

The SENSOR System: Using Standardized Data Entry and Dashboards for Review of Scientific Studies Using the Clinical Applications of Psychedelics as an Illustration

Latifah Kamal¹, Major Pauline Godsell², Bryce Mulligan¹, Stefan Eberspaecher⁴, Danny Myint, LCol Markus Besemann^{2,4}, Amir Minerbi³, Gaurav Gupta²

¹University of Ottawa, ²Canadian Forces Health Services Centre – Ottawa, ³ Israel Institute for Technology, ⁴Beechwood Physical Medicine

Abstract

Introduction: Literature reviews are useful tools for communicating the breadth of scientific discovery for a given topic. Irrespective of the nature of the review, data should be communicated in effective, easy to understand ways. In trying to address these limitations of traditional scientific reviews, we propose using dynamic data driven displays that have been used in multiple other industries to improve communication and decision making. Given the recent interest in the clinical applications of psychedelics for various mental health issues, we chose to test the SENSOR System (Standardized Data Entry and Dashboards for Review of Scientific Studies) as an alternative for an existing review article.

Methods: To validate the SENSOR System, an existing review with a topical, heterogenous, and growing set of studies was selected. In this case we chose the Wheeler et al. review on psychedelics in clinical practice where articles had already been preselected and reviewed. Detailed discussion of this review and the cited papers preceded designing the content and shared links for a Google Form for data intake, Google Drive for article access, and Google Sheets linked to the form intake data.

Results: A total of 46 study entries were made by 2 team members, including 3 articles published since the review to demonstrate the ease of updating the system. Various representations of the Google Forms intake data in the SENSOR System dashboard are presented.

Discussion: Visual representation of review studies using a dashboard proved feasible and advantageous for numerous reasons. As the technology and guidelines for these systems evolve there is an opportunity to standardize reporting, centralize legacy datasets, streamline the submission process, improve collaboration between researchers, measure relative contribution of participating authors, and improve patient involvement. For the use case of clinical applications of psychedelics, limitations of conveying data accurately includes heterogeneity of study design, dosing, indications, and outcome measures.

Conclusion: Creation of a system for standardized data entry and dashboards for reviews of scientific studies is a feasible alternative and/or adjunct to the dissemination of summaries through traditional scientific review. There are numerous proposed advantages of the flexible, dynamic, and graphical display that requires further validation.

Introduction

Literature reviews are useful tools for communicating the breadth of scientific discovery for a given topic. Given the ever-increasing output of scientific publications, synthesis of this data is becoming necessary for summaries of this research. [1,2,3] These

reviews allow for more efficient understanding of a body of study, hypothesis generation and understanding of the limits of clinical applications.

Various types of reviews have evolved over time. Format variations include scale (mini vs full), expression (descriptive vs. integrative) and type (narrative vs. systematic) reviews. [4,5,6] Therefore, the process of writing reviews can be complex, depending on the nature of the review, the intended goal, and the required structure. [7] In general, these steps include topic selection, literature search, critical appraisal, synthesis, report writing, and revision based on feedback. [8,9] The quality of the work product is predicated on systematically reducing the impact of bias and where possible, combining data to augment the power of the analysis (i.e. meta-analysis). [10,11]

Irrespective of the nature of the review, data should be communicated effectively, in an easy to understand way. Images are better for comprehension than numbers or words, suggesting graphics and pictures could facilitate synthesis of complex scientific communication. [12,13,14,15,16] Considerable literature has highlighted strategies for enhancing visual communications in scientific publications. These include a focus on simplicity, object/attribute encoding type and colors, visual patterning and distinctions, suitable axis selection, and carefully considered data axis, transformation, aggregation, and time series sequential. [15] Nevertheless even with these guidelines, the nature of scientific reviews has been largely static overtime. These communications can be time consuming to write, vast amounts of information can be difficult to synthesize, relative comparisons of data can be challenging

to make depending on the data and in some cases outdated by the time of publication.

In trying to address these limitations of traditional scientific reviews, we propose using dynamic data driven visual displays that have been used in multiple other industries to improve communication and decision-making. These dashboards theoretically can also exploit perceptual capacities to enhance cognition, but should be tailored to the use, case and/or user. [17] The dashboards themselves can contain both tabular and graphical information that can be manipulated by data filters and slicers.

