ejpmr, 2015, 2(1), 658-664

SJIF Impact Factor 7.065

EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL AND MEDICAL RESEARCH

www.ejpmr.com

Review Article

ISSN 2394-3211

EJPMR

DATA ANALYTICS IN INTEGRATED HEALTH RECORDS: ENHANCING PREDICTIVE HEALTH OUTCOMES ACROSS EMERGENCY, NURSING, PHARMACY, AND LABORATORY SERVICES

Ali Mesfer Alkhathami*, Awadh Mutab Alharbi, Mutlaq Shabab Huwaydi Alotaibi, Mesfer Hamed M. Almalki, Khalid Battaa Albeladi, Mohammed Abdulrahman Alrashed, Saleh Abdullah Altwaijri, Salah mohammed Alshaghroud and Talal Habeeb Bokhamsin

Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs.
https://shorturl.at/pYAyf

***Corresponding Author: Ali Mesfer Alkhathami**

Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs.

https://shorturl.at/pYAyf

Article Received on 05/12/2014 **Article Revised on 25/12/2014** **Article Published on 15/01/2015**

ABSTRACT

Background: Clinical Practice Guidelines (CPGs) play a critical role in standardizing healthcare delivery to improve patient outcomes. However, adherence to CPGs varies significantly across healthcare domains, particularly in multidisciplinary settings such as emergency, nursing, pharmacy, medical records, and laboratory services. Understanding the intrinsic and extrinsic factors that influence adherence is essential to identify gaps and optimize healthcare practices. **Methods:** This study employed a mixed-method systematic review using a convergent integrated approach. Relevant literature was sourced from peer-reviewed journals, databases, and grey literature. The analysis incorporated qualitative and quantitative data to examine personal, cognitive, organizational, and technological factors influencing CPG adherence. A thematic synthesis of qualitative findings was integrated with quantitative results to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the barriers and facilitators. **Results:** The review identified several recurring factors influencing adherence across disciplines. Intrinsic factors included healthcare professionals' knowledge, attitudes, and motivation, while extrinsic factors encompassed organizational support, availability of resources, and the integration of clinical decision support systems within electronic health records (EHRs). Emergency and nursing teams reported challenges related to high patient volumes and time constraints, while pharmacy and laboratory services highlighted the importance of accurate communication and data standardization. Improved adherence was associated with training programs, leadership support, and interoperable technology systems. **Conclusion:** Adherence to CPGs in multidisciplinary settings is influenced by complex, interrelated factors. Addressing both intrinsic and extrinsic barriers through targeted interventions, including education, enhanced collaboration, and technological integration, can significantly improve guideline adherence and patient care. The findings underscore the need for a cohesive approach to healthcare delivery that leverages multidisciplinary strengths.

KEYWORDS: Clinical Practice Guidelines, Multidisciplinary Healthcare, Adherence, Electronic Health Records, Systematic Review.

1. INTRODUCTION

Clinical informatics involves the use of informatics and information technology to enhance healthcare delivery services. Its function is swiftly transforming to enhance clinical decision-making via the integration of cutting-edge information with medical record systems.[1] As medicine transitions to customized therapy and precision medicines, the use of knowledge in electronic health/medical record (EHR/EMR) systems and translational research will improve operational efficiency for hospitals and decrease expenses. The population and analysis of significant data sets in standardized formats from EHRs have not yet occurred, since methods and resources remain insufficiently developed. The acknowledgment of the significance of using digital data and information for patient care has prompted the first cohort of doctors to get board certification in the newly established subspecialty of clinical informatics.[2]

Bioinformatics involves the creation of storage, analytical, and interpretative techniques to enhance the conversion of growing volumes of biomedical and genetic data into proactive, predictive, preventative, and participative healthcare.[3] The domain of bioinformatics has expanded significantly, yielding a substantial volume of data that is mostly unstandardized and generally

unavailable. Despite issues with the standardization of semantic medical terminology and inconsistent data quality affecting clinical informatics, researchers persist in grappling with diverse data interchange formats, service ontologies, and disjointed online services.[4,5] With the advent of $1,000 genome analysis and the implementation of mandated electronic health records, the emphasis in bioinformatics has transitioned from data collection to the analysis of extensive datasets for direct application in patient treatment.

A crucial step in realizing precision medicine is the integration of historical and contemporary data into verified information, subsequently transforming this information into knowledge useful to diagnosis, prognosis, or therapy.[6] This will include creating a cohesive knowledge ecosystem that consistently gathers, expands, organizes, and institutionalizes new information, ensuring its accessibility to healthcare practitioners. Data derived from scientific research and clinical information inside EHRs will be disseminated, influencing the identification of innovative treatment approaches and the implementation of precision medicine.[7] A laboratory discovery currently takes 17 years to achieve broad clinical use.[8] Bioinformatics aims to refine treatment choices and improve results by offering quick access to a patient's genetic, laboratory, and electronic health record data, while correlating this information with ongoing clinical trials and research.

