the information. The committee was composed of 12 site CMO, CMIO, or technical leads. These leaders also brought content and guidance back to site

participants, and sought to bridge varying degrees of internal technical capabilities among systems. The committee met weekly and helped to build trust among participating sites. General principles were modeled after rules implemented for use of CMS data(10) and were established among sites through this committee. These were:

Openness: Promoting and facilitating the open sharing of knowledge about COVID-19 data.

Communication: Promoting partnerships across the region to eliminate duplication of effort, a source of truth for regional data that may enable reduced administrative burden, and a valuable regional and national resource.

Accountability: Ensuring compliance with approved data management principles and policies. Understanding the objectives of current and future strategic or programmatic initiatives and how they impact, or are impacted by, existing data management principles and policies as well as current privacy and security protocols.

Reporting of bed, supply, and clinical capacity

Metrics mandated for reporting to multiple agencies and groups for Chicago hospitals at the time of the hub creation are shown in Table 1. In this inventory, over 100 measures to 4 systems were required: the National Healthcare Safety Network, EMResource, FEMA, and the Illinois National Guard. The systems measure Bed usage, ED Usage, Ventilator usage, Supply usage and need, and Lab testing. Of note, 57

different bed usage measures alone exist between the 4 systems. Though metrics shown had similar definitions, these still require separate administrative efforts for the collection and reporting of the data.

As of July 31, 2020, 14 hospitals in Chicago were reporting data to the hub. For bed capacity reporting, 7 were reporting NHSN data through manual data submission, 2 were reporting through electronic queries from their EHR with electronic submission to the hub, and 14 were submitting to EMResource.

Completeness of reporting via ELR and CCDA

88,906 total persons from CCDA data among 14 facilities, and 408,741 persons from ELR records among 88 facilities, were submitted. Table 3 shows the volume and completeness of data feeds related to COVID-19 as obtained from CCDA data and with ELR feeds. Individuals with records in these feeds were those with diagnostic testing (i.e molecular) with a Chicago address through July 31, 2020. For those individuals with more than one test reported, data have been deduplicated. Among individuals with CCDA records submitted, 13.1%(11,657) had positive tests, compared with 13.2% (53,968) among ELR feeds.

CCDA data provided an improvement in the quality of data available for surveillance. ELR feeds had gaps in the usability, or quality, of race and ethnicity data. With the addition of CCDA information, this content improved. CCDA was also highly

complete with <5% for all records types with the exception of patient cell phone, though a contact phone number was highly complete. CCDA, though covering fewer records, also had information related to encounters and hospitalization as well as the presence of comorbidities.

CCDA and ELR data feeds were matched by name and date of birth among 90.1% of patients. With matching, some improvement in data completeness for the three most incomplete fields was noted: race completeness improved to 20.6% (1.4% improvement), ethnicity improved to 41.5% (3.5% improvement), and phone number improved to 31.4%(2.8% improvement)

For presentation, data were displayed on a dashboard available for CDPH analysts, via the Azure Power BI platform and are shown in Figure 2.

Discussion

In this report, we describe the development of a city-wide public health data hub for the surveillance of COVID-19 infection. We were able to assess the completeness of existing ELR feeds, augment these feeds with CCDA documents, establish secure transfer methods for data exchange, develop cloud-based architecture to enable secure data storage and analytics, and produced meaningful dashboards for the monitoring of capacity and disease burden.

Electronic laboratory reporting, or the submission electronically of positive lab tests to public health through implementation of business logic for detection, has been found in multiple studies to improve the timeliness and completeness of reporting(11–15), at potentially lower cost(16). A review prior to widespread electronic reporting use found that despite legal mandates for reporting, passive surveillance yielded completeness rates of 23-81% for communicable diseases with higher rates for active surveillance(17), and for timeliness of reporting, between 10-13 days after lab result dates(18). Electronic laboratory reporting (ELR) systems have resulted in improvements in the reporting of data to public health for surveillance. In states that have implemented ELR, the volume and timeliness have improved 2.3-4.4 fold and 3.8-7.9 days earlier, respectively(19). ELR has been a major advance in that it can improve the completeness of reporting over what is found through passive surveillance(16,20). ELR based systems use a trigger of either a test having been performed or resulting as positive to start a submission workflow.

However, we found that ELR data can be incomplete. In prior reports, ELR data has been found to vary in its completeness: the completeness of fields reported via ELR within basic HL7 v 2.x messages ranges from 38% (race) to 98% (date of birth)(20). To improve completeness, groups have proposed 1) increased mandatory fields in ELR HL7 2.x messages(19); 2) augmenting ELR feeds with data from a health information exchange, which improved completeness for race to 60% (20); and 3) electronic case

report forms which are completed either through automated data capture or manual completion(21). Significant limitations in case reporting have identified during the COVID-19 pandemic, including limited data on key variables such as age, race/ethnicity, hospitalization, and ICU status(22).

