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How do people make difficult decisions in situations involving substantial risk and uncertainty? In this study, we presented a difficult medical decision to three expert physicians in a combined “thinking aloud” and “cross examination” experiment. Verbatim transcripts were analyzed using script analysis to observe the process of constructing and making the decision, and using referring phrase analysis to determine the representation of knowledge of likelihoods. These analyses are compared with a formal decision analysis of the same problem to highlight similarities and differences. The process of making the decision resembles an incremental, sequential-refinement planning algorithm, where a complex decision is broken into a sequence of choices to be made with a simplified description of the alternatives. This strategy results in certain kinds of relevant information being underweighted in the final decision. Knowledge of likelihood appears to be represented as symbolic descriptions capturing categorical and ordinal relations with “landmark” likelihoods, only some of which are described numerically. Numerical probabilities, capable of being combined and compared arithmetically, were not observed. These observations suggest an explanation for the heuristics and biases in human decision making under uncertainty in terms of the processes that manipulate symbolic descriptions of likelihoods and construct plans of action for situations involving risk and uncertainty.

1. INTRODUCTION

The critical decision between diagnostic and therapeutic alternatives faced by a physician is a paradigm example of decision making under uncertainty. Medical decision making is frequently characterized by the need to make
decisions in the face of incomplete knowledge of the patient's true condition and the therapeutic effect of a given management strategy.

People clearly have some knowledge of likelihood. They know that the risk of being struck by a meteorite is negligable, while the risk of being struck by an automobile is not. They know that the risk of an invasive test is greater than the risk of a noninvasive one. Many try to make substantial changes in lifestyle to reduce their risk of cancer or heart disease. However, people seldom know, describe, or utilize numerical values for these likelihoods, and their intuitive knowledge of these values and their abilities to compare the risks of widely different hazards are often quite poor (cf. Kahneman, Slovic, & Tversky, 1982). Formal decision analysis uses the mathematical concept of probability as a tool for describing partial knowledge of uncertain situations (Raiffa, 1970; Schwartz, Gorry, Kassirer, & Essig, 1973). Szolovitz and Pauker (1978) review the different representations of probabilistic knowledge in the first generation of rule-based and frame-based medical diagnosis programs: Mycin, Internist, Casnet, and the Present Illness Program. However, in everyday clinical practice, physicians rarely reason using mathematical probabilities nor do they compute expected utilities. When they do use numerical probabilities, they tend to make errors sufficiently important to result in erroneous medical practices (Eddy, 1982).

By carefully studying expert physicians solving a problem involving considerable uncertainty and risk, we can infer properties of the underlying knowledge representation and reasoning strategies they use to make difficult decisions. The analysis focuses on two separate but related aspects of the knowledge representation:

- the strategy for imposing structure on the decision problem, to decompose it into a set of manageable steps;
- the cognitive representation for likelihoods.

Shafer and Tversky (1985) argue that decision making under uncertainty can be viewed as a thought-experiment, designed and carried out to select a feasible set of elementary judgments, to estimate the required subjective likelihoods, and to combine them to yield the required decision. They illustrate how such experiments would be designed within the formal structures of Bayesian decision analysis (Raiffa, 1970) and the theory of belief functions (Shafer, 1976). This thought-experiment metaphor emphasizes that decisions are designed and constructed, and suggests certain empirical questions for study:

1. How are decisions actually designed and made in situations of risk and uncertainty.
2. How are individual judgments of subjective likelihoods obtained?

---

1 We reserve the term *probability* for mathematical probability: a measure of uncertainty as a real number between 0 and 1. We use the term *likelihood* for "subjective probabilities": knowledge of the fact that some events are more likely than others.
3. What is the cognitive representation of subjective likelihoods?

The second of these questions is the primary focus of studies by Kahneman, Tversky, and their colleagues (Kahneman, Slovic, & Tversky, 1982; Tversky & Kahneman, 1974), which document systematic biases in human decision making due to the heuristics used to estimate subjective likelihoods. The results presented here address the first and third questions through a protocol analysis experiment in which expert physicians were asked to make important clinical decisions under circumstances of considerable risk and uncertainty. We use a formal decision analysis of the same problem as a contrasting background for our findings.

In the next section, we describe the medical problem which we presented to physician subjects, along with a formal decision analysis that determines and compares the expected utilities of the different courses of action. The third section describes our protocol analysis methodology. The fourth section presents the results of the protocol analysis of two different aspects of the transcript: the structure of the decision-making process, and the representation of knowledge of likelihood. The fifth section discusses the implications of these observations.

2. THE CASE OF THE PULMONARY INFILTRATES

Three expert pulmonary physicians (specialists in lung disease) were asked to comment on a case selected from the records of the New England Medical Center.

The patient selected for study was a 63-year-old man with preleukemia, a disorder of blood cell production that progresses to overt leukemia. During the year following this diagnosis the patient received multiple blood transfusions to treat the anemia associated with this disease. Additionally, during that period he developed mucormycosis of the nasal sinuses, a fungal infection that primarily affects patients with compromised immune defenses. Although this infection was successfully controlled with the antifungal drug amphotericin B, the patient developed kidney toxicity from the drug, which resulted in a mild loss of kidney function.

The immediate problem concerns an acute illness that started with several days of fever, which prompted the patient to seek medical attention. A chest x-ray revealed that the patient had pneumonia involving both lungs diffusely. Further testing after admission to the hospital confirmed that the patient had compromised immune defenses and that his respiratory function was impaired by the pneumonia. While diagnostic sputum cultures were incubating, the patient was treated empirically2 with antibiotics that would effectively treat all likely causative microorganisms except fungi. This therapeutic exception was made to avoid the toxic effects of the anti-

---

2 "Empiric treatment" is therapy directed at a condition whose diagnosis is strongly suspected but not confirmed.
fungal drug (as noted above) and because a fungus was not thought likely to be the cause of his pneumonia at that point. After three days of treatment, however, the patient did not improve and the cultures did not grow a microorganism which could account for the pneumonia.

Faced with the urgency of treating this seriously ill patient, a clear decision-making dilemma emerged. The subjects had to make a choice to either

1. perform a lung biopsy to try to establish whether the patient had fungal pneumonia, in which case he would be treated with antifungal drugs despite the risk of such treatment, or
2. decide not to carry out a biopsy, but add antifungal drugs empirically to treat the possibility that the pneumonia is fungal in origin.

Each option has its own risks and benefits. Performing a lung biopsy, an invasive procedure, can itself result in death (1.5% of the time in a patient this ill), and will fail to identify the fungus 5% of the time when it is present. However, the great majority of the time, the patient will make it through the biopsy, and will be exposed to the toxicity of antifungal drugs only when the fungus is identified in the biopsy specimen. Empiric therapy avoids the risk of the biopsy procedure, but treats the patient whether the fungus is present or not. Of course, this approach may unnecessarily expose the patient to the drug's toxicity, which may result in kidney failure and death.

To complicate matters further, the physicians had two types of biopsy procedures available to them: open lung biopsy and transbronchoscopic lung biopsy. An open lung biopsy requires that the patient be given general anesthesia, the chest opened and a piece of the lung tissue removed. Transbronchoscopic biopsy, which does not require general anesthesia, involves placing a bronchoscope (a flexible tube through which the lung passages are directly visualized) into the patient's airways, passing a probe through the bronroscope across the surface of the airway, and nipping a fragment of the lung tissue. The advantage of the open lung biopsy is that a larger piece of the lung tissue is taken, increasing the chance that a fungal organism, if present, will be identified. However, the tradeoff is that open lung biopsy is more risky than the transbronchoscopic biopsy, with a mortality risk of 1.5% versus 0.2% with transbronchoscopic biopsy.

