

From Pre-test and Post-test Probabilities to Medical Decision Making

Michelle Pistner Nixon¹, Farhani Momotaz,¹ Claire Smith²,
Jeffrey S. Smith^{3, 4, 5}, Mark Sendak⁶, Christopher Polage⁷, Justin
D. Silverman^{1, 8, 9*}

¹College of Information Science and Technology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.

²Hematology and Medical Oncology, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA.

³Department of Biological Chemistry and Molecular Pharmacology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA.

⁴Department of Dermatology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Brigham and Women's Hospital, and Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA.

⁵Dermatology Program, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, MA.

⁶Duke Institute for Health Innovation, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC.

⁷Department of Pathology, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC.

⁸Department of Statistics, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.

⁹Department of Medicine, Pennsylvania State University, Hershey, PA.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): JustinSilverman@psu.edu;

Abstract

Background: A central goal of modern evidence-based medicine is the development of simple and easy to use tools that help clinicians integrate quantitative information into medical decision-making. The Bayesian Pre-test/Post-test Probability (BPP) framework is arguably the most well known of such tools and provides a formal approach to quantify diagnostic uncertainty given the result of a medical test or the presence of a clinical sign. Yet, clinical decision-making goes beyond quantifying diagnostic uncertainty and requires that that uncertainty be balanced against the various costs and benefits associated with each possible decision. Despite increasing attention in recent years, simple and flexible approaches to quantitative clinical decision-making have remained elusive.

Methods: We extend the BPP framework using concepts of Bayesian Decision Theory. By integrating cost, we can expand the BPP framework to allow for clinical decision-making.

047 **Results:** We develop a simple quantitative framework for binary clinical deci-
048 sions (e.g., action/inaction, treat/no-treat, test/no-test). Let p be the pre-test or
049 post-test probability that a patient has disease. We show that $r^* = (1 - p)/p$
050 represents a critical value called a decision boundary. In terms of the relative
051 cost of under- to over-acting, r^* represents the critical value at which action
052 and inaction are equally optimal. We demonstrate how this decision boundary
053 can be used at the bedside through case studies and as a research tool through
054 a reanalysis of a recent study which found widespread misestimation of pre-test
055 and post-test probabilities among clinicians.

056 **Conclusions:** Our approach is so simple that it should be thought of as a core,
057 yet previously overlooked, part of the BPP framework. Unlike prior approaches
058 to quantitative clinical decision-making, our approach requires little more than a
059 hand-held calculator, is applicable in almost any setting where the BPP frame-
060 work can be used, and excels in situations where the costs and benefits associated
061 with a particular decision are patient-specific and difficult to quantify.

062 **Keywords:** Pre-Test/Post-Test Probabilities, Bayesian Decision Theory
063

064
065
066

067 1 Introduction

068

069
070 The Bayesian Pre-test/Post-test Probability (BPP) framework provides a quantitative
071 framework for expressing diagnostic uncertainty and updating that uncertainty given
072 clinical signs or test results. The BPP framework is used as a tool at the bedside, in
073 the classroom, and as part of medical research [1]. Yet the BPP framework is only one
074 part of what could be a much larger toolkit that clinicians, educators, and researchers
075 could employ.
076
077
078
079

080 Though often discussed in the context of clinical decision-making [2, 3], the BPP
081 framework is insufficient for it: while pre- and post-test probabilities represent beliefs
082 in the disease state of a patient, clinical decision-making requires that diagnostic
083 uncertainty be balanced against various cost and benefits factors. For example, a
084 decision to treat must consider not only the probability that a patient has the disease
085 in question but also the safety and efficacy of the proposed treatment. Yet these costs
086 and benefits are often difficult to quantify, e.g., consider quantifying the psycho-social
087 costs of a prophylactic bilateral mastectomy in a BRCA1 carrier. In short, quantitative
088
089
090
091
092

approaches to clinical decision-making goes beyond the BPP framework and requires 093
balancing diagnostic uncertainty with patient-specific, difficult-to-quantify cost and 094
benefit factors. 095
096

