CLINICAL LEGAL FIELD™

A Framework for Clinical Evidence, Analytical Reliability, and Professional Collaboration

EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW | INSTITUTIONAL BRIEFING

For attorneys, healthcare professionals, universities, and prospective institutional partners

FOUNDATIONAL PUBLICATION

A proposed interdisciplinary model for source-referenced healthcare record review, contextual reconstruction, classification, and evaluation of analytical reliability.

Matthew Adcock | October 26, 2026

Companion to The Clinical Legal Field™ Consolidated Master, Integrated Edition v2.2

01 / EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose and Value Proposition

An organizing framework, not a new license, legal practice, or proven scientific standard.

The Clinical Legal Field™ is an author-developed interdisciplinary framework intended to connect clinical knowledge with structured examination of healthcare records, events, operational systems, and evidentiary questions arising in legal contexts. It builds on established practices such as legal nurse consulting and healthcare record review rather than claiming those activities did not previously exist.

The problem it addresses

Healthcare matters can involve fragmented records, differing clinical and legal vocabularies, incomplete timelines, and unclear distinctions between observation, inference, and expert opinion. The model proposes documented procedures that make analytical work more traceable and easier to scrutinize.

Four connected methods

Contexture™

Reconstruct event sequence and circumstances; preserve alternative explanations and missing intervals.

Evidexa™

Examine source provenance, consistency, conflicting information, and gaps in available records.

CLCS™

Organize observations using documented categories without treating classifications as legal conclusions.

LEXTEXTURE™

Evaluate reliability of analytical procedures, repeatability, accuracy where measurable, and application limits.

Clinical Legal Science™ is the proposed overarching methodology integrating these functions. The Clinical Legal Method™ describes the sequence of assignment definition, source review, reconstruction, standards comparison, classification, reliability review, and reporting.

EDUCATIONAL AND BRAND APPLICATION

Clinical Legal Science™ names the proposed methodology and is also intended as a source identifier for related education. Teaching a methodology and identifying the provider of that education are different functions; trademark recognition and use must be supported separately.

02 / PRACTICAL APPLICATION

From Records to Traceable Findings

A hypothetical dental review illustrates how the framework would be applied.

Consider a dental procedure note followed by a later entry recording a patient-reported symptom and a discussion of referral. The task is not to declare negligence, but to organize what the available records do and do not establish.

01 Define	Document the question, materials received, reviewer competence, and boundaries.
02 Review	Inventory records and record provenance, discrepancies, and missing material with Evidexa™.
03 Reconstruct	Sequence the procedure, symptom report, assessment, referral discussion, and follow-up with Contexture™.
04 Classify	Use documented CLCS™ categories; distinguish observations from interpretations.
05 Test and report	Apply appropriate LEXTEXTURE™ checks, record limitations, and issue a source-referenced summary.

What the output does not establish

A chronology alone does not prove causation; a missing document does not prove that an event did not occur; and a classification does not determine fault, damages, or legal liability. Clinical opinions, legal conclusions, and expert testimony require appropriate qualifications and governing-law analysis.

03 / PRACTITIONER AND INSTITUTIONAL MODEL

Roles, Education, and Credentialing

Distinct functions are proposed; operational and legal separation must be documented.

Clinical Legal Analyst™

An interdisciplinary role for structured healthcare-event review within demonstrated training, experience, and professional scope.

Dental Legal Nurse Consultant™

A nursing-focused dental specialty requiring nursing licensure and relevant dental knowledge; distinct from the broader DCLA™ role.

Institutional functions

Adcock Institute of Clinical Legal Science™

Proposed education, curriculum, methods documentation, and research development.

NBOLNCS™

Private professional standards, competency assessment, and voluntary credentialing functions, subject to adopted governance and actual programs.

NurseID.me™

Proposed identity, licensure, and private-credential verification and registry functions.

Clinical Legal Staffing Group™

Proposed workforce matching and deployment functions.

DentalCaseReview.com

Applied dental intake, record organization, and coordination pathway.

These labels do not establish that every program, credential, staffing relationship, or technology integration is operational. Education completion, credential award, license status, and registry participation are separate facts.

04 / PARTNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

Where Institutions Could Collaborate

Illustrative avenues for discussion, not existing agreements or guarantees.

Attorneys and law firms

Pilot source-indexed record chronologies, identify unresolved clinical questions, coordinate qualified experts, and assess whether outputs are useful to legal review.

Healthcare professionals

Review documentation quality, communication pathways, care-event reconstruction, and specialty-specific training needs within clinical scope.

Universities and educators

Evaluate curricula, student case exercises, source-traceability rubrics, and methods for measuring reviewer agreement and accuracy.

Institutional partners

Explore defined pilots for governance, verification, records workflow, specialist collaboration, or workforce qualification checks.

A practical first collaboration

Begin with a bounded, de-identified pilot: define a narrow review question; identify appropriately qualified participants; document the procedure and reference materials; assess source accuracy, agreement, and disagreements; publish limitations and corrections. No clinical records should be exchanged without appropriate authorization, privacy controls, and agreements.

Proposed success measures

Source-location accuracy, chronology completeness, identification of contrary evidence, classification agreement, error documentation, clarity of limitations, and reviewer effort. These are proposed metrics, not results from a completed validation study.

05 / EVIDENCE, GOVERNANCE AND NEXT STEPS

A Responsible Development Roadmap

Transparent boundaries are essential to meaningful institutional evaluation.

Research and validation

LEXTEXTURE™ proposes a framework for testing whether defined procedures yield consistent and source-supported findings. Repeatability and reviewer agreement are not the same as accuracy. A credible evaluation requires a stated intended use, predefined acceptance criteria, suitable reference findings, qualified reviewers, error measures, and published limitations.

Professional and legal boundaries

The framework does not confer authority to practice law, diagnose, treat, issue governmental licenses, or testify as an expert. Rule 702, Daubert, and Frye may be relevant to later expert-evidence evaluation, but the publication does not establish admissibility, scientific acceptance, accreditation, or court approval.

Intellectual property and status

Several related names have pending U.S. trademark applications. NBOLNCS received a Notice of Allowance in October 2026, not a registration. NBOLNCS BOARD CERTIFIED™ is separately pending; the project identifies a disclaimer of BOARD CERTIFIED apart from the complete mark. Claimed marks do not grant exclusivity over ordinary professional terminology or prevent an opposition.

Invitation to evaluate

Potential collaborators can begin with a focused discussion of the review question, required expertise, evidence handling, study design, governance responsibilities, and the actual readiness of any proposed service. The full 35-page master white paper provides the terminology, methodological detail, and publication limitations supporting this overview.

SOURCE PUBLICATION

Adcock, M. (2026). The Clinical Legal Field™: Consolidated Master, Integrated Edition v2.2. ClinicalLegalField.com | NBOLNCS.org