2.1. Formal Decision Analysis

Formal decision analysis (Kassirer, 1976, Raiffa, 1970; Schwartz, Gorry, Kassirer & Essig, 1973; Weinstein & Fineberg, 1980) provides a framework for making explicit the many factors in a complex decision problem like this, and allowing the decision to be made by comparing the expected utilities of the alternatives.

2.1.1 Sensitivity to Assumptions. Although one can construct a richly detailed decision tree that captures many of the nuances of a given patient's
illness, such models are often difficult to complete because they require highly specific conditional probabilities for which little or no objective data may exist. In such instances, the analyst must make simplifying assumptions to tailor the model to the available data. Where objective data do not exist, the subjective estimates of experienced medical specialists are sought and used as proxies. The resultant models are, therefore, merely approximations to clinical reality and the limits of their validity must be established by observing their behavior with sensitivity analysis, a process in which one systematically varies the values assigned to one or several parameters in the decision tree and recalculates expected utility (see section 2.1.3).

To fit the present clinical problem into the decision-analysis formalism, we made several assumptions. For the most part, the probabilistic data that we used were obtained from the medical literature, however, these data were not always specific enough for our patient. One assumption that we made, which is representative of others made in generating the model, concerned the patient's prior probability of having fungal pneumonia, a key factor in the decision. We were able to establish, from the medical literature, that fungi cause approximately 20% of the pneumonias in patients with compromised immune defenses. However, the studies from which this information was derived examined the prevalence of fungal pneumonia among all immunocompromised patients with pneumonia, not just those who had failed to respond to several days of broad spectrum antibiotic drugs aimed at all likely nonfungal causes of pneumonia, as was the case with our patient. Clearly, not responding to several days of such therapy selects out individuals who have a higher likelihood of having fungi as the cause for their pneumonia. In fact, the physicians that originally cared for this patient believed that he had a 30% to 35% chance of having fungi as the cause of his disease.

Because amphotericin B only offers a survival benefit when the pneumonia is actually fungal in origin, the higher the likelihood that the fungi are present, the greater the expected benefit of giving this drug empirically. Thus, by using the lower value (20%) for the prior probability of fungal pneumonia, we are biasing the analysis against treating empirically with amphotericin B. Despite this slight bias against empiric therapy, we shall demonstrate that it offers a relatively high expected utility.

2.1.2 Structure of the Decision. The problem is structured as a decision tree, a probability model which was constructed to determine the likelihood that this patient will survive his acute illness with each of the therapeutic options under consideration. The tree lays out the temporal sequence of clinical events, which begin at the root of the tree on the far left and end at the terminal branches of the tree on the far right. On the far left is the square decision node representing the choice among three therapeutic options: treating with amphotericin without further diagnostic studies (branch labeled
Figure 1. The decision tree for a formal decision analysis.
EMPIRIC AMPHOTERICIN), carrying out a lung biopsy and tailoring treatments to the results (branch designated BIOPSY), and neither giving amphotericin empirically nor carrying out further tests (branch labeled NO CHANGE IN RX).

Following the empiric amphotericin strategy (at the top), is a circular node, representing the notion that the patient’s pneumonia may or may not be fungal in origin, with branches labeled FUNGAL PNEUMONIA and NON-FUNGAL PNEUMONIA. The tree in Figure 1 could be expanded to contain the various causes of pneumonia other than fungi. The term nonfungal pneumonia is an abbreviation for all of the potential causes of pneumonia that were explicitly considered by our subjects. The outcome at this node is under the control of chance. Each of the two events (branches) has an associated likelihood of occurrence, represented here by the probability values given beneath each branch. In the baseline case (the first order approximation), the probability of fungal pneumonia is 20%. This value was obtained from the prevalence of this kind of infection among immunocompromised patients with pneumonia. Because this strategy (empiric amphotericin) dictates that no further diagnostic information be obtained, amphotericin will be given whether or not the fungal infection is present. If the patient has the infection (branch designated FUNGAL PNEUMONIA), the maximum therapeutic benefit from this action is achieved, a survival of 44%, which is the utility (value) associated with this outcome. If the lung infiltrate is not caused by a fungus (branch labeled NONFUNGAL PNEUMONIA) the expected survival is 60%. However, because amphotericin is not entirely a benign drug, its inappropriate use here is assumed to reduce the patient’s survival by 2%, to a value of 58%.

The middle strategy, designated by the label BIOPSY, is the only option in which diagnostic information is obtained before therapy is instituted. Following this branch is another square decision node with two options, open lung biopsy and transbronchial biopsy, labeled OLBx and TBBx, two alternative means of obtaining lung tissue. If open lung biopsy is selected there is a chance that the patient may or may not survive the procedure, represented by the two branches of the circular chance node labeled DIE and SURVIVE. The probability of dying during the open lung biopsy was taken at 1.5% and the probability of surviving is 98.5%. Should the patient die as a complication of biopsy, the utility of this outcome is taken to be 0. Should the patient survive open lung biopsy there remains only a chance that his pneumonia is actually fungal in origin (branches labeled FUNGAL PNEUMONIA and NONFUNGAL PNEUMONIA).

When the pneumonia is fungal in origin, the biopsy specimen may or may not reveal the presence of fungi (branches labeled FUNGI SEEN or NO FUNGI SEEN). Amphotericin is started when the test result is positive and withheld when the test result is negative. Appropriate treatment of fungal
pneumonia with amphotericin will achieve survival 44% of the time, which is the utility value assigned to this outcome. Because this test is imperfect, basing therapy on its outcome will occasionally cause us to withhold amphotericin when the pneumonia is actually fungal in origin. This outcome is represented by the path:

**Fungal Pneumonia => No Fungi Seen - No Amphotericin.**

Untreated, fungal pneumonia is uniformly fatal, so the utility value attached to this outcome is 0.

When the pneumonia is not fungal in origin (branch labeled Nonfungal Pneumonia) lung biopsy may be either positive or negative for fungi, designated respectively by the labels Fungi Seen and No Fungi Seen. When treatment is withheld (labeled No Amphotericin) the chance of survival is 60%. However, if the biopsy reveals fungi (branch labeled Fungi Seen), amphotericin will be given inappropriately and the treatment itself will reduce the patient's expected survival from nonfungal pneumonia by 2% to 58%.

If TBBx is selected over open lung biopsy, the same sequence of events ensue as that depicted above for the option labeled OLBx, unless tissue is not obtained by the transbronchoscopic biopsy. Of course, the probabilities of many of the outcomes are different. In particular, the TBBx mortality rate, 0.2%, is considerably lower than the OLBx mortality rate, 1.5%. However, this reduction in procedure risk comes at the expense of diagnostic yield. Transbronchoscopic biopsy will not yield lung tissue every time, and even when lung tissue is obtained, fewer fungal pneumonias are identified, that is, the test positive rate when fungal pneumonia is present is lower for TBBx than for OLBx, 71.5% versus 95%.