Despite the challenges, there is a rich history of methods that have been devel- 098
oped for quantitative clinical decision-making. Yet most of these methods have either 099
required complex computational models that cannot be easily performed at the bed- 100
side [4-6] or are specialized to a particular decision task (such as aspirin treatment 101
for pre-eclampsia prevention [7]). The key exception is the almost 50 year old work 102
by Pauker and Kassirer [8] which provides a flexible general purpose approach to 103
action/inaction (e.g., treat/no-treat or test/no-test) decisions that is simple enough to 104
be applied at the bedside or discussed easily in a classroom. The Pauker and Kassirer 105
(PK) framework combines diagnostic uncertainty with quantified costs and benefits to 106
determine a treatment threshold based on probability: a decision boundary between 107
action and inaction stated in terms of diagnostic uncertainty. Despite the maturity of 108
that work, it has not seen widespread adoption. While it is still discussed in certain 109
educational settings (e.g., Newman and Kohn [9], Chapter 2), when compared to the 110
BPP framework, it is largely unknown. We argue that the major limitation of the 111
PK framework, which has limited its adoption, is its requirement that all costs and 112
benefits be pre-specified and explicitly quantified. 113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123

The purpose of this article is to review the PK framework and to propose a simple 124
reformulation that addresses its major limitation. In brief, the PK framework requires 125
that all costs and benefits be specified *a priori*. With these specified costs, a decision 126
boundary p^* can be calculated which represents the probability of disease at which 127
action and inaction are equally optimal. A clinician-calculated probability p can then 128
be compared to p^* to determine whether action or inaction are warranted. Here we 129
show that the decision boundary p^* can be reformulated in such a way that it can 130
be calculated without requiring pre-specification of all costs and benefits. We call 131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138

139 this the *Simplified PK* (SPK) framework. We discuss the SPK framework in clinical
140 and educational contexts through a series of hypothetical case studies. In addition,
141 we illustrate its use as a research tool through a reanalysis of a study which found
142 widespread overestimation of disease probabilities among clinicians [10]. Unlike prior
143 analyses of that data, our results suggest that this over inflation may not be due to
144 errors in clinical perception but instead a bluntness of the survey instrument used.
145
146
147
148

149
150

151 **2 Methods**

152
153

154 **2.1 Probabilities and Odds**

155

156 We use p to denote the probability that a patient is in an *actionable state*. The precise
157 definition of actionable state will depend on the clinical decision under question. For
158 example, when deciding whether or not to treat with an antibiotic, p could represent
159 the probability that a patient has an infection treatable with the antibiotic. At times,
160 it will be more natural to state our results in terms of odds rather than probabilities.
161 Probabilities (p) can be calculated from odds (o) and vice versa using the following
162 two relationships:

163

164 Probabilities (p) can be calculated from odds (o) and vice versa using the following
165 two relationships:

166

$$167 \quad p = \frac{o}{o + 1} \quad \text{and} \quad o = \frac{p}{1 - p}.$$

168
169
170

171

172 **2.2 Review of the BPP Framework**

173

174 Bayesian statistics provides a quantitative tool for updating prior beliefs (quantified
175 as probabilities or odds) based on observed data. Compared to the full framework of
176 Bayesian statistics, the BPP framework includes a critical simplification: the patient
177 state is binary (e.g., disease or health as opposed to mild/moderate/severe disease).
178 Under this simplification, Bayesian statistics reduces to the BPP framework.