We hypothesize that an appropriate data input system and spreadsheet software could facilitate development of a dashboard as a standalone and/or complementary tool for a traditional scientific review. Given the recent interest in the clinical applications of psychedelics for various mental health issues, we chose to test the SENSOR System (Standardized Data Entry and Dashboards for Review of Scientific Studies) as an alternative for an existing review article written by Wheeler et al. [18]

Methods

To validate the SENSOR System, an existing review with a topical, heterogenous, and growing set of studies were selected. [18] In this case we chose the Wheeler et al. review on psychedelics in clinical practice where articles had already been preselected and reviewed. Each participating author was assigned their own articles, but any concerns regarding data input were discussed with the appropriate team member. Detailed discussions of the review and the cited papers preceded designing shared

links for a Google Form for data intake, Google Drive for article access, and Google Sheets linked to the form intake data.

The Google Form questions included a combination of short and long answer data, multiple checkboxes, and multiple choices. Table 1 shows how variables were assigned to questions subtypes, and “other” options were included, where possible. While flexible, questions were ordered in a way to facilitate data entry. For numerical inputs, care was taken to standardize input (e.g. time, absolute percentage of improvement for a given outcome measure, etc.). Where responder rate was reported, the total trial size was separately recorded, which allowed for bubble graphs to be generated for the dashboard. For medications, an average dose was calculated, where amounts between dosing sessions differed and were normalized for use in a 70kg participant. Patients were classified by their main and secondary indications where necessary, for instance those with anxiety and depression in the case of palliative conditions or addiction to various substances such as smoking or alcohol.

When considering response to treatment, allowance for multiple outcome measures were made in the one intake form, but functionally, only the primary outcome was recorded. Outcome measures were reported as percentages, based on the absolute improvement for a given scale (i.e. a change from 4-2 on a 10 point scale was a 20% improvement, not 50%) or responder rate if necessary (i.e. number of patients that achieved a certain percentage improvement).

The articles themselves were made available in a shared Google Drive and the links for each article were included in the form for ease of access in the future. The dashboard itself was created in Google Sheets with filters for publication year, medication, dose, location (i.e. city), percent improvement, author, indication and trial size. Graphs within the dashboard included bar graphs for trial size and percent response by both medication used and indication respectively. A bubble graph was also included, comparing percentage relief against dose with colors representing medication type and bubble size reflecting trial size. A map for study locations and pivot tables were incorporated to help with data presentation and to facilitate communication of information.

Table 1: Google Form Variables and Questions Subtype assignment

Short Answer	Long Answer	Checkboxes	Multiple Choice
Email	Comments	Study Country(ies)	Indication(s)
Date		Type of Study	
Year of Publication		Nature of Controls	
Author Name		Medication Used	
G-Drive article link		Medication Analogs	
Primary City		Administration Route	
Trial Size (Controls and Patients)		Control Group Type	
Average Dose		Outcome Measure	
Average Control Dose		Interval	
Percent response		Adverse Events	
Trial Length		Outcome Measures	
		Limitations	

Results

A total of 46 research paper entries were made by 2 team members, including 3 articles published since the review to demonstrate the ease of updating the system. This represents a total of 1237 patients, with an average response of 31%, spanning multiple continents, medications and indications. We note the presented data is impacted by the Wilkinson et al meta-analysis on ketamine for which there is no dosing data and the qualitative study by Swift et al for which no outcomes were presented. [19,20]

The data entered into the spreadsheet far exceeds what was included in the dashboard. See Figures 1-8 for full graphics. Below are the various representations of the Google Forms

intake data in the SENSOR System dashboard. All aspects of the graphs are easily customizable using the slicers. The drop-down menus provide the opportunity to remove or add any data input immediately into the graphs. Currently, for ease of visibility, two medications (ibogaine and nitrous oxide) with high relative dosing regimens have been omitted from all represented data as seen in the slicers of figure 2. Given the entered data far exceeds what is included in the current dashboard (e.g. limitations, measurement tool, reviewer notes) multiple dashboards can be used in the future for a specific data set. Despite best efforts we concede not all calculations will be accurate, and encourage readers to focus on the benefits of the system itself.