Laboratory reporting does not provide all of the information needed for adequate case investigation, however. As our data shows, demographic and risk factor information may not be complete in the HL7 feeds for ELR, and case report forms continue to have a critical role in the work of public health practice. Additionally, comorbid conditions, a significant predictor of disease outcome, are not captured. We found that CCDA data had a broader set of clinical fields, and have the advantage of providing valuable comorbidity information. While only small improvements in completeness were achieved, a high match rate to ELR data makes CCDA a compelling addition to ELR to improve the analytic power of public health data sets.

Initiatives to standardize and automate case report form completion have been developed (23) and piloted (24), which have shown promise at reducing the time to complete reporting. Similar to our results, others have found that health information exchanges show value in prepopulating key elements for reporting through automated matching and searches in the patient record(25). The use of FHIR(26) may provide a viable path for automatic of public health case reporting and reduce administrative

burden: when combined with an ELR based trigger for a case (in this example, sexually transmitted infection cases), an app that executed a FHIR-based query could complete an electronic case report form in 85% of cases(21). Additionally, all the key components of FHIR based workflows for public health reporting are often in place(27).

A feature of our solution is that it supports the central role of local health departments in data aggregation and reporting. An important component of the public health response in many communities is “home rule” for public health agencies(28), or local jurisdiction and control of policy and approach for local health departments. Present in 48 states, home-rule law empowers local governments to address public health issues and fill gaps in the patchwork of national and state based public health response. In the current pandemic, robust local responses that can enable targeted interventions and planning can allow more sophisticated preparedness planning, pandemic control, and epidemiological analysis.

For the most efficient exchange of data, standards for the structure of data shared, and on the semantic representation of information are critical. In this context, the technical and non-technical handshakes and handoffs related to data are key factors in successful programs. In this setting, technical handshakes are the trust relationships between systems to enable data sharing: the ability to use both authenticated API based transfers, and Direct Mailbox shares accelerated time to implementation for the project.

Technical handoffs were the ability to have seamless data parsing because of robust standards implemented via meaningful use. The ability to leverage CCDA to increase the completeness of overall PUI reporting, given the greater coverage of fields in the PUI form by CCDA files, is a sign of the value of federal standards for clinical data interchange.

Of more importance were the non-technical “handshakes” - i.e. relationship building and the development of consensus among institutions to enable sharing of data - and “handoffs” - the partnerships between public and private entities. A data governance committee was essential to promote trust, enabled the scaling of the program to new data sets and deeper information within sets. At a time of a surge in COVID-19 cases, a private, academic partner (Rush University Medical Center) with the technical capacity was able to rapidly implement a solution.

We see this public health and clinical data registry as an informative example of the power of common standards across electronic records, and a potential template for future extension of the use of standards to improve public health surveillance.

Acknowledgements: None

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts.

References

1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *New England Journal of Medicine* [Internet]. 2020 Feb [cited 2020 Apr 27];382(8):727–33. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001017>
2. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020 [Internet]. [cited 2020 Apr 27]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020>
3. Syndromic Surveillance (SS) | Meaningful Use | CDC [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Apr 25]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/ehrmeaningfuluse/Syndromic.html>
4. Electronic Laboratory Reporting (ELR) | Meaningful Use | CDC [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Apr 25]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/ehrmeaningfuluse/elr.html>
5. Guides | Meaningful Use | CDC [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Apr 25]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/ehrmeaningfuluse/guides.html>
6. Arnold KE, Thompson ND. Building Data Quality and Confidence in Data Reported to the National Healthcare Safety Network. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology* [Internet]. 2012 May [cited 2020 May 3];33(5):446–8. Available from:

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/infection-control-and-hospital-epidemiology/article/building-data-quality-and-confidence-in-data-reported-to-the-national-healthcare-safety-network/DA0B1FE51A558BB4C5A4AB7CD77BE730>

7. Holmgren AJ, Apathy NC, Adler-Milstein J. Barriers to hospital electronic public health reporting and implications for the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* [Internet]. [cited 2020 Jul 17]; Available from:

<https://academic.oup.com/jamia/article/doi/10.1093/jamia/ocaa112/5842141>

8. Strengthening the Public Health Infrastructure: The Role of Data in Controlling the Spread of COVID-19 [Internet]. 2020. Available from:

http://www.adhocresponsegroup.org/OPCAST_Public_Health_Data_Report_07-28-20.pdf

9. COVID-19 Orders [Internet]. [cited 2020 May 3]. Available from:

<https://www.chicago.gov/content/city/en/sites/covid-19/home/health-orders.html>

10. CMS Information Systems Security and Privacy Policy [Internet]. 2019. Available from: <https://www.cms.gov/Research-Statistics-Data-and-Systems/CMS-Information-Technology/InformationSecurity/Downloads/CMS-IS2P2.pdf>

11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Automated detection and reporting of notifiable diseases using electronic medical records versus passive

surveillance–massachusetts, June 2006-July 2007. MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report. 2008 Apr;57(14):373–6.

12. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Potential effects of electronic laboratory reporting on improving timeliness of infectious disease notification–Florida, 2002-2006. MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report. 2008 Dec;57(49):1325–8.

13. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Effect of electronic laboratory reporting on the burden of lyme disease surveillance–New Jersey, 2001-2006. MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report. 2008 Jan;57(2):42–5.

14. Nguyen TQ, Thorpe L, Makki HA, Mostashari F. Benefits and Barriers to Electronic Laboratory Results Reporting for Notifiable Diseases: The New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene Experience. American Journal of Public Health [Internet]. 2007 Apr [cited 2020 Apr 26];97(Suppl 1):S142–5. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1854985/>

15. Swaan C, van den Broek A, Kretzschmar M, Richardus JH. Timeliness of notification systems for infectious diseases: A systematic literature review. PloS One. 2018;13(6):e0198845.

16. Samoff E, Dibiase L, Fangman MT, Fleischauer AT, Waller AE, MacDonald PDM. We can have it all: Improved surveillance outcomes and decreased personnel costs

associated with electronic reportable disease surveillance, North Carolina, 2010.

American Journal of Public Health. 2013 Dec;103(12):2292–7.

17. Doyle TJ, Glynn MK, Groseclose SL. Completeness of notifiable infectious disease reporting in the United States: An analytical literature review. American Journal of Epidemiology. 2002 May;155(9):866–74.

18. Jajosky RA, Groseclose SL. Evaluation of reporting timeliness of public health surveillance systems for infectious diseases. BMC Public Health [Internet]. 2004 Jul [cited 2020 Apr 26];4:29. Available from:

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC509250/>

19. Rajeev D, Staes CJ, Evans RS, Mottice S, Rolfs R, Samore MH, et al. Development of an electronic public health case report using HL7 v2.5 to meet public health needs. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association: JAMIA. 17(1):34–41.

20. Dixon BE, McGowan JJ, Grannis SJ. Electronic laboratory data quality and the value of a health information exchange to support public health reporting processes. AMIA Annual Symposium proceedings AMIA Symposium. 2011;2011:322–30.

21. Dixon BE, Taylor DE, Choi M, Riley M, Schneider T, Duke J. Integration of FHIR to Facilitate Electronic Case Reporting: Results from a Pilot Study. Studies in Health Technology and Informatics. 2019 Aug;264:940–4.

22. CDCMMWR. Severe Outcomes Among Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) United States, February 12–March 16, 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 5];69. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6912e2.htm>
23. Mac Kenzie WR, Davidson AJ, Wiesenthal A, Engel JP, Turner K, Conn L, et al. The Promise of Electronic Case Reporting. *Public Health Reports* [Internet]. 2016 Nov [cited 2020 Apr 26];131(6):742–6. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033354916670871>
24. Whipple A, Jackson J, Ridderhoff J, Nakashima AK. Piloting Electronic Case Reporting for Improved Surveillance of Sexually Transmitted Diseases in Utah. *Online Journal of Public Health Informatics* [Internet]. 2019 Sep [cited 2020 Apr 25];11(2). Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6788887/>
25. Painter I, Revere D, Gibson PJ, Baseman J. Leveraging public health's participation in a Health Information Exchange to improve communicable disease reporting. *Online Journal of Public Health Informatics*. 2017;9(2):e186.
26. Index - FHIR v4.0.1 [Internet]. [cited 2020 May 2]. Available from: <https://www.hl7.org/fhir/>
27. Mishra NK, Duke J, Lenert L, Karki S. Public health reporting and outbreak response: Synergies with evolving clinical standards for interoperability. *Journal of the*

American Medical Informatics Association [Internet]. [cited 2020 Jul 17]; Available from:

<https://academic.oup.com/jamia/article/doi/10.1093/jamia/ocaa059/5848746>

28. McCarty KL, Nelson GD, Hodge JG, Gebbie KM. Major Components and Themes of

Local Public Health Laws in Select U.S. Jurisdictions. *Public Health Reports* [Internet].

2009 [cited 2020 Jul 16];124(3):458–62. Available from:

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2663884/>

| Type | Name | Definition | Agency/System |
|-----------|--|---|---------------|
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Availability: Adult Surge ICU | Number of Adult Surge ICU beds available at facility. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Availability: Burn | Availability of burn beds. These are thought of as burn ICU beds, either approved by the American Burn Association or self-designated. These beds are NOT to be included in other ICU bed counts. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Availability: Med/Surg | Availability of medical-surgical beds. These are also thought of as ward beds. These beds may or may not include cardiac telemetry capability. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Availability: NegFlow | Availability of negative airflow isolation beds. These provide respiratory isolation. NOTE: This value may represent available beds included in the counts of other types. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Availability: OR | Availability of operating rooms which are equipped, staffed and could be made available for patient care in a short period of time. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Availability: Other | Number of other available beds. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Availability: Pediatric Surge ICU | Number of pediatric surge beds available at facility. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Availability: Peds | Availability of pediatrics beds. These are ward medical/surgical beds for patients 17-years-old and younger. | EMResource |