If lung tissue is not obtained by transbronchoscopic biopsy (branch labeled No Tissue), the patient is subjected to an open lung biopsy procedure, represented by the branch following the square shaded node. The tree logic following open lung biopsy at this point is identical to that seen in an open lung biopsy strategy above. However, because time is lost in attempting a transbronchoscopic biopsy first, antifungal therapy is delayed and the prognosis of fungal pneumonia is reduced by 4%.

The last therapeutic option is to neither intervene diagnostically nor add amphotericin empirically (branch labeled No Change in Rx). In the baseline case, fungal pneumonia is present 20% of the time and will always be fatal. However, 80% of the time, a nonfungal pneumonia is present and by not administering amphotericin survival is uncompromised.

### 2.1.3 Calculated Expected Utilities

The expected utility of each strategy in the decision tree is calculated using a weighted average technique, referred to as “averaging out and folding back” the decision tree. This process en-
tails averaging together the utility values of each potential outcome for each given strategy, after weighting them by their likelihood of occurrence.

In the present analysis, the choice of open lung biopsy provides the highest expected utility (55.5% survival), followed closely by empiric amphotericin (55.2% survival), and transbronchial biopsy (54.2% survival). The no-change-in-therapy strategy is a distant fourth with a 48% expected survival. The results of this analysis are based on the best available data from the medical literature and on estimates obtained from infectious disease consultants in instances in which such data were not available (Table 1).

Although the expected utilities of the strategies are nearly indistinguishable, the utility of not changing therapy is clearly inferior. Open lung biopsy is favored by a 0.3% survival margin, which according to some analysts, qualifies the decision as a “toss up” (Pauker & Kassirer, 1980). Indeed, if the analysis were fine-tuned further by including quality adjustments for the short term morbidities of the limited thoracotomy (opening the chest for the lung biopsy), the bronchoscopy, or the prolonged hospitalization for amphotericin therapy (six to eight weeks), these differences might diminish even further.

Recall that a key assumption was the 20% probability of fungal pneumonia, where some experts estimated the value as high as 30% to 35%. Sensitivity analysis determines the change to an estimated value that would be required to change the recommended strategy. It reveals that empiric amphotericin B dominates the other three strategies when the prior probability of fungal pneumonia is greater than 0.21. Above this value, the casualties from diagnostic error (missing the fungi when present) for either OLBx or TBBx, is greater than the mortality from the overuse of amphotericin B. Other sensitivity analyses that we performed substantiated the “close call” nature of this decision.

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical Data for the Decision Tree, Derived from the Medical Literature and Estimates from Expert Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost (in survival) of amphotericin in nonfungal pneumonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (in survival) of delaying definitive therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality of open biopsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality of transbronchoscopic biopsy (TBBx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior probability of fungal pneumonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of getting tissue with TBBx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity of open biopsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity of TBBx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity of open biopsy and TBBx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility of procedure death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility of untreated fungal pneumonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility of treated fungal pneumonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility of nonfungal pneumonia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The decision tree provides a useful framework for comparison of the cognitive decision-making strategies with formal decision analysis. As we shall see from analysis of the transcripts, the expert physicians took quite a different view of this difficult decision. Empiric treatment with amphotericin B, which is at least a close call and possibly the dominant treatment strategy according to the formal decision analysis, is hardly considered at all by the experts.

3. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS METHODS

In a previous survey, we reviewed the experimental methods available for the study of clinical cognition (Kassirer, Kuipers, & Gorry, 1982). We concluded that the complex phenomena of knowledge representation and problem-solving strategies are best derived from the type of data that appear in verbatim transcripts (or protocols) of interview studies (Newell & Simon, 1972). A more statistically tractable source of data such as a questionnaire would obscure the details we need to observe, by aggregating across subjects to eliminate the effect of individual variation. In previous studies of expert physicians, interviews producing verbatim transcripts appeared to provide sufficient fidelity to the actual task environment, and the analysis of these transcripts is feasible, though laborious. The additional effort and methodological difficulties required for collection and analysis of videotaped patient encounters, for example, does not, in our opinion, pay off in better or more revealing data about clinical cognition (Kassirer et al., 1982).

In this study, we used two different types of verbatim protocol collection methods on each subject, thinking aloud protocols and cross examination protocols.

- **Thinking aloud protocols** are obtained by recording subjects' responses to clinical data without interruptions for questions. This technique is sensitive to the natural control flow of the subject’s problem solving, but it is insensitive to the limits of the knowledge stored. Care must be taken to distinguish the trace of on-going problem solving from the “canned” explanation of a previously produced results.

- **Cross examination protocols** are obtained after the thinking aloud protocol is completed, by asking the subject to respond to specific questions about the clinical problem at hand. These questions probe the limits of a subject's knowledge directly, even resembling oral examinations, but they are insensitive to the subject’s natural control structure.

A mix of the two methods makes it possible to examine different aspects of the subjects' knowledge and representation.

The analysis of the protocols can also be of several different types, looking at different aspects of the reasoning in the transcript.
Referring phrase analysis identifies the set of referring noun phrases in a protocol excerpt and defines a small natural universe of underlying conceptual objects which can be the referents of those phrases. This universe constitutes an ontology for the domain being discussed.

Assertional analysis identifies the set of assertions being made in the excerpt about the objects identified by referring phrase analysis. A set of relations on objects and connectives and operators on sentences are then defined to express the content of the assertions. This constitutes an epistemology for the domain being discussed.

Script analysis identifies the overall structure of the reasoning process, argument, or explanation being given in the excerpt. The analysis is intended to reveal the goal structure of the problem-solving process or the explanation strategy.

The first two methods were developed as part of our study of causal reasoning in medicine (Kuipers & Kassirer, 1983, 1984), and the third was developed for the needs of the study reported here. The methodological principles underlying protocol analysis are examined in depth by Ericsson and Simon (1984) using an information processing model of the verbalization process.

4. RESULTS OF PROTOCOL ANALYSIS

4.1. The Structure of the Decision
We analyzed verbatim protocols of three expert physicians as they were deciding how to manage the patient. We excerpted for detailed analysis the fragment of each interview, after all the data had been presented, in which each subject considered whether to apply an invasive test (a lung biopsy) and which type of test to apply (a transbronchoscopic biopsy (TBBx) or an open-lung biopsy (OLBx)). This decision is a major portion of the decision whether to administer amphotericin.

We believe that the transcript represents a trace of an ongoing problem-solving process in all three protocols, particularly because we observed our subjects making statements and reaching conclusions which they modified after further consideration. The subjects usually did not remark on the change of opinion.

Script analysis allowed us to identify the steps of reasoning and decision making in the different protocols. Appendix A presents a complete script analysis of the "thinking aloud" section of one of the transcripts.

There was considerable variation among the different subjects in their explanation strategies. In explaining their reasoning, some subjects were considerably more verbose than others. For example, in some cases a subject would describe the current decision problem, discuss a set of relevant factors, and finally select an action. In other cases, the problem was left
unstated but the factors that were discussed, and the statement of the final choice, clearly presupposed the problem formulation. In yet other cases, the problem was stated, the relevant factors were discussed, but no decision was stated explicitly except as a presupposition to the next problem. In such cases, we considered it justified to insert the implicit reasoning step into the coding sequence, suitably marked.

