

VIBE ROUNDS

Guided Discovery Protocol

AI-Augmented N-of-1 Case Research Methodology

Dr. Avinash Kumar Gupta

<https://avi33tbtt.github.io>

Overview

Vibe Rounds — Guided Discovery is an AI-augmented protocol for clinician-led, single-case research synthesis. Drawing on the Socratic framework underlying Vibe Rounds, it extends AI-assisted clinical reasoning from the bedside into a structured research workflow: enabling a clinician with one complex patient and an afternoon to move from raw case narrative to publication-compatible outputs.

Unlike population-scale informatics pipelines (EvAgg, ZebraMap), this protocol is case-first. It is designed to be run by the treating clinician, not an informatician, and produces structured outputs aligned to existing reporting standards (CARE guidelines, PRISMA-style search documentation) without requiring institutional infrastructure.

Core Thesis

"The individual pipeline steps exist elsewhere. The combination — run by a clinician, on their own case, in a single sitting, converging to CARE-compatible outputs via a Socratic-AI two-tier analysis — does not appear to exist as a named, described protocol."

Section 1 — Seven-Stage Workflow

The Guided Discovery protocol proceeds across seven stages, moving from raw clinical narrative to a structured, decision-useful output package. Each stage maps onto a section of a publishable methods paper.

| Stage | Name | What Happens | Standard Alignment |
|-------|------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Index Case Structuring | Extract diagnosis-related and intervention-related term lists from the case narrative | CARE guidelines checklist fields |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 2 | Comparator Identification | Use extracted terms as search seeds; identify 5 similar cases from PubMed and web | PRISMA-style search documentation |
| 3 | Aggregation & Cross-Comparison | Pool comparator case text into one dataset; compare against index case | Shared gene / phenotype / intervention criteria |
| 4 | Two-Tier Analysis | Tier 1: coded/structured view. Tier 2: full narrative/contextual view | Core methodological contribution |
| 5 | Analytic Ideation | Open-ended AI prompt: expand the option space for further analysis | Vibe Rounds Socratic mode |
| 6 | Selection of Analytic Menu | Choose from candidate analyses (timeline, gene map, intervention scoring, gap analysis, risk trajectory, lab patterns) | Transferable menu for other clinicians |
| 7 | Convergence to Outputs | Four standard deliverables: severity rating, priority rating, patient journey timeline, intervention–symptom correlation table | Publication-ready package |

Section 2 — Two-Tier Analysis Methodology

The Two-Tier Analysis is the protocol's core methodological contribution. It explicitly separates two epistemically distinct views of the same case — a separation rarely made in clinical case report methodology, where a single synthesised narrative typically blends both.

Tier 1 — Coded / Structured View

Input: diagnosis-related and intervention-related terms extracted in Stage 1.

What this captures: what a structured database, registry, or coding system (ICD, SNOMED) would capture about this case.

What it misses: clinical reasoning, sequencing of events, contextual weighting, temporal patterns, and narrative logic.

Tier 2 — Narrative / Contextual View

Input: full unstructured text of the index case narrative.

What this captures: the clinician's reasoning, the sequence in which findings emerged, which symptoms were weighted and why, and the interpretive logic that codes strip away.

What it misses: comparability across cases (every narrative is differently structured).

Why Both Tiers Matter

Running both tiers on the same case exposes what structured coding captures and what it loses. In rare or multi-system cases, the narrative often contains diagnostic signal that codes systematically erase. The two-tier split makes this erasure visible and analysable — a clinically useful epistemic move.

Section 3 — Worked Example: Triple Energy Pathway Case

The protocol was developed and validated using a complex index case: a 42-year-old female presenting with severe recurrent oedema and suspected convergence of three independent energy-pathway lesions.

3A. Index Case Summary

| Parameter | Detail |
|---------------------|---|
| Patient | 42F — severe recurrent oedema, multi-system fatigue pattern |
| Suspected Diagnoses | G6PD deficiency · AMPD1 deficiency · GSD Type III/IX (VUS, pending biopsy) |
| Framework | "Triple Energy Pathway Deficit" — novel clinical synthesis |
| Status | First-of-its-kind combination in literature; individual components well-characterised |

3B. Novelty Assessment

The honest framing from literature search:

- **The bricks are well-known:** G6PD's role in NADPH/glutathione/oxidative stress is extensively characterised. AMPD1's role in ATP regeneration during exertion is well established. GSD III/IX's role in glycogen mobilisation is classic metabolic biochemistry.
- **The wall is new:** No published case report, review, or framework combines G6PD deficiency + AMPD1 deficiency + GSD type III/IX into a single 'triple energy pathway' syndrome or diagnostic concept. The specific combination returns nothing in searchable literature.
- **The caveat:** GSD III/IX remains a VUS, unconfirmed pending biopsy. The 'triple' framing's durability is contingent on that confirmation. The protocol paper, however, is independent of this outcome.