179

180 Under this simplification, Bayesian statistics reduces to the BPP framework.

181

182 Let o_{pre} (or o_{post}) denote the odds of an actionable state before (or after) observing
183 a particular diagnostic test or clinical sign. With this notation, the BPP framework
184

can be written as

$$o_{\text{post}} = \ell \times o_{\text{pre}} \quad (1)$$

where ℓ is the likelihood ratio of the test or sign (a quantity capturing the evidence provided by the observed data). In short, given a clinician specified pre-test odds and given the likelihood ratio of a particular sign or test, the BPP framework computes an updated (post-test) odds. More discussion on the BPP framework in the context of medical decision-making can be found in Mark and Wong [11] or Armstrong and Metlay [12].

A note on notation: Much of what follows can be applied equally well to pre-test probabilities (or pre-test odds) as to post-test probabilities (or post-test odds). Therefore, we will often drop the subscript *pre* or *post* and simply write p or o .

2.3 BDT and the Pauker-Kassirer (PK) Framework

Bayesian Decision Theory (BDT) extends Bayesian statistics and provides a principled approach to making decisions under uncertainty. Compared to Bayesian statistics, BDT requires an additional user input: a cost function which takes two inputs and outputs a number between negative and positive infinity. The two inputs are the patient state and a potential action. The numerical output represents the *cost* or *loss* incurred by a given action and state of patient combination. Costs are a general concept and may incorporate medical, monetary, psycho-social, or even opportunity costs that may result from a given action. Negative costs are often called benefits. Were the patient state known exactly, BDT would reduce to finding the action that minimizes cost. Uncertainty in the state of the patient complicates the problem. To address this, BDT defines an optimal action (the “Bayes action”) as the action that minimizes the *expected cost*: the cost weighted by the probability of disease or no disease.

Optimizing expected cost often involves advanced numerical techniques, as seen in many prior articles in medicine [4–6]. We follow Pauker and Kassirer [8] and take a

231 simpler approach. Beyond the standard simplifying assumption of the BPP framework
232 (that the patient state is binary), we also assume that the considered action is binary
233 (e.g., test/no test or treat/no treat). This implies that there are four combinations of
234 action and patient state, each with an associated cost: accurate action ($c_{\text{accurate action}}$,
235 e.g., treating with disease), accurate inaction ($c_{\text{accurate inaction}}$, e.g., treating with no
236 disease), inaccurate action ($c_{\text{inaccurate action}}$, e.g., treating with no disease), and inac-
237 curate inaction ($c_{\text{inaccurate inaction}}$, e.g., not treating with disease). Using shorthand,
238 we denote these as c_{aa} , c_{ai} , c_{ia} , and c_{ii} , respectively. Letting that p denote the prob-
239 ability of an actionable state (e.g., disease), the expected cost of action (or inaction)
240 decisions is then given by:
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249

$$\text{Expected Cost(action)} = pc_{aa} + (1 - p)c_{ia}$$

$$\text{Expected Cost(inaction)} = (1 - p)c_{ai} + pc_{ii}.$$

250
251
252
253
254 The Bayes action is action or inaction depending on whether Expected Cost(action)
255 or Expected Cost(inaction) is less.
256
257

258 Given the four cost values $\{c_{aa}, c_{ia}, c_{ai}, c_{ii}\}$, Pauker and Kassirer [8] suggest calcu-
259 lating the threshold probability p^* needed to warrant action. That is, p^* is the specific
260 probability at which Expected Cost(action) and Expected Cost(inaction) are equal. A
261 physician calculated probability p (e.g., calculated using the BPP framework) can be
262 compared to p^* to determine if action or inaction is optimal. They showed that this
263 threshold was equal to:
264
265
266

$$p^* = \frac{1}{r + 1} \tag{2}$$

267 where

$$r = \frac{c_{\text{under-action}}}{c_{\text{over-action}}} = \frac{c_{ii} - c_{aa}}{c_{ia} - c_{ai}}.$$

271 The term $c_{\text{under-action}}$ represents difference in costs between inaccurate and accurate
272 action when a patient is in a state that warrants action. Similarly, the term $c_{\text{over-action}}$
273
274
275
276

represents the difference in costs between inaccurate and accurate action when the patient is in an state that warrants no action. In essence, these two terms represents the additional cost of choosing the wrong action over the correct. We refer to these two terms as the cost of under-action and over-action, respectively.