There were also significant idiosyncratic elements in the reasoning strategies used by the three different physicians. One subject built a management plan in a straightforward manner. Another did a considerable amount of reasoning in hypothetical contexts both before and after the point in the case where the problem was posed. The third paused in the middle of a decision to consider a new aspect of a prior decision.

In spite of these differences, there are important similarities among the reasoning protocols of the physician subjects, and notable distinctions between the protocols and formal decision analysis. To clarify this common structure, we extract from the script analyses of the three transcripts those operators which deal directly with formulation of a decision problem (PROBLEM), the selection of an alternative (CHOOSE), or insertion of a new action into a partially-completed plan (INSERT). Tables 2, 3, and 4 present this skeleton of each of the three script analyses.

The three physician subjects share a common sequence of operations in their formulation of the decision:

PROBLEM: Biopsy versus No change in therapy.
CHOOSE: Biopsy.
PROBLEM: TBBx versus OLBx.
CHOOSE: TBBx.
REVIEW: TBBx in context of possible diagnoses.

By way of contrast, if we were to construct a formal decision analysis, including the same factors discussed by the physicians, and with the probabilities and utilities assigned so that it would reach the same conclusion, its reasoning would follow a quite different sequence:

PROBLEM: Biopsy versus No change in therapy.
PROBLEM: TBBx versus OLBx.
REVIEW: all choices (TBBx and OLBx) in context of possible diagnoses.
CHOOSE: TBBx.
CHOOSE: Biopsy.
REVIEW: sensitivity to variations in probabilities and utilities.

Thus, the common structure shared by the physicians reflects the structure of the knowledge representation and the inference methods used, and cannot be merely a mathematical consequence of the structure of the problem.

As noted below, we also observed that none of the physician subjects explicitly considered the possibility of empiric treatment with amphotericin
### TABLE 2
Script Analysis for VP-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem: Biopsy vs. No change in therapy.</th>
<th>(Implicit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose: Biopsy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In hypothetical context (time of admission, 48 hours previously):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Immediate biopsy vs. Wait 48 hours on current therapy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose: Wait 48 hours on current therapy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: TBBx vs. OLBx.</td>
<td>(Implicit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose: TBBx.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In hypothetical context (after negative result from TBBx):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Accept negative finding vs. Go on to OLBx.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose: If condition improves, accept negative finding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose: If condition deteriorates, go on to OLBx.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Consider pericardial tap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Consider pleural effusion tap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review: TBBx in context of possible diagnoses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the common sequence, this subject formulated additional decision problems in hypothetical contexts.

### TABLE 3
Script Analysis for VP-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem: Biopsy vs. No change in therapy.</th>
<th>(Implicit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose: Biopsy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert: Sputum culture, before biopsy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: TBBx vs. OLBx.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject percutaneous needle biopsy and transtracheal aspiration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose: TBBx.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert: Lavage, with TBBx.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insert: OLBx, if no results from TBBx and patient deteriorates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review: TBBx in context of possible diagnoses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to making the decisions in the common sequence, this subject inserted non-critical steps into the plan as opportunity presented itself.

### TABLE 4
Script Analysis for VP-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem: Biopsy vs. No change in therapy.</th>
<th>(Implicit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose: Biopsy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: TBBx vs. OLBx.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem: Pericardial tap vs. Biopsy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose: Biopsy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose: TBBx.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review: TBBx in context of possible diagnoses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After formulating the more detailed problem, this subject returned to consider and eliminate a new alternative to a previous decision.
during the "thinking aloud" portion of the interview. When the topic was probed during the "cross examination" portion, empiric amphotericin was considered obviously inappropriate unless the patient were too sick for any biopsy at all.

Other steps in the reasoning process, such as insertion of a noncritical plan steps, review of risk factors and prerequisites to biopsies, and examination of less important alternative treatments, were not consistently ordered with respect to the core sequence.

The implications of these findings will be discussed in more detail in section 5.

4.2. Representation of Likelihood

The second question we address is how knowledge of likelihood is represented. That is, how are subjective probabilities described? We used referring phrase analysis (Kuipers & Kassirer, 1984) to identify and classify each phrase in the transcripts that referred to likelihood. The assumption behind referring phrase analysis is that any concept or relation that is expressed verbally in an explanation must be expressible in the cognitive knowledge representation.

The selection criteria for phrases to be analyzed are designed to be inclusive, rather than making a closely defined distinction. A phrase is included for analysis either because it contains a relevant word like chance, risk, yield, and so forth, or because the meaning of the phrase in context clearly relates to likelihoods.

Once a set of referring phrases has been identified, each phrase is classified into one (occasionally two) of a small set of categories, according to the type of description of a likelihood that is being asserted. An analysis is considered successful if a small set of categories can account for the complete set of identified phrases.

Table 5 shows a protocol extract with the phrases referring to likelihoods in boldface. The righthand column in that table gives the classification of each phrase.

We accounted for all relevant referring phrases in the transcripts by classifying them into three major categories, with subclassifications.

- **Descriptions of Likelihood.** The likelihoods of events are generally described in symbolic, rather than numerical, terms.

  CAT: categorical values without precise boundaries: low, moderate, very high, and so forth.
  ORD: ordinal assertions of relative likelihoods: greater than, less than, equal to.
  NUM: numerical values or ranges.

- **Possibility of Events.** When establishing the structure of a decision, possible events are roughly classified according to whether they will be
CRITICAL DECISIONS UNDER UNCERTAINTY

TABLE 5
A Fragment from the Cross-Examination Portion of a Transcript

L183 But if this man were severely thrombocytopenic,
L184 and if his bleeding time was abnormal,
L185 I would put him in a much higher risk category
L186 for undergoing an open procedure
L187 or a transbronchial biopsy for that matter.
L188 He could probably still undergo a lavage.
L189 You know, I would still probably consider doing that
L190 because the yield,
L191 even in fungal infection
L192 is pretty good with a lavage.
L193 But I would be very reluctant to do any invasive procedure on him,
L194 because I think the chances of killing him... due to hemorrhage,
L195 would be in the range of the ten-fifteen percent
L196 and I think the chances of killing him with amphotericin
L197 would probably be a bit less than that.
L198 So if he were deteriorating and
L199 if I felt
L200 based on these parameters
L201 that doing an invasive procedure would be too risky.
L202 then I would certainly cover him empirically.

The boldfaced phrases are those phrases considered to make some direct or indirect reference to likelihood. The annotations at the right of certain lines classify the referring phrases into the categories described in the text.

treated as alternative outcomes in the decision. These references are a special case of categorical descriptions, distinguished by their role in formulating the decision.

ALWAYS: This event, though perhaps not absolutely certain, may be assumed to occur.
SOMETIMES: This event is one of a set of possibilities; its likelihood will need to be considered.
NEVER: This event, though perhaps not absolutely impossible, may be excluded from consideration.

- **Other References.** Surface constructions referring to likelihoods without providing information about the underlying knowledge representations.

REF: A construction referring to a likelihood without describing it, for example "The chances of killing him with amphotericin..."
HEDGE: A rhetorical usage indicating lack of commitment, for example "I would still probably consider doing that."

This classification accounts for every referring phrase in the three protocols meeting our selection criteria, leading us to believe that it captures real properties of the representation of knowledge of likelihood and probability.
Table 6 shows the total number of phrases in each category found in the different transcripts.

