Story Thinking: A New Cognitive Framework for Critical Care Medicine

A follow-up to my conference presentation in Wrocław

Michael S. Czekajlo, MD, PhD, MSc

At my recent critical care presentation in Wrocław, I introduced a concept I have been developing called Story Thinking. The premise is simple: in critical care, the challenge is rarely a lack of data. The challenge is connecting data through time, physiology, causality, context, and prediction so that the team can understand what is happening now and anticipate what may happen next.

We are trained to collect information, generate differential diagnoses, identify abnormalities, and construct problem lists. All of those skills remain essential. But the ICU is not a static environment. Physiology changes rapidly. Organ systems interact. Treatment changes the disease itself. Information arrives asynchronously and is distributed among nurses, physicians, respiratory therapists, pharmacists, consultants, bedside ultrasound, the electronic record, and the family. A diagnosis that was reasonable six hours ago may no longer explain the patient in front of us.

That is why I believe critical illness is better understood as a movie than as a photograph.

The monitor displays numbers. The patient lives a story. Great intensivists connect the numbers to the story.

What I mean by Story Thinking

I define Story Thinking as the continuous construction, testing, and revision of an evolving explanatory narrative that integrates physiology, pathology, time, context, and anticipated future events to guide clinical decisions.

The operative sequence is: observe, understand, predict, intervene, reassess, and rewrite. The “story” is not a literary device. It is a cognitive structure. It asks the clinician to move beyond naming disease toward building an explanation that accounts for how the patient arrived at the current state, what mechanisms are driving that state, what remains hidden, how treatment should alter the trajectory, and what the team expects to see next.

This is consistent with established work in clinical reasoning, naturalistic decision making, situation awareness, and high-reliability organizations. Story Thinking is not intended to replace those models. It is a proposed integrative framework designed for the dynamic and multidisciplinary environment of critical care.

Five chapters of the clinical story

A useful way to operationalize the model is to think in five chapters:

1. **Past:** Why did this patient become critically ill? What was the baseline, and what sequence of events produced the present condition?
2. **Present:** What physiology is occurring now? Which data describe the current state, and which are merely consequences or noise?

3. **Hidden:** What has not yet declared itself? Which explanation is being missed because the team is anchored to the first plausible diagnosis?
4. **Future:** What happens next if nothing changes? What is the likely trajectory, and what is the most dangerous plausible trajectory?
5. **Intervention:** How should treatment rewrite the story? What physiologic response do we expect, and what will we conclude if that response does not occur?

Why this matters at the bedside

In the conference presentation, I used a postoperative cardiac surgery case to illustrate the difference between a snapshot and a story. A patient with hypotension, rising lactate, oliguria, and increasing vasopressor requirements can easily acquire labels such as “vasoplegia,” “needs more fluid,” or “possible LV dysfunction.” Each may be reasonable. None is sufficient unless it explains the whole pattern.

Once the chronology and physiology are assembled, the interpretation can change. A high central venous pressure, cool extremities, narrow pulse pressure, worsening oxygenation, difficult separation from bypass, and bedside echocardiographic evidence of right ventricular dilation create a different narrative: evolving acute right ventricular failure. In that context, the rising lactate is not automatically a request for more fluid. It is a clue.

The next step is prediction. If the story is correct, continued right ventricular dilation should reduce left ventricular filling and cardiac output, increase venous congestion, worsen kidney and liver function, and potentially create a shock spiral. Prediction is not fortune-telling. It is physiology extended forward in time.

Treatment then becomes a test of the story. If the team reduces unnecessary fluid loading, optimizes oxygenation and ventilation, reduces right ventricular afterload, maintains coronary perfusion pressure, considers inotropic support, and the patient's hemodynamics improve, the response strengthens the working explanation. If the response does not match the prediction, the team should rewrite the story.

A potential defense against cognitive error

One reason I find this framework useful is that it makes cognitive error visible. Anchoring can be reframed as: Is the original story still supported? Premature closure becomes: What important finding does the story fail to explain? Confirmation bias becomes: What evidence would make our story wrong? Diagnostic momentum becomes: Are we inheriting someone else's narrative? Search satisfaction becomes: What hidden chapter remains?