2. The function of Electronic Health Records in connecting clinical informatics with laboratory research

The merits and drawbacks of Electronic Health Records (EHR) have been contested since the enactment of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and the HITECH Act of 2009, which required and rewarded its implementation and use.[9,10] Despite the American Medical College of Informatics identifying cost, data security issues, and significant learning curves as primary obstacles to EHR adoption, most healthcare providers believe that the implementation and effective utilization of EHR will reduce operating expenses, lower error rates, and enhance positive patient outcomes. From an informatics standpoint, the introduction of EHR will facilitate the establishment of centralized repositories for clinical data, assay findings, and patient outcomes, therefore enhancing scientific research.[11,12] The proactive use of electronic health records would enhance patient care across all medical sectors. Blake et al. present an EHR database with a universal, intuitive, "Google-like" informatics interface that enables communication across diverse infrastructures, hence facilitating the identification of new cancer biomarkers.[13]

Early adoption of Electronic Health Records (EHR) has occurred in numerous European countries and within private entities such as Kaiser Permanente, as well as government organizations like the VA hospital system.[14] The adoption of EHR in the United States is becoming increasingly widespread and rapid, with various vendors supplying EHR systems to medical practices of all sizes. Data from the National Center for Health Statistics indicates that the use of electronic health records (EHR) by office-based doctors has increased from 42.0% to 78.4% during the previous five years.[15] Survey data from the American Hospital Association substantiates this trend, indicating that the use of EHR systems in U.S. hospitals increased to 44% in 2012, thrice the rate in 2010.[16,17] United States Data from the Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) indicate that healthcare providers engaged in federal EHR Incentive Programs have indicated a growing use of diverse EHR systems, suggesting an imminent full transition to electronic data. Although peer-reviewed data on the several EHR providers is scarce, analyses conducted by commercial organizations reveal a fragmented market influenced by characteristics such as learning curve, usability, and practice size.[18] This rise is occurring despite obstacles to physician acceptance of EHRs, which include financial (elevated starting and maintenance costs), technical (deficiencies in computer skills), temporal (learning curve), and legal (security apprehensions) challenges to EHR implementation.[19]

The need to implement EHR has resulted in substantial volumes of patient data transitioning to the digital domain. A pivotal inquiry pertains to the optimal use of this knowledge to enhance patient outcomes. A systematic analysis conducted in 2011 on the use of EHRs on a primary care healthcare system revealed that EHRs offered "structural and process benefits," however few evidence suggested enhanced patient outcomes.[11] The positive benefits identified were that EHRs: 1) enhanced the completeness of patient contacts, 2) stimulated patient inquiries, 3) eliminated misunderstanding caused by illegible handwriting, and 4) strengthened physicians' trust in the EHR system.[11] The negative or detrimental consequences of EHRs included: 1) no significant variation in the overall number of patient office visits, 2) an increase in duplicate order entries, 3) a rise in inadequate EHR training, and 4) workflow disruptions resulting from system malfunctions.[11] Randomized controlled research indicates that electronic health records may adversely impact physicians' perception of patients' non-verbal signals.[11] The current comprehension of the impact of EHRs on patient care is underdeveloped; nonetheless, enhanced EHR practices, standardization, and training to rectify shortcomings will maximize the efficacy of EHRs.

3. Electronic Health Records

The absence of definitive data demonstrating beneficial impacts of EHR use on clinical outcomes indicates that EHR implementation is only a first step in enhancing patient care via informatics. To enhance results via EHR use, it is essential to identify optimal strategies for

digitizing the extensive data. The now-retired caBIG initiative of the National Cancer Institute and its successor, the National Cancer Informatics initiative (NCIP), exemplify the integration of extensive cancer data sets. The advancement of open-source standards has allowed cancer researchers to get current clinical data, genotypic data, and family inheritance data for study design and decision-making purposes.[20] Clinically, electronic health records (EHRs) provide extensive information to researchers and clinicians, while early adopters have begun the integration of clinical decision support systems (CDSS), which use the information network established by EHRs. The implemented Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) provide reminder boxes for patient follow-up, alert mechanisms for data submission deadlines, and diagnostic recommendations.

4. The need for Clinical Decision Support Systems in precision medicine

Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) are instruments that integrate known clinical knowledge with current patient data to improve patient care; they include a range of methodologies addressing many subjects.[21] Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) are intended to aid the physician-patient interaction at various stages, from the first consultation to diagnosis and follow-up (Figure 1). It is anticipated that adequately equipped Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) would greatly enhance patient care across all tiers.