Two conclusions may be drawn from these data. First, the descriptions of likelihood used in the physicians' explanations are almost exclusively qualitative. Second, there is substantial individual variation in the mix of phrases used. Appendix B includes the complete sets of CAT, ORD, and NUM referring phrases from the most verbose of the transcripts (VP-18).

The main results of the referring phrase analysis are, first, that references to likelihoods consist primarily of two distinct kinds of symbolic description of likelihood—categorical and ordinal—and, second, that references to numerical values or ranges are treated in the same way as qualitative descriptions, without taking advantage of their numerical properties.

Numerical terms (coded as NUM in the referring phrase analysis) appear in the explanation as descriptions of likelihoods, but in a way that is quite different from the mathematical theory of probability. In some cases, numerical descriptions act as categorical descriptions by providing focal values for a region without precise boundaries, for example, "...you have maybe a 70–80% chance (of) making the diagnosis." In other cases, the numerical value is used as an anchoring value for an ordinal description, for example, "...that occurs you know less than a half percent of the time." In both cases, rather than functioning as coordinates on the real number line, capable of supporting arithmetic operations, the numerical phrases serve as names for focal or bounding points defining qualitative regions.

These observations suggest that knowledge of likelihood is represented as symbolic descriptions of categorical and ordinal relations, and that numerical descriptions function as easily communicable names for important landmarks rather than as real numbers. The concept of "landmark values" as qualitatively important distinctions is inspired by research on visual similarity and cognitive maps (Goldmeier, 1972; Kuipers, 1978; Lynch, 1960),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>VP-18</th>
<th>VP-19</th>
<th>VP-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEDGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and contributes importantly to research on qualitative reasoning about physical mechanisms (Bobrow, 1985).

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. The Structure of the Decision

Our analysis of the reasoning stages of three expert physicians as they formulated the structure of the decision revealed a consistent pattern. They made an initial decision at an abstract level, and then went on to specify it more precisely. In a rough comparison with a decision tree, their reasoning steps could be seen as moving from the root to the terminal branches, but with various elaborations considered at unpredictable times (i.e. "opportunistically"). Their approach contrasts with formal decision analysis, which lays out a tree of choice and chance nodes, determines the utilities of a large number of highly specific final outcomes, then backs up through the tree to calculate the expected utilities of the branches at the fundamental choice point.

The decision process we observed in the protocols is well described as one of planning by successive refinement of an abstract plan (Sacerdoti, 1977), combined with opportunistic insertion of plan steps (Hayes-Roth & Hayes-Roth, 1979).

- The decision is first approached at its most abstract level: "Test or wait?"
- Two factors argue in the same direction: there is no clear response from the current therapy, and there is considerable uncertainty about the identity of the infection.
- This formulation of the problem presupposes a decision on a closely related question: "Treat or test?"
- This implicit decision is dominated by a single factor: the risk of harming the patient with unnecessary therapy is viewed as large compared with the risk of the invasive test.
- Once the decision to test has been made, the next decision is formulated: "Which test?"
- This decision is dominated by the trade-off between relative invasiveness and relative yield.
- As opportunity arises, additional diagnostic and therapeutic procedures which are not part of the critical decision are inserted into the plan.
- Finally, the plan is reviewed under various hypothetical circumstances, in case revision should be indicated.

The cognitive methods for formulating a decision thus appear to be incremental and local, breaking the overall decision into manageable pieces
that can be decided on the basis of only a few attributes. This method is
cognitively useful because it allows sophisticated reasoning with limited
computational resources, but it underweights factors whose significance is
not local to an individual point in the decision.

This was not a difficult choice for our subjects, nor should it have been. The
formal decision analysis also shows that the choice of continuing the current
therapy in hopes of improvement clearly has the lowest expected utility of
all possibilities considered.

In the protocols, we observe two influences on the decision, both in the
direction of the invasive test. First, the patient is clearly very sick, and there
has been no improvement after a reasonable time period on the previous
therapy. While it is still possible that the current therapy is correct and the
patient’s state will soon improve, the patient’s poor condition adds urgency
and argues against waiting. Second, the identity of the patient’s infection is
not known. Because there are specific, though risky, treatments for fungal
infections, there is pressure for testing to reduce the physician’s uncertainty
and to select more appropriate treatment.

In formal decision analysis, the complete set of alternatives for this deci-
sion would be: “Treat, Test, or No Treat?” Here we are considering only
the last two. The first possibility, of treating without testing, has already
been discarded.

5.1.2 The Implicit Choice: Empiric Amphotericin Therapy versus Invasive
Biopsy. Our subjects did not explicitly discuss the alternative of empiric
treatment with amphotericin except under direct cross-examination. The
dominant value in the subjects’ decision making was the need to know that
a fungal infection is present before administering amphotericin. The un-
acceptable scenario of administering this putatively dangerous drug when the
fungal infection is not present appeared to dominate the reasoning of our
subjects. This is a specific instance of one of the oldest principles in medi-
cine: “As to disease, make a habit of two things—to help, or at least to do
no harm.” (Hippocrates, Epidemics, B.I., Sect. XI, translated by W.H.S.
Jones) Only if a patient were so sick that a biopsy would probably be fatal
would the physicians be willing to administer amphotericin empirically.

However, the formal decision analysis shows that the decision between
empiric administration of amphotericin without a biopsy, versus an invasive
biopsy, may be more difficult than our subjects recognize. The invasive
biopsy has two significant drawbacks. First, there is a small but significant
chance that this very ill patient may die as a direct result of the biopsy pro-
cedure. Second, he may die from untreated fungal pneumonia if the biopsy
result is falsely negative. Each of these factors decreases the utility of inva-
sive biopsy relative to empiric treatment with amphotericin. The individual and combined impact of these factors appears to be underweighted by our subjects.

Viewing the decision as a planning process, we can suspect the existence of a rule of the form:

\[
\text{if a patient is likely but not certain to have disease } D, \\
\text{ and the therapy for disease } D \text{ is risky,} \\
\text{ and the patient is able to tolerate a definitive test for } D, \\
\text{ then test for disease } D \text{ before administering the therapy.}
\]

We find an explanation stated in almost this form in the cross-examination portion of one of the protocols.

L198 So if he were deteriorating and
L199 if I felt
L200 based on these parameters
L201 that doing an invasive procedure would be too risky,
L202 then I would certainly cover him empirically.
L203 But, as long as I thought he could undergo an invasive procedure,
L204 I would do it. [VP-19]

This rule regards the test abstractly as an information source. The risks of the test are only minimally considered, and the possibility of false negative results are not considered at all. These more detailed characteristics are considered only after the decision to test has been made, when choosing between biopsy alternatives.

5.1.3 The Second Choice: Open Lung versus Transbronchoscopic Biopsy.

Once the decision had been made to test with an invasive biopsy, the decision between methods involved a trade-off. The primary consideration, and the one that dominated the final decision, was that TBBx is a less invasive procedure (i.e., less risky) than open lung biopsy. The secondary consideration is that TBBx may yield an insufficient amount of lung tissue, resulting either in an increased chance of a false negative result or the need to do the open lung biopsy anyway, as a second procedure, after some delay.