A good clinical story should explain the important data, predict the trajectory, and remain falsifiable. A coherent narrative is valuable only if it can be challenged. Story Thinking should therefore increase metacognition, not simply replace one form of anchoring with another.

The story belongs to the team

Critical care reasoning is not purely an individual cognitive process. The nurse sees trends and responses to therapy. The respiratory therapist sees ventilatory mechanics. The pharmacist sees medication effects and interactions. POCUS may reveal the physiology. The family provides baseline function, values, and context. The physician's role is not merely to collect these inputs, but to integrate them into a shared explanatory model.

The best ICU teams do not merely exchange data. They construct and update one shared story. That shared mental model can make rounds more useful because the team leaves with a common understanding of what is happening, what remains uncertain, what treatment is expected to accomplish, and what change should trigger escalation.

A practical format for tomorrow's ICU rounds

I ended the presentation with five questions that can be used immediately:

- What story brought the patient here?
- What story best explains today's physiology?
- What story have we not yet discovered?
- What story are our interventions creating?
- What story do we expect by tomorrow?

From bedside cognition to simulation and AI

The same framework may have value beyond daily rounds. In simulation, we can move from teaching memorized responses toward teaching anticipation. Debriefing can reconstruct how the team's story evolved, where competing mental models appeared, which clues were missed, and how treatment responses should have changed the working explanation.

Artificial intelligence creates another opportunity. AI is increasingly capable of detecting patterns, surfacing weak signals, and identifying trajectories that humans may overlook. But pattern recognition is not the same as clinical meaning. My view is that the most useful future model will combine machine pattern recognition with human judgment about physiology, context, values, causality, and narrative coherence. AI should support prediction and sensemaking, not replace clinical judgment.

Where this goes next

Story Thinking is currently a proposed integrative framework, not a validated clinical instrument. That distinction matters. The next step is to test whether the model is teachable, whether it improves shared mental models and anticipation, whether it reduces fixation on incomplete explanations, and whether it can improve communication without making rounds longer or more complicated.

Critical care has always depended on the ability to act under uncertainty. The ICU of the future will provide us with even more data, more monitoring, and more predictive tools. Our cognitive challenge will therefore not become smaller. It will become larger.

The question is not simply whether we can see more data. It is whether we can connect those data into an evolving explanation that helps the team decide what to do next.

That is the idea behind Story Thinking.

References and Further Reading

1. Norman G, Monteiro S, Sherbino J. Is clinical cognition binary or continuous? Academic Medicine. 2013;88(8):1058-1060. doi:10.1097/ACM.0b013e31829a3c32.
2. Croskerry P. The importance of cognitive errors in diagnosis and strategies to minimize them. Academic Medicine. 2003;78(8):775-780. doi:10.1097/00001888-200308000-00003.
3. Eva KW. What every teacher needs to know about clinical reasoning. Medical Education. 2005;39(1):98-106. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2929.2004.01972.x.
4. Klein G. Sources of Power: How People Make Decisions. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 1998.
5. Endsley MR. Toward a theory of situation awareness in dynamic systems. Human Factors. 1995;37(1):32-64. doi:10.1518/001872095779049543.
6. Weick KE, Sutcliffe KM. Managing the Unexpected: Sustained Performance in a Complex World. 3rd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley; 2015.
7. Lewis J. Story Thinking Compared with 50 Change Models - Letter from Industry. Journal of Innovation Management. 2025;13(1):I-XXXI. doi:10.24840/2183-0606_013.001_L001.

8. Society of Critical Care Medicine. ICU Liberation resources and contemporary interprofessional critical care principles.

Suggested LinkedIn introduction:

Following my recent presentation in Wrocław, I wanted to share the central idea behind Story Thinking: critical illness is not a snapshot. It is an evolving story. The challenge for the ICU team is to connect data through time, causality, physiology, treatment response, and prediction. This article outlines the framework and why I believe it may be useful for bedside care, simulation, team cognition, and the future integration of AI.