Overall, what we call the PK framework consists of first quantifying the four cost values, calculating the ratio of the costs of under- to over-action and then comparing the resulting action threshold p^* against a physician-calculated (or specified) probability of an actionable state p .

2.4 The SPK Framework

The major limitation of the PK framework is the need to pre-specify the four cost values in order to calculate the decision boundary p^* . Especially when the costs or benefits of a potential action are patient-specific or even qualitative, it can be impossible to use the PK framework. Yet, we can mitigate this limitation of the PK framework by framing the same decision boundary in terms of a critical value for the ratio $r = c_{\text{under-action}}/c_{\text{over-action}}$ rather than a critical value for the probability p :

$$r^* = \frac{1}{o} = \frac{1-p}{p}. \quad (3)$$

Equation (3) (SPK Framework) represents the same decision boundary as Equation (2) (PK Framework) but is presented differently (see Supplementary Section 1, Additional File 1 for derivation). Yet, we expect Equation (3) will be substantially easier to use than Equation (2). Consider that Equation (2) requires that all four costs values be specified in order to calculate p^* . In contrast, Equation (3) requires only that a probability p or odds o be specified. Given the ubiquity of the BPP framework, we expect the later will be substantially easier than the former: any clinician already using the BPP framework can essentially calculate r^* for free (without further input).

323 There are two main ways to use Equation (3) depending on whether or not the four
324 cost values $\{c_{aa}, c_{ia}, c_{ai}, c_{ii}\}$ can be quantified. If those cost values cannot be specified,
325 e.g., if the costs are fundamentally qualitative and patient-specific, then Equation (3)
326 can be used as a qualitative tool to help incorporate diagnostic uncertainty into the
327 decision-making process. As an example, consider a patient with a 20% probability
328 of being in an actionable state. This implies a decision boundary $r^* = 4$. In words,
329 regardless of the particular action in question, *the cost of under-treating must be at*
330 *least 4 times higher than the cost of over-treating in order to warrant action in this*
331 *patient*. Even if the actual cost of under- and over-treating cannot be calculated, we
332 expect this result may help frame the decision and catalyze discussions about costs
333 and benefits. When costs can be quantified, clinicians can calculate r and compare it
334 to r^* to determine whether action or inaction is warranted. In Supplementary Section
335 1 (Additional File 1), we discuss how to compare r and r^* in more detail.
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345

346 **3 Applications**

347
348 We illustrate the SPK framework through a hypothetical case study of asymptomatic
349 bacteriuria and a reanalysis of a recent study which found widespread misestima-
350 tion of pre- and post-test probabilities by clinicians [10]. In Supplementary Section
351 2 (Additional File 1), we provide an additional case study designed to illustrate how
352 subjective and objective cost factors can be combined within the SPK framework. All
353 three of these applications are designed to highlight the use of the SPK framework in
354 situations where the PK framework cannot be applied: where it is difficult to specify
355 the four cost values *a priori*.
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363

364 **3.1 Case Study: Antibiotics for Asymptomatic Bacteriuria**

365 Consider a healthy, non-pregnant, pre-menopausal 35-year-old woman diagnosed with
366 asymptomatic gram negative bacteriuria by urine culture, with no recent history of
367
368

Urinary Tract Infections (UTIs). Based on this presentation, prior work suggests that
this patient has an approximately 6% probability of progressing from asymptomatic
bacteriuria to symptomatic bacteriuria [13, 14]. Let this probability denote a post-
test probability, where the state in question is whether the patient’s pathology will
progress to symptomatic bacteriuria. We must decide whether to treat this patient
with antibiotics at this time or wait and reevaluate if symptoms present.