| | | | |
|------------------|---|---|------------|
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Availability: Psych | Availability of psychiatric beds. These are ward beds on a closed/locked psychiatric unit or ward beds where a patient will be attended by a sitter. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Available: Adult ICU | Availability of adult ICU beds. These can support critically ill or injured patients, including ventilator support. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Available: NICU | Number of available neonatal ICU beds | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Available: Pediatric ICU | Availability of pediatric ICU beds. Similar to adult ICU beds, but for patients 17-years-old and younger. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Capacity: Adult ICU | Total number of staffed adult ICU beds. These can support critically ill or injured patients, including ventilator support. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Capacity: Burn | Total number of staffed burn beds. These are thought of as burn ICU beds, either approved by the American Burn Association or self-designated. These beds are NOT to be included in other ICU bed counts. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Capacity: ED | Number of licensed ED beds | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Capacity: Medical Surgical | Total number of staffed medical-surgical beds. These are also thought of as ward beds. These beds may or may not include cardiac telemetry capability. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Capacity: | Total number of staffed negative airflow isolation beds. These provide respiratory isolation. NOTE: | EMResource |

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| Usage | Neg Flow Isolation | This value may represent available beds included in the counts of other types. | |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Capacity: NICU | Number of licensed NICU beds | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Capacity: Operating Room | Total number of staffed operating rooms which are equipped and could be made available for patient care in a short period of time. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Capacity: Other | Number of other licensed beds | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Capacity: Pediatric ICU | Total number of staffed pediatric ICU beds. Similar to adult ICU beds, but for patients 17-years-old and younger. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Capacity: Pediatrics | Total number of staffed pediatrics beds. These are ward medical/surgical beds for patients 17-years-old and younger. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Bed Capacity: Psychiatric | Total number of staffed psychiatric beds. These are ward beds on a closed/locked psychiatric unit or ward beds where a patient will be attended by a sitter. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | EMResource - Ventilators Available Surge | Number of available surge ventilators at facility. | EMResource |
| Bed Usage | FEMA - All hospital beds | Total number of all staffed inpatient and outpatient beds in your hospital, including all overflow and surge/expansion beds used for inpatients and for outpatients (includes all ICU beds). | FEMA Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | FEMA - Hospital Inpatient | Total number of staffed inpatient beds that are | FEMA Daily Report |

| | | | |
|------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| Usage | bed occupancy | occupied | |
| Bed Usage | FEMA - Hospital Inpatient Beds | Total number of staffed inpatient beds in your hospital including all overflow and surge/expansion beds used for inpatients (includes all ICU beds) | FEMA Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | FEMA - Hospital Onset | Patients currently hospitalized in an inpatient bed with onset of suspected or confirmed COVID-19 fourteen or more days after hospital admission due to a condition other than COVID-19 | FEMA Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | FEMA - Hospitalized and ventilated COVID patient | Patients currently hospitalized in an inpatient bed who have suspected or confirmed COVID-19 and are on a mechanical ventilator | FEMA Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | FEMA - Hospitalized COVID patients | Patients currently hospitalized in an inpatient bed who have suspected or confirmed COVID-19 | FEMA Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | FEMA - ICU bed occupancy | Total number of staffed inpatient ICU beds that are occupied | FEMA Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | FEMA - ICU Beds | Total number of staffed inpatient ICU beds | FEMA Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | FEMA - Total Beds (Temporary) | The current number of physical usable beds in the facility. If the bed is not currently staffed, but usable and has the potential to be staffed, it should be counted. The same would apply to a blocked bed. If the bed is currently blocked, but is usable bed, it should be counted. | FEMA Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | FEMA - Total Occupied Beds (Temporary) | The number of beds currently occupied with patients. This also includes any patient that may be located in an outpatient area within the facility (e.g. | FEMA Daily Report |

ED or PACU bays) that have an inpatient or observation order).

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| Bed Usage | ING - Airborne Isolation Beds | Total number of AIIR (airborne infection isolation room) beds at hospital? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Bed Usage | ING - Airborne Isolation Beds Available | Total number of AIIR (airborne infection isolation room) beds at hospital available? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Bed Usage | ING - Alternative Care Site - Isolation | Does this facility have isolation capabilities? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Bed Usage | ING - Alternative Care Site - Respiratory Illness/Ventilation | Can this facility handle patients with respiratory illness (ventilation)? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Bed Usage | ING - ICU Beds | Total number of ICU (Intensive Care Unit) beds at hospital? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Bed Usage | ING - ICU Beds Available | Total number of ICU (Intensive Care Unit) beds at hospital available? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Bed Usage | ING - Medical/Surgical Beds | Total number of medical/surgical beds at hospital? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Bed Usage | ING - Medical/Surgical Beds Available | Total number of medical/surgical beds at hospital available? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Bed Usage | ING - Other Staffed Beds | Total number of other staffed beds at hospital? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Bed Usage | ING - Other Staffed Beds Available | Total number of other staffed beds at hospital available? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Bed Usage | ING - Unlicensed Beds | Does the hospital have unlicensed beds that could be opened if allowed by IDPH hospital licensing? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Bed Usage | ING - Unlicensed Beds - | How many beds could be opened? | Illinois National Guard |