As with the first choice, a single consideration appeared to dominate the subjects’ reasoning and they consistently chose the transbronchoscopic biopsy. In two of the protocols, contingency plans were formulated for proceeding on to OLBx in case TBBx produced insufficient tissue. Factors such as risk of the test and possibility of insufficient tissue or false negative results were considered only in the local context of the choice between biopsy alternatives. Only the relative risks of TBBx and OLBx are relevant to this decision, not the absolute level of risk. However, the absolute level of biopsy risk, and other factors that might affect the previous “Test or Treat” decision, were not propagated globally and reconsidered.
5.1.4 Comparison of Decisions. The final decisions made by all the subjects are plans of approximately the following form, with justifications and caveats included.

- Perform a lung biopsy, because the current therapy has not produced an improvement and the diagnosis is still unknown.
- Perform a lung biopsy before treating with amphotericin, to avoid the possibility of giving a dangerous drug when the infection is not present.  
  —If the patient is too sick for a biopsy, however, treat without one.
- Do the transbronchoscopic biopsy, because it is less invasive.  
  —If results are inconclusive, do the open lung biopsy next.  
  —If the patient is too sick for two diagnostic procedures, do only the open lung biopsy.

Each choice is well justified, based on the factors taken into account when it was made. However, it is clear that information that was potentially relevant to the first decision was only considered within the local context of the second decision.

This pattern is in marked contrast with the formal decision analysis in section 2, where the detailed risks and possible errors of the tests are combined into expected utility values and propagated globally. As a result, three alternatives—the two biopsies and empiric therapy—end up with very similar expected utilities, rather than the clearcut distinctions seen by the human subjects.

It might be argued that human decision-makers take into account subtle factors that are inexpressible in the decision analysis formalism. This did not appear to be reflected in our protocol analysis. The subjects considered a variety of factors in making their choices. However, the use of information in a local context to make a series of incremental decisions was the dominant characteristic we observed in the protocols.

There is a clear reason why human decision making should follow the approach of incremental planning rather than formal decision analysis: computational resources are limited. Human cognitive processing is relatively slow, has a very limited supply of working memory (though effectively unlimited long-term memory), and is subject to frequent interruptions (Miller, 1956; Newell & Simon, 1972; Sternberg, 1966).

An incremental planning strategy allows a large and difficult decision problem to be broken into a sequence of small choices, each of which can be made on the basis of a relatively limited amount of information. If the planning process is interrupted, the partially refined plan can be stored and re-examined later, so relatively little work is lost. A formal decision analysis, on the other hand, requires a large decision tree with many numerical values to be found, computed, and stored before the decision can be made. If working memory is not large enough for the tree, or if part of the tree is lost
during an interruption, a great deal of work is lost. Thus, formal decision analysis is only feasible with significant amounts of external memory and computational resources. The incremental planning approach is far better suited to the cognitive resources of human decision-makers. Further general implications of these computational limitations are discussed in (Kuipers, 1979).

5.1.5 Decision-Making as Planning. Our observations of this planning process are consistent with the findings of Hayes-Roth and Hayes-Roth (1979), who have performed protocol analysis studies of planning processes, and propose an "opportunistic" model of the planning process. In their model, a number of local specialists communicate through a shared "blackboard" data structure, and assemble a plan in a sequence of loosely coordinated steps. Their model predicts that the different steps of the planning process will not be strictly ordered; their sequence will be determined partly by the structure of the problem and partly by which information happens to be available, or which inferences happen to be activated, at which times. We observe this, in that there is considerable individual variation in the overall reasoning process, especially in the points when hypotheses are considered and risks are assessed.

The consistent sequence of decision steps we observed may be explained by two factors. First, the logical structure of the problem determines that one must decide whether to test before deciding which test. Second, the sequential refinement character of the process, where an abstract decision is completed before a more specific one is formulated, conserves the working memory that would otherwise be needed to store large numbers of open problems. In Sacerdoti's NOAH planner (1977) the sequential refinement sequence is specified by the intrinsic control structure of the planner. Hayes-Roth and Hayes-Roth (1979) observe that the sequential refinement sequence can be derived, in an opportunistic model, from constraints within the problem. We can extend their point to argue that resource limits in the planner may force decisions at an abstract level to be made before more detailed problems can even be considered.

We also observe a substantial difference between what plans look like in the AI planning literature (e.g. Sacerdoti, 1977) and what they look like to our physician subjects. In particular, patient management planning raises a number of important issues not considered in previous AI planning research. The state of the patient and the effects of actions are both uncertain. Diagnosis and therapy are interleaved rather than sequential. Even when the patient's disease is known, a given therapy may have several possible outcomes. As a result, decision makers construct contingency plans, including branches on possible future events. There are also embedded planning operators: a physician may state that at a certain point in the future there
will be enough information to formulate an appropriate plan. Such observations provide good evidence that the medical domain is a fruitful area for future research in planning.

5.1.6 Decisions, Explanations, and Policy. There may be additional factors, distinct from the direct effect of computational resource limits on the decision maker, responsible for the local nature of the observed decision-making process. The physician is under several constraints that make his task different from that of minimizing the patient’s probability of death. First, Hippocrates’ command, “Do no harm,” may cause the physician to give additional weight to negative effects the patients suffers as a (potentially preventable) result of direct action, for example, administration of a dangerous drug when the disease is not present. Second, the physician knows that a decision must be explainable as reasonable and prudent under the circumstances.

Different decision-making processes lend themselves to different types of explanations. The explanation of a decision analysis requires justifying the choice and chance nodes included in the tree, and demonstrating through sensitivity analysis (section 2.1.1) the effects of the estimated probabilities and utilities on the outcome (Pauker & Kassirer, 1987). Calculation of expected utilities at a choice node presupposes the relatively sophisticated concepts of probability and weighted average.

The local process of constructing a plan through sequential refinement is explainable in terms of rules that transform the plan from its initial to its final form. For example, consider a rule that says, “A dangerous drug may only be given after establishing the presence of the disease it treats.” Such a rule represents a policy: a universally quantified imperative specifying actions appropriate to situations matching the rule antecedents. In this case, the rule provides an ordering constraint on actions in the plan, and effectively prohibits empiric treatment with a dangerous drug.

In order to be useful and comprehensible, the antecedents of a policy must be relatively simple. Considered across situations matching its relatively simple antecedent, a rule such as the one above appears to be (and very likely is) the best possible policy. A sequence of such rule applications (or syllogisms), appropriately linked, provides a convincing and defensible syllogistic explanation of the overall decision.

The explanation of a formal decision analysis may be seen by a physician as more sophisticated, less familiar to patients, and more difficult to construct, convey, and defend than a local, step-by-step, syllogistic explanation. Thus, even though a decision analysis can weigh global considerations that are not seen by the rule-based approach, the more explainable method may be preferred.

Another factor is the representation of knowledge learned from previous experience, and its role in both decision making and explanation. If pre-
vious experience is compiled into rules or policies, it is natural for both the decision-making process and the explanation to draw on that form of existing knowledge, rather than constructing each decision from scratch.

Although these additional factors must be considered in interpreting our results, they are not entirely independent of the computational resource limits we have discussed. Constructing an explanation is a process that requires computational resources of various kinds, including previously acquired knowledge, and it must allow for the resources available to a listener attempting to understand the explanation. Further development of a computational theory of critical decision making must take these factors into account.

5.2. Representation of Likelihood
Our referring phase analysis provides constraints which must be satisfied by the representation of knowledge of likelihood used by expert physicians. Thus, a cognitive model of knowledge of likelihood must have the following characteristics.