Regardless of whether this 6% represents a pre-test or post-test probability, it is
enough to calculate the decision boundary: $r^* = \frac{1-0.06}{0.06} = 16$. In words: *Given our
diagnostic uncertainty, the cost of under-treating must be at least 16 times greater than
the cost of over-treating to warrant treatment.*

In this situation, we expect that many clinicians will find it difficult to apply the
PK framework directly: it is difficult to quantify the cost of under- and over-treating as
there are many considerations including morbidity, monetary, and public-health (e.g.,
antibiotic resistance) costs. Even if all these costs could be specified exactly, combining
them into an overall cost of over- and under-treating is not straightforward. Despite
these challenges, we show that the decision boundary, particularly its translation into
words, provides insights for contextualizing the decision in terms of diagnostic uncer-
tainty. As a starting point, we suggest considering each type of cost individually (e.g.,
monetary, morbidity, and public health), from most to least important. If these costs
agree on which decision is optimal, the choice of treatment decision is obvious. If they
do not agree, we suggest careful consideration of which costs are most important and
how strongly each cost supports its preferred decision.

In this case, we consider morbidity, public health, and monetary costs in that order.
Either individually, or in concert with the patient, we would consider the following
question: “Is the morbidity associated with under-treating at least 16 times greater
than that of over-treating?” In our reading of the literature [15, 16], we expect that the
morbidity associated with under-treating is likely higher than the morbidity associated

415 with over-treating, yet we expect it is not 16 times greater especially when the low
416 probability of progression to pyelonephritis and the probability of adverse reactions
417 to antibiotics are considered. Therefore, considering morbidity alone we consider that
418 no-treatment is warranted at this time. Additionally, after asking analogous questions
419 about the monetary and public health costs, we believe the costs are higher in the case
420 of over-treating. In sum, our suggestion would be to not treat this patient at this time
421 but to pursue watchful waiting. This conclusion is supported by current treatment
422 recommendations for asymptomatic bacteriuria in healthy non-pregnant persons [17].
423
424
425
426
427
428
429

430 **3.2 Reevaluating the Source of Inflated Probability Estimates** 431 **among Clinicians** 432 433

434
435 In a study of 553 medical practitioners presented with four different clinical scenarios,
436 Morgan et al. [10] found widespread over-estimation of both pre-test and post-test
437 probabilities compared to objective probability estimates. The results of this study
438 are significant and led to a conversation about potential biases affecting the observed
439 inflation (for example, see Chaitoff [18]; Patel and Goodman [19]). Current hypothe-
440 ses include various factors that confound physicians' perceptions and interpretations
441 of medical tests [10, 20]. For example, Kellner [20] suggests this over-estimation comes
442 from less-experienced physicians included in the study cohort. While we do not doubt
443 that such factors are at play, we hypothesize that the observed inflation may result
444 from a bluntness of the survey instrument used to elicit physician probability estimates.
445 What if the physicians surveyed included in their reported probabilities considera-
446 tion of various cost factors: e.g., a physician asked to quantify the probability of
447 disease might modify their probability estimates based the risk of missing a diagnosis.
448 Assuming that the cost of under-treatment is greater than the cost of over-treatment,
449 we expect that such conflation would lead reported probability estimates to exceed
450 objective probability estimates, exactly as reported in Morgan et al. [10].
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460

The SPK framework can be used to gauge the plausibility of this hypothesis. Let us suppose that our hypothesis is true: the Morgan et al. [10] survey elicited a physician's *probability to act* (p_{act}) rather than their estimation of the probability of disease (p_{disease}). Further, let us assume that clinicians' perceptions about disease probabilities are accurate: physicians' true estimates of p_{disease} are equal to their objective values. Let us assume that the probability that a physician will act is proportional to their perceptions about the expected cost of action. Using this later assumption, we can calculate the physicians perceptions about the relative cost of under- to over-treating (the *implied cost-ratio*) as:

$$r = \frac{p_{\text{act}}(1 - p_{\text{disease}})}{p_{\text{disease}}(1 - p_{\text{act}})}.$$

See Supplementary Section 3.1, Additional File 1 for derivation.