| Usage | Count | | Survey |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Bed Usage | NHSN - All Hospital Beds | Enter the total number of all hospital beds, including inpatient and outpatient beds. All staffed, licensed, and overflow and surge/expansion beds used for inpatients or outpatients. This includes ICU beds. | NHSN Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | NHSN - Deaths | Enter the number of patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 who died in the hospital, ED, or any overflow location. This includes patients with laboratory-confirmed or clinically diagnosed COVID-19. Please enter the count of deaths newly occurred, at the time the data is collected instead of the cumulated number of deaths. | NHSN Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | NHSN - ED/Overflow | Enter the number of patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 who are in the Emergency Department(ED) or any overflow/expansion location awaiting placement in an inpatient bed at the time the data is collected . This includes patients with laboratory-confirmed or clinically diagnosed COVID-19. Overflow locations include any physical locations created to accommodate patients include but not limited to 24-hour observation units, hallways, parking lots, or tents. | NHSN Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | NHSN - ED/Overflow and Ventilated | Enter the number of patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 who are in the ED or any overflow/expansion location on a mechanical ventilator* at the time the data is collected . This includes patients with laboratory-confirmed or | NHSN Daily Report |

clinically diagnosed COVID-19. *Ventilator: Any device used to support, assist or control respiration (inclusive of the weaning period) through the application of positive pressure to the airway when delivered via an artificial airway, specifically an oral/nasal endotracheal or tracheostomy tube. Note: Ventilation and lung expansion devices that deliver positive pressure to the airway (for example: CPAP, BiPAP, bi-level, IPPB and PEEP) via non-invasive means (for example: nasal prongs, nasal mask, full face mask, total mask, etc.) are not considered ventilators unless positive pressure is delivered via an artificial airway (oral/nasal endotracheal or tracheostomy tube).

| | | | |
|------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| Bed Usage | NHSN - Hospital Inpatient Beds | Required. Enter the total number of all inpatient beds, including all staffed, licensed, and overflow and surge/expansion beds created for inpatient care. This includes intensive care unit (ICU) beds. | NHSN Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | NHSN - Hospital Inpatient Beds Occupancy | Enter the total number of staffed inpatient beds occupied by patients at the time the data is collected, including all staffed, licensed, and overflow and surge/expansion beds created for inpatient care. This includes ICU beds. | NHSN Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | NHSN - Hospital Onset | Enter the number of patients hospitalized in an inpatient bed at the time the data is collected with onset of suspected or confirmed COVID-19 fourteen or more days after hospitalization (admission date = hospital day 1). This includes laboratory-confirmed | NHSN Daily Report |

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| | | or clinically diagnosed COVID-19 cases. | |
| Bed Usage | NHSN - Hospitalized | Enter the number of patients hospitalized in an inpatient bed at the time the data is collected who have suspected or confirmed COVID-19. This includes the patients with laboratory-confirmed or clinically diagnosed COVID-19. Confirmed: A patient with a laboratory confirmed COVID-19 diagnosis Suspected: A patient without a laboratory confirmed COVID-19 diagnosis who, in accordance with CDC's Interim Public Health Guidance for Evaluating Persons Under Investigation (PUIs), has signs and symptoms compatible with COVID-19 (most patients with confirmed COVID-19 have developed fever and/or symptoms of acute respiratory illness, such as cough, shortness of breath or myalgia/fatigue). | NHSN Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | NHSN - Hospitalized and Ventilated | Enter the number of patients hospitalized in an inpatient bed who have suspected or confirmed COVID-19 and are currently on a mechanical ventilator* at the time the data is collected . This includes the patients with laboratory-confirmed or clinically diagnosed COVID-19. *Ventilator: Any device used to support, assist or control respiration (inclusive of the weaning period) through the application of positive pressure to the airway when delivered via an artificial airway, specifically an oral/nasal endotracheal or tracheostomy tube. Note: Ventilation and lung expansion devices that deliver | NHSN Daily Report |