3C. Stage-by-Stage Walkthrough

1. **Index case structuring:** Extracted two clean term lists (diagnosis-related; intervention-related) from the 2019 case narrative. Mapped onto CARE checklist fields.
2. **Comparator identification:** Used extracted keywords as PubMed/web seeds; identified 5 cases with overlapping genetic/metabolic profiles or phenotype clusters.
3. **Aggregation:** Pooled full comparator case text into one dataset; cross-compared against index case for shared features and divergence points.
4. **Two-tier analysis:** Level 1 (coded terms only) vs Level 2 (full unstructured narrative) — surfaced what structured coding missed in a multi-system rare phenotype.
5. **Analytic ideation:** Open prompt generated six candidate analyses: symptom–trigger–intervention timeline; gene interaction network map; intervention response scoring; literature gap analysis; risk trajectory modelling; lab value pattern analysis.
6. **Selection:** Narrowed to four immediately actionable deliverables (see 3D).
7. **Convergence:** Standard output package produced (see 3D).

3D. Standard Output Package

| Deliverable | Description | Purpose |
|--|--|----------------------------|
| Severity Rating per Diagnosis | Each confirmed/suspected diagnosis rated by clinical impact severity | Clinical prioritisation |
| Priority Rating per Diagnosis | Ranked by urgency of confirmation / intervention | Decision support |
| Patient Journey Timeline | Condensed chronological sequence of symptom emergence, investigations, and interventions | Narrative synthesis |
| Intervention–Symptom Correlation Table | Maps each intervention to its observed symptom relief or non-response | Treatment pattern analysis |

Section 4 — Positioning Against Existing Pipelines

| System | Scale | Operator | AI Role | Gap Addressed |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------|---|---|
| EvAgg | Population / cohort | Informatician | Automated batch query | Variant-level gene evidence at scale |
| ZebraMap | 36,000+ cases | Informatician | LLM parsing of case text into structured fields | Population-level rare disease knowledge map |
| Fabry AI Review | Large dataset | Research team | Prospective patient identification | Population-first rare disease detection |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Vibe Rounds Guided Discovery | N=1 (index case) | Treating clinician | Conversational Socratic co-pilot | Bedside-to-desk synthesis in a single session |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|

The Guided Discovery protocol occupies a space none of the above tools address: the treating clinician who needs to make sense of one unusual patient now, without institutional informatics infrastructure, in a workflow that is reproducible and publication-compatible.

Section 5 — Source Documentation

All source links underlying this document are listed below for citation, reproducibility, and version tracking.

5A. Clinical Case Foundations

Complex Index Case — 42F Triple Energy Deficit

Primary case used as the worked example. Demonstrates the 'first of its kind' triple energy pathway synthesis (G6PD + AMPD1 + GSD III/IX).

- **Case narrative (2019):** https://classworkdecjan.blogspot.com/2019/05/42-f-with-severe-regular-edema-with_17.html?m=1

Common Hospital Case — 55M Diabetic Patient

Used to demonstrate how the protocol prevents diagnostic closure in routine clinical scenarios.

- **Case narrative:** <https://chetanakorada.blogspot.com/2021/03/dr.html>

5B. AI Analytics & Interaction Logs

Raw conversational data and outputs from multi-level internal analysis sessions on Claude.ai.

- **Session 1 — Term extraction and comparator search:** <https://claude.ai/share/a710c8f4-1656-4087-876e-f415a84ca63c>
- **Session 2 — Two-tier analysis and ideation:** <https://claude.ai/share/b172def3-a09b-4b8a-a522-83b6e2bd2240>
- **Session 3 — Case analytics output:** <https://claude.ai/share/a4ba3737-8f69-4a13-b31d-b7177cd3dffb>

5C. Protocol Documentation

Core protocol blog posts detailing the seven-stage workflow and two-tier analysis methodology.

- **Case-Based Guided Discovery and Research (2026-06-13):**
<https://classworkdecjan.blogspot.com/2026/06/case-based-guided-discovery-and-research.html>
- **N-of-1 Complex Case and LLM-Based Analytics (2026-06-14):**
<https://classworkdecjan.blogspot.com/2026/06/n-of-1-complex-case-and-llm-based.html>

5D. Project Hub

- **Vibe Rounds Website:** <https://avi33tbtt.github.io>

Vibe Rounds — Guided Discovery Protocol

Not AI replacing doctors. AI giving doctors the cognitive bandwidth to be their best.

Dr. Avinash Kumar Gupta