Below, we reanalyze the results of Morgan et al. [10] and calculate implied cost-ratios for three diseases studied in that work. We argue that the implied cost ratios are defensible given current evidence. In short, we are able to provide a model for the inflated probability estimates observed in Morgan et al. [10] based only on a bluntness of the survey instrument and without requiring overt errors in clinical perception.

3.2.1 Re-analyzing Morgan et al.

We calculated implied cost ratios for three of the four clinical scenarios studied in Morgan et al. [10]: pneumonia, breast cancer, and coronary artery disease. We excluded the asymptomatic bacteriuria scenario from our reanalysis due to concerns about the accuracy of the survey data (see Supplementary Section 3.2, Additional File 1 for details). The resulting cost-ratios are 15.8 for the pneumonia scenario, 16.7 for the breast-cancer scenario, and 21.4 for the coronary artery disease scenario.

We argue that these implied cost ratios could represent realistic clinical attitudes towards risk. To justify our opinion, we provide an example clinical argument justifying the 16.7 breast-cancer cost-ratio in Supplementary Section 3.3, Additional File

507 1. Moreover, we can compare to prior literature which studied physicians' attitudes
508 towards the risk of over- and under-treating patients with pneumonia [21]. Based on
509 that prior literature, we estimate a pneumonia cost-ratio of 14.7 (see Supplementary
510 Section 3.4, Additional File 1). We suggest that the correspondence between that
511 result and the estimated results from Morgan et al. [10] is a strong argument that
512 these implied cost ratios reflect potentially realistic clinician attitudes towards risk.
513 Together, this suggests that the inflated probability reported by Morgan et al. [10] may
514 not be due to altered physician perceptions but may instead be due to a bluntness of
515 the survey instrument. Overall, our results strongly suggest that future research should
516 consider that physicians may conflate probabilities of disease with factors affecting
517 decisions to act.

525

526

527

528

529 **4 Discussion**

530

531 We introduced the Simplified PK (SPK) Framework as a flexible and easy-to-use tool
532 for medical decision-making when there is uncertainty in the state of the patient. This
533 SPK framework translates disease probabilities into quantitative statements about
534 the ratio of benefits to costs. For a clinician already using the BPP framework, our
535 approach is essentially free: simply invert an odds of disease.

536 The SPK framework does not replace more advanced decision support models such
537 as Parmigiani [4], Kornak and Lu [5], or Skaltsa et al. [6]. Those methods address
538 more complex decision tasks where either the patient state or the potential action is
539 not binary. The SPK framework is meant to fill a need unmet by those tools: a flexible
540 framework for quantitative decision making that matches the simplicity and ease of
541 use of the BPP framework. In this way, the SPK framework fills much of the same gap
542 as the PK framework [8] yet is easier to use in that it does not require pre-specification
543 and quantification of relevant costs and benefits in order to use.

Beyond clinical practice, we expect that the SPK Framework will be useful in 553
medical education. Much as the BPP framework provides a formal language for inter- 554
preting the value of a medical test, the SPK framework provides a formal language for 555
medical decision-making. Educators can use this language to discuss the intricacies 556
of medical decision making and to explain their own decisions to students. Moreover, 557
this framework will clarify the distinction between quantifying the state of a patient 558
and quantifying costs associated with over- and under-treating. 559
560
561
562
563

Finally, we proposed a new interpretation of the results of Morgan et al. [10]. 564
Beyond the factors already suggested, we argue that physicians may conflate the 565
probability of disease with the costs of over- and under-treating, which would appear 566
as over-estimation of pre- and post-test probabilities. While we believe this topic 567
requires further study, given the present evidence, we suggest that future studies look- 568
ing to elicit clinician estimated pre-test or post-test probabilities also survey attitudes 569
towards costs and actions (see Heckerling et al. [21] and Baghdadi et al. [22] for prac- 570
tical examples). Notably, this recommendation has been made elsewhere albeit due to 571
different concerns [19]. 572
573
574
575
576
577
578