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| | | positive pressure to the airway (for example: CPAP, BiPAP, bi-level, IPPB and PEEP) via non-invasive means (for example: nasal prongs, nasal mask, full face mask, total mask, etc.) are not considered ventilators unless positive pressure is delivered via an artificial airway (oral/nasal endotracheal or tracheostomy tube). | |
| Bed Usage | NHSN - ICU Bed Occupancy | Enter the total number of staffed ICU beds occupied by patients at the time the data is collected. | NHSN Daily Report |
| Bed Usage | NHSN - ICU Beds | Enter the total number of staffed Intensive Care Unit (ICU) beds. | NHSN Daily Report |
| ED Usage | EMResource - Bed Availability: ED | Please add your ED bed availability. | EMResource |
| Ed Usage | EMResource - Decon Throughput | The number of patients facility can decontaminate every hour. | EMResource |
| ED Usage | FEMA - ED/Overflow | Patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 who currently are in the Emergency Department (ED) or any overflow location awaiting an inpatient bed | FEMA Daily Report |
| ED Usage | FEMA - ED/Overflow and Vented | Patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 who currently are in the ED or any overflow location awaiting an inpatient bed and on a mechanical ventilator | FEMA Daily Report |
| ED Usage | ING - Alternative Care Site - Availability | Has the hospital designated (or have access to a site to serve as) an Alternate Care Site (remote location the hospital can stand up to handle surge of patients)? | Illinois National Guard Survey |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| ED Usage | ING - Alternative Care Site - Operation | Is this facility operational? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| ED Usage | ING - External Triage/Screening - Availability | Does the hospital have an external triage/screening area away from the emergency department or outside of the hospital? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| ED Usage | ING - External Triage/Screening - Operation | Is the external triage/screening area in operation? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| ED Usage | ING - Hospital Entrance for COVID Patients | Has the hospital identified an area for potential COVID-19 patients to enter the hospital other than the emergency department? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Lab Testing | FEMA - COVID-19 Patients Confirmed (Temporary) | The number of patients anywhere in the facility that are currently positive with COVID-19. This does not include patients that were once positive but are now negative. | FEMA Daily Report |
| Lab Testing | FEMA - COVID-19 Patients Under Investigation (Temporary) | The number of patients anywhere in the facility that are currently under investigation suspected to have COVID-19 | FEMA Daily Report |
| Lab Testing | FEMA - Cumulative Diagnostic Tests Ordered/Recieved | All tests ordered to date; Rush internal tests only | FEMA Daily Report |
| Lab Testing | FEMA - Cumulative Negative COVID-19 Tests | All negative test results released to date; Rush internal tests only | FEMA Daily Report |
| Lab Testing | FEMA - Cumulative Positive COVID-19 Tests | All positive test results released to date; Rush internal tests only | FEMA Daily Report |
| Lab | FEMA - Cumulative Tests | All tests with results released to date; Rush internal | FEMA Daily Report |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| Testing | Performed | tests only | |
| Lab Testing | FEMA - New Diagnostic Tests Ordered/Received | Midnight to midnight cutoff, tests ordered on previous date queried; Rush internal tests only | FEMA Daily Report |
| Lab Testing | FEMA - New Negative COVID-19 Tests | Midnight to midnight cutoff, negative test results released on previous date queried; Rush internal tests only | FEMA Daily Report |
| Lab Testing | FEMA - New Positive COVID-19 Tests | Midnight to midnight cutoff, positive test results released on previous date queried; Rush internal tests only | FEMA Daily Report |
| Lab Testing | FEMA - New Tests Resulted | Midnight to midnight cutoff, test results released on previous date queried; Rush internal tests only | FEMA Daily Report |
| Other | FEMA - Deaths | Number of patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 who died in the hospital, ED, or any overflow location on the date for which you are reporting | FEMA Daily Report |
| Other | ING - Security | Is there a security need? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | FEMA - On-hand supply of N95 masks | _ Zero days _ 1-3 days _ 4-14 days _ 15 or more days | FEMA Daily Report |
| Supplies | ING - Alternative Care Site - Additional Resources | Is additional resources need to operate the facility? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - Alternative Care Site - Establishment | Is there a need for the state to assist with the establishment? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - Alternative Care Site - Support | What support does the hospital need to operate the facility? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - Blood Shortage | Does the hospital have blood shortages? | Illinois National Guard |

| | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| | | | Survey |
| Supplies | ING - Critical Resource Needs - Current | What are your critical resource and support needs - currently? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - Critical Resource Needs - Next 12 hours | What are your critical resource and support needs - Next 12 hours? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - PPE - Face Shields Inventory | How many face shields do you have on-hand? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - PPE - Face Shields Request | How many face shields do you need to request? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - PPE - Gloves Inventory | How many gloves do you have on-hand? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - PPE - Gloves Request | How many gloves do you need to request? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - PPE - Gowns Inventory | How many gowns do you have on-hand? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - PPE - Gowns Request | How many gowns do you need to request? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - PPE - Masks Inventory | How many masks do you have on-hand? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - PPE - Masks Request | How many masks do you need to request? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - PPE - Thermometers Request | How many thermometers do you need to request? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - PPE - Thermometers Inventory | How many thermometers do you have on-hand? | Illinois National Guard Survey |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| Supplies | ING - PPE Request | Did you submit a resource request to the county for Personal Protective Equipment for your facility? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - Supplies for EMS | Is the hospital able to replace supplies for EMS providers sent to the emergency department and for inpatients? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - Surge Situation | Is the hospital in a surge situation? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Supplies | ING - Urgent Resource Requests | Does the hospital have any urgent (i.e. needed within 6 hours) resource requests? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Ventilator Use | EMResource - Available: Vents | Total number of full feature ventilators available to the facility that can support patients > 5kg and above | EMResource |
| Ventilator Use | EMResource - Capacity: Vents | The total number of ventilators at this facility (in-use and available). | EMResource |
| Ventilator Use | FEMA - COVID-19 Patients Using Ventilation (Temporary) | The current number of confirmed COVID-19 patients (laboratory confirmed or clinically diagnosed) using ventilators. | FEMA Daily Report |
| Ventilator Use | FEMA - Mechanical Ventilators | Total number of ventilators available | FEMA Daily Report |
| Ventilator Use | FEMA - Mechanical Ventilators in use | Total number of ventilators in use | FEMA Daily Report |
| Ventilator Use | ING - Ventilators | Total number of ventilators in use at hospital? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Ventilator Use | ING - Ventilators Available | Total number of ventilators in use at hospital available? | Illinois National Guard Survey |
| Ventilator | NHSN - Mechanical | Enter the total number of mechanical ventilators in | NHSN Daily Report |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Use | Ventilators in Use | use at the time the data is collected, including anesthesia machines and portable/transport ventilators. Include BiPAP machines if the hospital uses BiPAP to deliver positive pressure ventilation via artificial airways. | |
| Ventilator Use | NHSN - Mechanical Ventilators | Enter the total number of mechanical ventilators, including anesthesia machines and portable/transport ventilators available in the facility. Include BiPAP machines if the hospital uses BiPAP to deliver positive pressure ventilation via artificial airways. | NHSN Daily Report |

Table 1 List of measures and agencies with mandated reporting in April 2020 for COVID-19 in Chicago

| CDC PUI Form Field | In CCDA | In ELR | FHIR | Other Data Sources |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------|------|--------------------|
| What is the current status of this person? | | | | |
| PUI- testing pending | X (Lab test and result information) | | X | |
| PUI- tested negative | X (Lab test and result information) | | X | |
| Presumptive case (positive local test)- confirmatory testing pending | | | | |
| Presumptive case (positive local test)- confirmatory tested negative | | | | |
| Laboratory-confirmed case | X | X | X | |
| Report date of PUI to CDC | | | | |
| Report date of case to CDC | | | | |
| County of residence | X | X | X | |
| State of residence | X | X | X | |
| Ethnicity | X | X | X | |
| Race | X | X | X | |
| Sex | X | X | X | |
| DOB | X | X | X | |
| Age | X | X | X | |
| Was the patient hospitalized? And Date | X | | X | ADT or Census Data |
| Was the patient admitted to an intensive care unit (ICU) | | | X | ADT or Census Data |
| Did the patient receive | | | | Custom |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|----|---------------|
| mechanical ventilation (MV) or intubation? (And Days of MV) | | | | Report |
| Did the patient receive ECMO? | | | | Custom Report |
| Did the patient die as a result of this illness? (And date) | X | | X | ADT |
| Date of first positive specimen collection | X | X | X | |
| Did the patient develop pneumonia? | X | | X | |
| Did the patient have acute respiratory distress syndrome? | X | | X | |
| Did the patient have another diagnosis/etiology for their illness? | | | | |
| Did the patient have an abnormal chest X-ray? | | | X* | |
| Symptoms present during course of illness: (Symptomatic Asymptomatic Unknown) | | | | |
| Symptom onset date | | | | |
| Symptom resolution date | | | | |
| Is the patient a health care worker in the United States? | | | | |
| Does the patient have a history of being in a healthcare facility (as a patient worker or visitor) in China? | | | | |
| In the 14 days prior to illness onset- did the patient have any of the following exposures (check all that apply): | | | | |
| Travel to Wuhan | | | | |

Travel to Hubei

Travel to mainland China

Travel to other non-US country

Community contact with another lab-confirmed COVID-19 case-patient

Any healthcare contact with another lab-confirmed COVID-19 case-patient (Patient Visitor HCW)

Exposure to a cluster of patients with severe acute lower respiratory distress of unknown etiology

Household contact with another lab- confirmed COVID-19 case -patient

Animal exposure

If the patient had contact with another COVID-19 case- was this person a U.S. case?