Figure 1: Global View of Dashboard




Figure 2: Slicers to Modify the Data



Figure 3: Overview of Results

Total Patients	Average Response
1237	32.05

Figure 4a: Trial Size by Medication Used




Figure 5a: Percent Response by Medication Used




Figure 4b: Trial Size by Indication




Figure 5b: Percent Response by Indication




Figure 6: Comparison of Percentage Relief Against Dose




Figure 8: Pivot Tables

Author	Year	Indication	Medications	City	Trial Size	Dose	Percent Response
Argento	2019	Addiction	Ayahuasca	Vancouver	8	41	100
Barone	2018	Anxiety	MDMA	Pleasant Hill	19	100	68
Belser	2017	Depression	Psilocybin	New York	13	21	60
Bongenschütz	2015	Addiction	Psilocybin	Albuquerque	10	21	26
	2018	Addiction	Psilocybin	Albuquerque	3	30	40
Bouso	2008	Anxiety	MDMA	Madrid	6	50	8.8
Carhart-Harris	2016	Depression	Psilocybin	London	12	17.5	30
	2017	Depression	Psilocybin	London	9	17.5	50
	2018	Depression	Psilocybin	London	20	17.5	33
	2021	Depression	Psilocybin	London	59	25	7
Danforth	2018	Anxiety	MDMA	Los Angeles	12	100	17
Davis	2021	Depression	Psilocybin	Baltimore	24	25	30
Dore	2019	All mental health	Ketamine	Woodside	235	140	18
Erritzoe	2018	Depression	Psilocybin	London	20	25	8.5
Gasser	2014	Anxiety	LSD	Solothurn	12	0.2	25
	2015	Anxiety	LSD	Solothurn	9	0.2	15
Griffiths	2016	Depression	Psilocybin	Baltimore	51	25.5	17
Grob	2011	Anxiety	Psilocybin	Los Angeles	12	14	11
Johnson	2014	Addiction	Psilocybin	Baltimore	15	25	80
	2017	Addiction	Psilocybin	Baltimore	12	25	60
Krupitsky	2002	Addiction	Ketamine	St. Petersburg	70	140	16
	2007	Addiction	Ketamine	St. Petersburg	59	140	28
Malone	2018	Depression	Psilocybin	New York	4	21	36
Mitchell	2021	Anxiety	MDMA	San Francisco	90	160	13
Mithoefer	2010	Anxiety	MDMA	Mount Pleasant	20	125	25
	2013	Anxiety	MDMA	Mount Pleasant	16	125	40
	2018	Anxiety	MDMA	Charleston	26	125	43
Moreno	2006	Anxiety	Psilocybin	Tucson	9	14	37.5
Nielson	2018	Addiction	Psilocybin	New York	10	28	55
Noorani	2018	Addiction	Psilocybin	Baltimore	12	25	60
Oehen	2013	Anxiety	MDMA	Biberist	12	125	9.1
O'Alora	2018	Anxiety	MDMA	Boulder	28	112.5	19
Palhano-Fontes	2018	Anxiety	Ayahuasca	Natal	29	25	21
Roseman	2018	Depression	Psilocybin	London	9	17.5	50
Ross	2016	Depression	Psilocybin	New York	29	21	24
Stroud	2018	Depression	Psilocybin	London	34	17.5	42
Swift	2017	Depression	Psilocybin	Baltimore	13	21	0
Thomas	2013	Addiction	Ayahuasca	Victoria	12	41	13.5
Wagner	2017	Anxiety	MDMA	Mount Pleasant	20	125	9.7
Watts	2017	Depression	Psilocybin	London	7	17.5	50
Wilkinson	2018	All mental health	Ketamine	New Haven	167	0	18

Discussion

The main goal of this study was to determine the feasibility of using the SENSOR System for scientific reviews. The study specifically examined the technical process of data input and dashboard using an existing review article. Despite the inherent challenges of the literature examined, and the technological constraints, the data from the index trials were clearly and dynamically presented in the resulting dashboard.

We believe if employed properly this approach could offer an alternative to the traditional dissemination of scientific reviews in various scientific and clinical fields. The applications could include rebooting traditional review articles, journal or organization specific

dashboards summarizing existing literature selectively open to certain authors, or systems designed to direct future inquiry for validation and discovery purposes. See table 3 for proposed advantages of the SENSOR System.

As the technology and guidelines for these systems evolve there is an opportunity to standardize reporting, centralize legacy datasets, streamline the submission process, improve collaboration between researchers, measure relative contribution of participating authors, and improve patient involvement.

Limitations include accuracy of the conveyed data included heterogeneity of study design, dosing, indications, and outcome measures. In addition, further research would be required to formally test usability, applicability and

adaptations when compared to the traditional non-digitized scientific review methods. Finally, organizations will have to ensure the appropriate infrastructure is in place to manage these systems overtime. This will require an

understanding of the resources and effort for the various components such data entry, dashboard management and dissemination. For limitations and challenges see table 4.