There are countless avenues for future study of the SPK framework; we high- 579
light three. First, many papers support the BPP framework by providing quantitative 580
estimate for likelihood ratios of different clinical signs and tests (e.g., Coburn et al. 581
[23]). In fact, these papers can be useful in estimating decision boundary for the SPK 582
framework. Future studies can similarly support both the PK and SPK framework by 583
providing clear statements and quantification of cost-ratios. Beyond this, we note that 584
more objective measures such as hazard ratios or odds ratios represent forms of cost- 585
ratios that can be used in the SPK framework. Second, we have only demonstrated 586
a very restricted set of tools for evaluating cost-ratios. A wide literature on eliciting 587
decision makers preferences could be applied to quantify clinicians' and patients' atti- 588
tudes towards costs [24, 25]. Finally, we have not addressed potential conflicts between 589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598

599 clinicians' and patients' attitudes towards cost though such conflicts exist. We imagine
600 that future studies may find the SPK framework useful in mitigating these conflicts
601 as it may catalyze discussions about costs.
602
603

604

605 **Additional Files**

606

607

608 Supplementary materials and information can be found in the 'Additional File 1' pdf.

609

610

611 **Declarations**

612

613

614 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

615

616 Not applicable.

617

618

619 **Consent for publication**

620

621 Not applicable.

622

623

624 **Availability of data and materials**

625

626 Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed

627 during the current study.

628

629

630 **Competing interests**

631

632 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

633

634

635 **Funding**

636

637 JDS and MPN were supported by NIH 1 R01GM 148972-01.

638

639

640 **Authors' contributions**

641

642 MPN, JDS, and FM conceptualized the SPK framework and its supporting mathe-

643

644 matical details. JDS, CS, and JSS developed the arguments for bacteriuria and breast

cancer case studies. MS and CP suggested the connection to Morgan et al. which was
further developed by MPN and JDS. MPN and FM found and analyzed the neces-
sary data to support the case studies and implemented any necessary software code.
MPN and JDS prepared the original draft. All authors read and approved the final
manuscript.

References

- [1] Brush JE, Lee M, Sherbino J, Taylor-Fishwick JC, Norman G. Effect of teaching Bayesian methods using learning by concept vs learning by example on medical students' ability to estimate probability of a diagnosis: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;2(12):e1918023–e1918023.
- [2] Aykal G, Kesapli M, Aydin O, et al. Pre-Test and post-test applications to shape the education of phlebotomists in a quality management program: an experience in a training hospital. *J Med Biochem*. 2016 Sep;35(3):347–353. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jomb-2016-0011>.
- [3] Baez AA, Cochon L, Nicolas JM. A Bayesian decision support sequential model for severity of illness predictors and intensive care admissions in pneumonia. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2019;19(1):1–9.
- [4] Parmigiani G. Measuring uncertainty in complex decision analysis models. *Stat Methods Med Res*. 2002;11(6):513–537.
- [5] Kornak J, Lu Y. Bayesian decision analysis for choosing between diagnostic/prognostic prediction procedures. *Stat Interface*. 2011;4(1):27.
- [6] Skaltsa K, Jover L, Carrasco JL. Estimation of the diagnostic threshold accounting for decision costs and sampling uncertainty. *Biom J*. 2010;52(5):676–697.