- All likelihood descriptions are symbolic. There was no evidence of high-resolution storage of numerical values, or the cognitive use of arithmetic operators. Numerical values are used as recognizable landmark values.
- There are two distinct symbolic descriptions of likelihood:
  - categorical descriptions: "fuzzy" values on an absolute scale;
  - ordinal descriptions: sharply defined ordinal relations (greater than, less than, equal) between pairs of values.
- Reference of "landmark" values, specified either numerically or in terms of a well-known example situation, serve as focal or boundary values for symbolic descriptions of likelihoods.

The important role of landmark values, as focal values for categorical descriptions or as boundaries for ordinal descriptions, leads us to speculate about the derivation of these descriptions. This provides a possible explanation for two of the phenomena documented by Tversky and Kahneman (1974): the representativeness heuristic and the anchoring heuristic.

If categories are defined in terms of one or more focal examples, the appropriate categorical description is determined by the closest match between an observation and the focal examples of the different categories. A risk category such as "very high" would be associated with a small set of domain-specific focal examples of very high risk situations. The risk of a particular situation is assessed by determining its similarity to the focal example. This is exactly the representativeness heuristic. Although it is a reasonable heuristic in many cases, it can lead to substantial biases in cases where the prior probability of the most similar category is very much smaller than that of a less similar one.
Ordinal descriptions are defined by boundary values, which may be well-known landmarks or may be recently derived values. These descriptions can be derived, or at least filtered, by adjusting a value away from a reference point. For example, suppose we know that the mortality risk of an open lung biopsy (OLBx) is "low." Transbronchoscopic biopsy (TBBx) differs from OLBx on two features relevant to risk of mortality: TBBx is less risky than OLBx in only requiring local rather than general anesthesia, and it is less risky in being less invasive. Thus, both of the relevant differences between TBBx and OLBx provide evidence that the risk of TBBx is less than that of OLBx. Even without knowing the magnitudes of the differences, we can conclude that the overall mortality risk from TBBx is less than that of OLBx. This type of inference is essentially the anchoring heuristic, and is thus subject to biases in the direction of the anchoring value.

Computationally, categorical and ordinal representations have different advantages and disadvantages (Figure 2). Categorical descriptions provide a qualitative classification of values that is useful in rule antecedents (cf. Clancey, 1985). For example, we observe one subject describing what appears to be a rule application:

L0183 "But if this man were severely thrombocytopenic
L0184 and if his bleeding time was abnormal
L0185 I would put him in a much higher risk category
L0186 for undergoing an open procedure
L0187 or a transbronchial biopsy for that matter." (VP-19)

By contrast, ordinal relations support high-resolution distinctions in the neighborhood of a boundary, but highly aggregated, qualitative descriptions in the regions between landmarks. Some have argued that ordinal relations with landmark values are the basis of human similarity judgments. In a

very low low moderate high very high

*Figure 2. Categorical and ordinal descriptions of risk. A categorical description is one of a small set of regions without definite endpoints. An ordinal description is a point or interval defined by specified landmark values.*
dramatic series of studies, Goldmeier (1972) observed that similarity judgments among visually observed figures are strongly affected by ordinal comparisons with certain landmark values. Two values which are quite close but separated by a landmark are judged to be “less similar” than two values which have no intervening landmark, even though they are more widely separated.

In general, categorical and ordinal value descriptions are not mutually translatable. A categorical description such as very high does not correspond to the set of values greater than some definable landmark value. Conversely, one might know that \( x < y \) without having \( x \) and \( y \) belong to different categories. There are, of course, certain inferences that one can make, to find new ordinal or categorical descriptions, or to rule out certain combinations.

- if \( x \) is very high, and \( x < y \), then \( y \) is very high;
- if \( x \) is low, and \( y \) is high, then \( x < y \);
- if \( x \) is normal, and \( x < y \), then \( y \) cannot be low.

Our observations provide empirical evidence that is generally consistent with Cohen’s proposal (1985) for symbolic rather than numerical representation of probabilities. However, Cohen’s specific idea of endorsements requires creating, storing, and manipulating an extensive structure of justifications as part of each description of a likelihood. Furthermore, his proposal allows an open-ended and perhaps domain-specific language for endorsements. Ordinal and categorical descriptions of likelihood are not as domain-independent as numerical probabilities, since the set of landmarks or categories is domain-specific. However, they do not carry an audit trail of justifications from the prior stages of a problem. Our observations of the local nature of the decision-making process suggest that there is normally very little provision for reexamining an earlier conclusion when additional relevant evidence is encountered. Thus, while we agree with Cohen’s belief that knowledge of probabilities should be represented symbolically, the evidence from our study does not require an explanation as complex as his theory of endorsements.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Our analysis suggests ways to account for some of the heuristics, biases, and distortions observed when people reason about likelihoods (Kahneman, Slovic, & Tversky, 1982; Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). We have observed two important characteristics of human decision making under uncertainty that are quite different from formal mathematical models of probability:

- Decisions are not made after gathering all the facts, but rather constructed through an incremental process of planning by successive refinement. This process has the cognitive advantage of allowing a complex problem to be solved with limited computational resources. Its disad-
vantage, when compared with formal decision analysis, is that an early
decision is made with simplified, abstracted information about the alter-
natives; more detailed information that may be relevant to the decision
is not considered until later. As a result, in our medical example, we
observe that the risk of biopsy and the risk of false negative test results
were underweighted in the decision between biopsy versus empiric
amphotericin.

- Subjective probabilities, that is, knowledge of likelihoods, are not numbers, subject to multiplication and addition operations, with errors and biases measurable as distances from the correct values. Rather, they are symbolic descriptions of numbers, expressing categorical and ordinal relations with certain focal or bounding landmark values. Even likelihoods that are verbally described as numbers are treated in the explanation as names of landmarks. If this view is correct, then the representativeness and anchoring heuristics are consequences of natural classification strategies for determining categorical and ordinal descriptions, respectively.
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**APPENDICES**

**A. Script Analysis of VP-20**

To clarify the protocol analysis method, this appendix contains the “thinking aloud” portion of transcript VP-20 in which the biopsy decision was made. Line and paragraph breaks divide the transcript into meaningful small units. Each line is numbered so the analysis can refer back to it.

After examination of the transcript, a set of operators is devised to account for the major reasoning processes observed in the explanation. From the analysis of this excerpt, the operators and the objects they apply to are the following:

- **REVIEW**: list of facts, hypotheses, prerequisites or plan steps.
- **CONSIDER**: hypothesis.
- **COMPARE**: quantities.
- **PROBLEM**: set of possible actions.
- **CHOOSE**: action

These operators are created from examination of the transcript prior to a formal theory of knowledge representation and inference for the observed reasoning. Thus, we can code a segment of the transcript as REVIEW if we
observe the subject systematically considering all or most of the current disease hypotheses, even though we lack a complete theory of how such an iterative process takes place.

For the purpose of this study, the critical parts of the analysis are the identification of the PROBLEM and CHOOSE operators, where decision problems are identified and an alternative is selected. Our analysis rests on correct identification of those operators, and their distinction from other actions in the transcript.

A.1. Verbatim Transcript with Script Analysis
The script analysis is presented in italics, interleaved with the lines of the transcript.

