CLIAC Meeting Public Comment
March 7, 2013

Supportive of standardization

Let me preface this comment that I am strongly supportive of standardization of terminology and units for laboratory tests. I would like to point out that adding LOINC codes to an existing LIS order catalog is a very substantial and time consuming work effort because of the difficulty to determine the correct LOINC codes. Since many of the tools to determine the correct LOINC codes are still evolving, based on Dr. McDonald's excellent presentation, I question if it is premature to push ahead with LOINC coding at this time. The meaningful use requirement is that approximately 80% (I am not certain of this number) of the total number of laboratory results (not the number of test procedures) in an EMR be LOINC coded. My understanding is this requirement is interpreted that LOINC codes for approximately 70 (again and estimate) of the higher volume laboratory tests will satisfy the meaningful use requirement. Consequently, I wonder if achieving such a partial solution will only alter the current non-standardized situation to a different but still poorly standardized situation.

Greg Miller, Ph.D.
Professor of Pathology
Director of Clinical Chemistry
Director of Pathology Information Systems
Virginia Commonwealth University
403 N. 13th Street, Room 501
Richmond, VA 23298-0286

Telephone: 1-804-828-0375
Fax: 1-804-828-0353
Email: gmiller@vcu.edu