- 691 [7] Wright D, Wright A, Tan MY, Nicolaides KH. When to give aspirin to prevent
692 preeclampsia: application of Bayesian decision theory. *Am J Obstet and Gynecol.*
693 2022;226(2):S1120–S1125.
694
695
696 [8] Pauker SG, Kassirer JP. Therapeutic decision making: a cost-benefit analy-
697 sis. *New Engl J of Med.* 1975 Jul;293(5):229–234. [https://doi.org/10.1056/](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM197507312930505)
698 [NEJM197507312930505](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM197507312930505).
699
700
701 [9] Newman TB, Kohn MA. Evidence-based diagnosis: an introduction to clinical
702 epidemiology. Cambridge University Press; 2020.
703
704
705 [10] Morgan DJ, Pineles L, Owczarzak J, et al. Accuracy of practitioner esti-
706 mates of probability of diagnosis before and after testing. *JAMA Intern Med.*
707 2021;181(6):747–755.
708
709
710 [11] Mark DB, Wong JB. Decision-making in clinical medicine. In: Loscalzo J, Fauci
711 A, Kasper D, et al., editors. *Harrison’s Principles of Internal Medicine.* vol. 22.
712 McGraw-Hill; 2022. p. 1–16.
713
714
715 [12] Armstrong KA, Metlay JP. Annals clinical decision making: using a diagnostic
716 test. *Ann Intern Med.* 2020;172(9):604–609.
717
718
719 [13] Hooton TM, Scholes D, Stapleton AE, et al. A Prospective Study of asymp-
720 tomatic bacteriuria in sexually active young women. *New Engl J of Med.* 2000
721 Oct;343(14):992–997. <https://doi.org/10.1056/nejm200010053431402>.
722
723
724 [14] Hooton TM, Roberts PL, Stapleton AE. Asymptomatic bacteriuria and pyuria
725 in premenopausal women. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2020 Mar;72(8):1332–1338. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa274>.
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736

[15] Mohsen S, Dickinson JA, Somayaji R. Update on the adverse effects of antimicrobial therapies in community practice. *Can Fam Physician*. 2020;66(9):651–659. 737
738
739
740

[16] Barry HC, Ebell MH, Hickner J. Evaluation of suspected urinary tract infection in ambulatory women: a cost-utility analysis of office-based strategies. *J of Fam Pract*. 1997;44(1):49–60. 741
742
743
744
745
746

[17] Nicolle LE, Gupta K, Bradley SF, Colgan R, DeMuri GP, Drekonja D, et al. Clinical practice guideline for the management of asymptomatic bacteriuria: 2019 update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2019;68(10):e83–e110. 747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754

[18] Chaitoff A. Uncertainty in medicine. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2021;181(10):1416–1417. 755
756

[19] Patel JJ, Goodman R. Uncertainty in medicine. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2021;181(10):1417–1418. 757
758
759
760

[20] Kellner P. Needed point of care information for value and for shared decision-making. Published comment in *JAMA Intern Med*. 2015;. 761
762
763
764

[21] Heckerling PS, Tape TG, Wigton RS. Relation of physicians' predicted probabilities of pneumonia to their utilities for ordering chest x-rays to detect pneumonia. *Med Decis Making*. 1992;12(1):32–38. 765
766
767
768
769
770

[22] Baghdadi JD, Korenstein D, Pineles L, et al. Exploration of primary care clinician attitudes and cognitive characteristics associated with prescribing antibiotics for asymptomatic bacteriuria. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(5):e2214268–e2214268. 771
772
773
774
775
776

[23] Coburn B, Morris AM, Tomlinson G, Detsky AS. Does this adult patient with suspected bacteremia require blood cultures? *JAMA*. 2012 Aug;308(5):502. 777
778
779
780
781
782

783 [24] Tsalatsanis A, Hozo I, Vickers A, Djulbegovic B. A regret theory approach to
784 decision curve analysis: A novel method for eliciting decision makers' preferences
785 and decision-making. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak. 2010 Sep;10(1). [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6947-10-51)
786 [org/10.1186/1472-6947-10-51](https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6947-10-51).
787
788
789
790 [25] Abernethy J, Evgeniou T, Toubia O, Vert JP. Eliciting consumer preferences
791 using robust adaptive choice questionnaires. IEEE Trans Knowl Data Eng. 2008
792 Feb;20(2):145–155. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tkde.2007.190632>.
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828