L001 But he did apparently get along alright
L002 for a period of between 5 months before admission
L003 and 2 months before admission
L004 without any other information given.
L005 So, I would assume that he might have had a good response.
L006 1.8 grams cumulative dose is not all that big of a dose,
L007 but maybe he had a response,
L008 because there is no further information.
L009 So then he turns up just 3-4 days before admission with fever,
L010 diffuse process,
L011 again pancytopenia on peripheral count.
L012 And so my thinking...
L013 and was treated with broad spectrum drugs
L014 without an effect in 48 hours.
L015 Now that still may be a somewhat short time.
L016 Even if those were going...
L017 even that combination of drugs was going to have an effect,
L018 but I think that what is important here
L019 is to make a specific diagnosis,
L020 and the approach is a lung biopsy.
L021 I assume that they have already x-rayed his sinuses.
L022 (I) question whether there is something still present in the sinuses.
L023 (I) question whether there is something still present in the sinuses. Rules out.
So, I think the first approach would be a lung biopsy. and then the question comes up should this be an open biopsy or should it be a close biopsy

PROBLEM: TBBx vs. OLBx.

And then the question comes up how much of a risk he'll be for biopsy whichever way it's done. There's no information given about parameters such as platelet count, bleeding times, things of that sort which would be important to know in face of any plan biopsy. But I assume that those will be done and if he needed platelets, he would receive them prior to biopsy, and if he... he would probably be transfused prior to biopsy because his hematocrit and hemoglobin...again with. So, all of that could be taken care of and that doesn't sound like that's going to be a major sort of a problem.

REVIEW: risks of biopsy.

The other bit of information here is that he has a pericarditis both by EKG and physical examination and so the presumption here will be that this is part of the same process that's causing... the that's causing the pulmonary infiltrates.

CONSIDER: pericarditis

I suppose that one question might come up whether one might want to consider a pericardial tap as an initial diagnostic procedure, and that would be something that might be considered.

PROBLEM: pericardial tap vs. biopsy

I probably would have gone directly for the lung biopsy because I see no reason he couldn't tolerate that from the information that we have here. He has a pO2 of 50. That can probably be brought up with delivery of oxygen. So, the general feeling from information given is that he can tolerate a lung biopsy with some appropriate therapy such as blood transfusions, prior to the time that it's done. So I would opt first for a lung biopsy and then keep the idea of a pericardial tap in mind.
The situation about the tap is one would have to rely upon culture. We're not dealing basically with a high suspicion tumor candidate. We're considering infection is the primary event, and one's not going to be able to see anything right away, but would have to wait for culture. With lung biopsy one might see fungi, or whatever else there would be. So, I would elect probably to do this as a closed biopsy... transbronchial. The choice of closed versus open here is probably somewhat of a toss-up. However, with the types of things that one is considering here like fungal infection and I don't think that one has to think very hard about possibilities like protozoa because he's basically not immunosuppressed. White count... let me just get back to that for a moment. (I) question whether he is... white count was 1200 with a total neutrophil count of 150. So he does have a pretty low count and in a sense he is suppressed for overcoming any type of infectious organism. Just quickly going down the lists of possible infections that would be considered here: funga... bacterial; protozoa, that I probably put down lower on the list; TB, not really a strong consideration; viral infection, always a possibility; but no reason to think that here in particular. So I would do the lung biopsy and would probably get a... an immediate wet prep from the biopsy...
L103  touch prep and see what that shows.
L104  We'd put some tissue up for culture
L105  then we'd put some tissue through the usual fixation process.

A.2. Final Script Analysis
Thus, the final result of the script analysis is a sequence of operators applied to various aspects of the description of the case.

B. Referring Phrase Analysis of VP-18
This appendix presents the complete sets of categorical, ordinal, and numerical range descriptions appearing in one of the transcripts (VP-18).

B.1. Categorical Descriptions
Categorical descriptions classify a quantity into one of a small set of categories without sharply defined boundaries.

...is notoriously a procedure that does not give accurate diagnoses
...has had very little success overall,
...which you would have a very high yield of finding...
...would pretty much eliminate it from the cause...
...considering how good we've gotten in diagnosing that.
...which a transbronchial biopsy is also good for,
...washings aren't any good,
...would also be pretty well diagnosed.
...I think he would not be a high risk, but (a) satisfactory candidate for bronchoscopy. You('d) have a fairly high yield, however, he would still be a high risk person, and the chances of... is actually small. Because it would be unsafe to proceed. I think his chance of mortality... is still very small. So, the mortality isn't very high. Which doesn't occur all that frequently, the prognosis... is extremely poor. Your chance of survival is practically nil.

B.2. Ordinal Descriptions

Ordinal descriptions describe a quantity in terms of its ordinal relation—greater than, less than, equal to—with another quantity.

Although, not quite as good as pneumocystis. And since it's a safer procedure then general anesthesia, the chance of... is probably not all that much greater. More safely or have a better chance of getting a result. Because the patient can tolerate the procedure better, even less than that. So, that would have remained the same. His risk of bleeding is less than that. And (?death from) bleeding that occurs you know less than a half percent of the time. I think is chance of... would have been increased, more than the general population, (it) would still be a safer procedure than general anesthesia. I think it still would be a safer procedure. I'd say the risk clearly outweighs the risk of amphotericin.

...to find a specific answer... would clearly outweigh that risk. The risk of the bronchoscopy would outweigh empiric treatment. I would rather find out what I have than...

B.3. Numerical Range Descriptions

Numerical range descriptions specify a quantity in terms of a numerical measure. It is important to note, however, that these "numbers" function as names for values, rather than real numbers subject to arithmetic opera-
tions. The actual content and use of these descriptions resembles the categorical and ordinal descriptions.

...you should be well over 90% of diagnosing pneumocystis.
...you have maybe a 70–80% chance (of) making the diagnosis,
... between 60 and 70% chance of making that diagnosis
...a fairly high yield, at least 60%...
... up to 90% chance of getting that answer...
...whether that small means 10%, 15%,...
It’s still less than a half or tenth of a percent.
His risk...would still be about 5 to 7%,...
...but his risk...would be probably somewhere between 5 and 10%,...
...that occurs you know less than a half percent of the time.
... usually about 2 or 3%.
... maybe somewhere between 5 and 10%.

B.4. Possible Event Descriptions
The possible event descriptions are a low-resolution variant of categorical descriptions, used to determine whether an event should be included as an alternative in a decision or not.

ALWAYS: This event, though perhaps not absolutely certain, may be assumed to occur.
SOMETIMES: This event is one of a set of possibilities; its likelihood will need to be considered.
NEVER: This event, though perhaps not absolutely impossible, may be excluded from consideration.¹

This is a selected excerpt from the transcript illustrating the usage, not a complete list.

L242 the potential bleeding complications scare me with invasive procedures.
L243 I think those are clearly the things that kill people.
L244 you know.
L245 these people generally don’t die from procedures
L246 of...

¹ Chorus: “Never?”
Captain Corcoran: “Well, hardly ever.”
[H.M.S. Pinafore, Gilbert and Sullivan.]
generally don’t die from respiratory failure
following these procedures
‘cause we can ——
we can ventilate them,
we can support them.
But they do die from hemorrhagic complications,
and that’s something that would frighten me,
but cardiopulmonary things I would just try to control
and do the biopsy.