Under what process was the PUI or case first identified? (check all that apply):

Clinical evaluation leading to PUI determination

X*

Contact tracing of case patient

Routine surveillance

EpiX notification of travelers if checked

Unknown

Other- specify

Symptoms

Fever >100.4F (38C)

X*

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| Subjective fever (felt feverish) | | X* |
| Chills | | X* |
| Muscle aches (myalgia) | | X* |
| Runny nose (rhinorrhea) | | X* |
| Sore throat | | X* |
| Cough (new onset or worsening of chronic cough) | | X* |
| Shortness of breath (dyspnea) | | X* |
| Nausea or vomiting | | X* |
| Headache | | X* |
| Abdominal pain | | X* |
| Diarrhea (≥3 loose/looser than normal stools/24hr period) | | X* |
| Other | | |
| Pre-existing medical conditions | | |
| Chronic Lung Disease (asthma emphysema COPD) | X | X |
| Diabetes Mellitus | X | X |
| Cardiovascular disease | X | X |
| Chronic Renal disease | X | X |
| Chronic Liver disease | X | X |
| Immunocompromised Condition | X | X |
| Neurologic neurodevelopmental intellectual disability | X | X |
| Other chronic diseases | X | X |
| If female- currently pregnant | | |
| Current smoker | X | X |
| Former smoker | X | X |
| Respiratory Diagnostic Testing Test (Respiratory virus testing panel information) | X | X |

Specimens for COVID-19

Testing

NP Swab OP Swab Sputum

Other- Specify:

Table 2 Crosswalk table to compare coverage of PUI form fields and ELR, CCDA, and

FHIR Resources

*If Notes are shared through FHIR Resources

| Data Field | | CCDA Data Source | ELR Data Source |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Total Records | | 88,906 | 408,741 |
| Facilities | | 14 | 88 |
| Lab-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 | | 11,657 (13.1) | 53,968 (13.2%) |
| Facility Name / Reporting Lab | Non-missing | 88,906 (100.0%) | 408,737 (100.0%) |
| | Useful | 88,906 (100.0%) | 408,463 (99.9%) |
| Patient First Name | Non-missing | 88,906 (100.0%) | 408,732 (100.0%) |
| | Useful | 88,906 (100.0%) | 408,717 (100.0%) |
| Patient Last Name | Non-missing | 88,906 (100.0%) | 408,732 (100.0%) |
| | Useful | 88,906 (100.0%) | 408,718 (100.0%) |
| Patient DOB | Non-missing | 88,904 (100.0%) | 408,270 (99.9%) |
| | Useful | 88,900 (100.0%) | 407,730 (99.9%) |
| Patient Sex (M/F/Unk) | Non-missing | 88,832 (99.9%) | 408,540 (100.0%) |
| | Useful | 88,821 (99.9%) | 398,590 (97.5%) |
| Patient Race | Non-missing | 88,136 (99.1%) | 382,097 (93.5%) |
| | Useful | 82,110 (92.4%) | 215,273 (52.7%) |
| Patient Ethnicity | Non-missing | 88,141 (99.1%) | 333,122 (81.5%) |
| | Useful | 70,573 (79.4%) | 165,715 (49.7%) |
| Patient Address | Non-missing | 88,904 (100.0%) | 385,073 (94.2%) |
| | Useful | 88,254 (99.3%) | 384,000 (93.9%) |
| Patient City | Non-missing | 88,902 (100.0%) | 408,741 (100.0%) |
| | Useful | 88,902 (100.0%) | 408,741 (100.0%) |
| Patient Zip | Non-missing | 88,780 (99.9%) | 408,026 (99.8%) |
| | Useful | 88,775 (99.9%) | 407,918 (99.8%) |
| Patient Home or Cell Phone* | Non-missing | 21,468 (24.1%) | 321,121 (78.6%) |
| | Useful | 21,451 (24.1%) | 319,974 (78.3%) |
| Test name | Non-missing | 88,906 (100.0%) | 408,694 (100.0%) |
| | Useful | 88,906 (100.0%) | 408,694 (100.0%) |
| LOINC Code | Non-missing | 0 (%) | 408,741 (100.0%) |
| | Useful | 0 (%) | 408,727 (100.0%) |
| Test results (raw feed) | Non-missing | 55,248 (62.1%) | 405,650 (99.2%) |
| | Useful | 55,235 (62.1%) | 396,110 (96.9%) |

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Test results (imputed*) | Non-missing | 88,906 (100.0%) | 408,741 (100.0%) |
| | Useful | 88,906 (100.0%) | 408,741 (100.0%) |
| Test date | Non-missing | 86,159 (96.9%) | 408,046 (99.8%) |
| | Useful | 86,139 (96.9%) | 408,046 (99.8%) |
| Hospitalization (y/n)** | Non-missing | 88,906 (100.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| | Useful | 88,906 (100.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Comorbidities | Non-missing | 88,906 (100.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| | Useful | 88,906 (100.0%) | 0 (0.0%) |

Table 3 Completeness of data submitted via CCDA and ELR

*Cell and Home phone not differentiated in ELR feed; Non-missing refers to populated data field; Useful refers to clean, complete information in data field; <100% indicates “unknown” (race, ethnicity, address, etc); for address (PO Boxes, Unknown, Homeless, N/A); phone (no phone, bad number/not enough numbers); ZIP codes <5 digits or 99999 or 00000 or UUUUU etc.

CDPH CCDA Clinical Data Submission Options (Choose an option 1 - 5)

All Patients Given COVID-19 Test




Figure 1 High level architecture of CDPH Data Hub




Figure 2 Epidemiologic dashboards for assessment of outbreak, CDPH data hub