Table 3: Proposed Advantages of the SENSOR System for Scientific Reviews

Collaboration	Tasks easily shared amongst team members
Comparability	Outcomes can be standardized/benchmarked for appraisal
Visual Appeal	Improves readability and synthesis of information
Data Management	Can organize notes and articles for easy access and sharing
Dynamic	Explore data based on pre specified metrics
Flexibility	Can update with new research or adapt to different types of data
Error Tracking	Can easily update or correct errors
Objectivity	Approach may limit bias given nature of data entry
Cost	Low cost to no cost digital infrastructure
Efficiency	Reduces the redundancy of multiple written reviews on the same topic

Table 4: Challenges and Limitations of the SENSOR System in reviewing Clinical Applications of Psychedelics

Consistency	Determining whether to report responder rate vs absolute changes
Measures	Various heterogeneous outcomes measures used requiring standardized reporting
Methods	Various trial designs including qualitative and crossover which complicated interpretation and control comparisons
Results	Absolute changes compared to total outcome scored preferred where possible and total scoring available, whereas reports often focused on relative benefit
Completeness	Variable data types, methods of presentation and inclusiveness based on report therefore only results from primary scales were included
Critical Appraisal	Can be itemized to a degree, but insights and opinion for peer review can be limited depending on system design
Technology	Access and comfort with technology may limit utility for some authors
Overlap	Multiple studies from a single patient population were reported independently for this illustration but ideally treated as a single study with multiple outcomes in the future
Reporting	Not amenable static print or digital publications or traditional reporting structure

Conclusion

Creation of a system for standardized data entry and dashboards for reviews of scientific studies

is a feasible alternative and/or adjunct to the dissemination of summaries through traditional scientific review. There are numerous proposed advantages of the flexible, dynamic, and graphical display that requires further validation.

References

1 Rappale C (2011) The role of the critical review article in alleviating information overload. Annual Reviews White Paper. Available:

2 Pautasso M (2010) Worsening file-drawer problem in the abstracts of natural, medical and social science databases. *Scientometrics* 85: 193–202

3 Pautasso M. Ten simple rules for writing a literature review. *PLoS Comput Biol.* 2013;9(7):e1003149.

4 Khoo CSG, Na JC, Jaidka K (2011) Analysis of the macro-level discourse structure of literature reviews. *Online Info Rev* 35: 255–271

5 Cook DA, West CP (2012) Conducting systematic reviews in medical education: a stepwise approach. *Med Educ* 46: 943–952 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2012.04328.x

6 Rosenfeld RM (1996) How to systematically review the medical literature. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 115: 53–63 doi:10.1016/S0194-5998(96)70137-7

7 Ketcham CM, Crawford JM (2007) The impact of review articles. *Lab Invest* 87: 1174–1185

8 Ridley D (2008) The literature review: a step-by-step guide for students. London: SAGE.

9 Carnwell R, Daly W (2001) Strategies for the construction of a critical review of the literature. *Nurse Educ Pract* 1: 57–63

10 Dijkers M (2009) The Task Force on Systematic Reviews and Guidelines (2009) The value of “traditional” reviews in the era of systematic reviewing. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 88: 423–430 doi:10.1097/PHM.0b013e31819c59c6

12 Cukier, K., 2010. A special report on managing information. *The Economist* 394 (8671), 3e18.

13 Rebolj, D., Sturm, P.J., 1999. A GIS based component-oriented integrated system for estimation, visualization and analysis of road traffic air pollution. *Environ. Model. Software* 14, 531e539.

14 Ware, C., 2000. Information Visualization: Perception for Design. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, San Francisco CA

15 Kelleher, C.A., & Wagener, T. (2011). Ten guidelines for effective data visualization in scientific publications. *Environ. Model. Softw.*, 26, 822-827.

16 Jeong, S., Liang, Y., Liang, X., 2006. Design of an integrated data retrieval, analysis, and visualization system: application in the hydrology domain. *Environ. Model. Software* 21 (12), 1722e1740

17 Ogan M. Yigitbasioglu, Oana Velcu, A review of dashboards in performance management: Implications for design and research, *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, Volume 13, Issue 1, 2012, Pages 41-59,

18 Wheeler, S. W., & Dyer, N. L. (2020). A systematic review of psychedelic-assisted psychotherapy for mental health: An evaluation of the current wave of research and suggestions for the future. *Psychology of Consciousness: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 7(3), 279–315.

19 Wilkinson ST, Ballard ED, Bloch MH, Mathew SJ, Murrough JW, Feder A, Sos P, Wang G, Zarate CA Jr, Sanacora G. The Effect of a Single Dose of Intravenous Ketamine on Suicidal Ideation: A Systematic Review and Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2018 Feb

20 Swift TC, Belser AB, Agin-Liebes G, et al. Cancer at the Dinner Table: Experiences of Psilocybin-Assisted Psychotherapy for the Treatment of Cancer-Related Distress. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*. 2017;57(5):488-519.