CDSS promises to mitigate the increasingly burdensome time constraints faced by doctors. Since the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, 46% of surveyed emergency medicine doctors have reported an increase in patient volume in emergency departments.[22] The American Academy of Family Physicians projects that office visits would rise from 462 million in 2008 to 565 million by 2025. The American Association of Medical Colleges (AAMC) anticipates a deficit of 130,600 doctors by 2025. The Social Security Administration indicates approximately 10,000 baby boomers retire daily. The growing disparity between the supply of doctors and the demand for their time underscores the need for well-structured Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS).[23-25]

Time constraints, coupled with continuously changing standards of care, lead to physician errors and postponed clinical decisions[26], which negatively affect medical economics (physician error is the primary cause of ambulatory malpractice claims, averaging $300,000 per claim).[27] Error rates have decreased during the last 40 years, however, may still reach 24.4%.[28] A 2009 review indicated that 32% of medical mistakes stemmed from insufficient time allocated for patient evaluation, leading to inaccurate diagnoses, less emphasis on critical analyses, or failure to acknowledge urgency or complications.[26] In a contemporary clinical environment utilizing Electronic Health Records (EHRs), 78.9% of diagnostic errors stemmed from deficiencies in the patient-physician interaction, encompassing 1) the omission of necessary tests, 2) challenges in obtaining precise medical histories, 3) insufficient patient examinations by physicians, and 4) inadequate assessment of existing documentation.[29] A research indicated the absence of electronic recording for differential diagnosis on the first visit in 81.1% of instances.[29] A recent survey indicated that 74 percent of misdiagnoses were attributable to cognitive mistakes made by the physician. The predominant mistakes were linked to "premature closure," the inclination to cease evaluating other alternatives once arriving at a diagnosis.[30] During a 25-year span, diagnostic mistakes constituted 28.6% of malpractice claims in the United States.[31]

These results indicate that contemporary EHRs provide data points and information but have not enhanced comprehension or knowledge. Patient data need sequential analysis by clinicians to arrive at accurate clinical findings, which then transform into knowledge. These difficulties underscore the need for EHR-based CDSS to convert clinical data and information into actionable knowledge for time-pressed clinicians, therefore reducing the occurrence of mistakes.

Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) have been used in pharmacology, pharmacy, pharmacogenomics, and pathology. Well-defined Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) that evaluate renal function, pregnancy status, duplicate order entry, drug allergy verification, and the appropriateness of drug selection and dosage in relation to a specific diagnosis are presently employed to mitigate errors in pharmaceutical dosing, drug-drug interactions, drug-pregnancy interactions, and other medication-related factors.[32] A 1994 comprehensive study indicated that drug-prescribing and interaction-warning systems had improved patient outcomes by reducing side effects and dosage mistakes.[33] A computerized order entry support system for renal-toxic and renal-cleared drugs enhanced dosage appropriateness for renal function and reduced the median duration of stay by half a day.[34] These systems fulfill an essential need by accommodating the ever-evolving pharmacological recommendations and interactions, as well as the significant number of specialized doctors involved with a single patient. Prospective research demonstrated an 86% reduction in significant drug mistakes after the use of CDSS.[35] Case investigations have shown heightened pathogen sensitivity to certain antimicrobial drugs, reduced incidence of adverse medication reactions, elevated toxic drug levels, and bleeding occurrences in patients administered anticoagulants.[33]

Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) are especially adept in forecasting drug-dosing issues linked to medications that interact with the cytochrome P450 system, which metabolizes pharmaceuticals with limited therapeutic windows (e.g., Warfarin). Future

implementations of Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) will enhance pharmacological and dose selection by economical genomic analysis, enabling the prediction of drug metabolism tailored to individual genetic profiles. A CDSS designed for this objective would need a substantial initial data collection; but, if implemented, it will enable safer, evidence-based optimum therapy and dosage for patients.[36]

Pathologists have rapidly embraced Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) due to the pathology report being a critical decision-making element across several disciplines, from preventative medicine to surgery. Improvements in histopathology analysis, electronic health record documentation, and cellular biology methodologies have facilitated the collection of extensive digitized patient data, leading to the development of novel processes in the digital pathology laboratory.[37] A specific Clinical Decision Support System (CDSS) enables pathologists to aggregate prostate cancer data and offers prognostic and decision-making capabilities.[38] BRCAPRO is a software application that estimates the likelihood of possessing a harmful mutation in the breast cancer genes BRCA1 and/or BRCA2, depending on the patient's cancer status and familial history of breast and ovarian cancer. BRCAPRO demonstrates great sensitivity for screening and exemplifies the significant potential of clinical informatics to influence preventive medicine and enhance patient outcomes.[39]

Notwithstanding the encouraging preliminary results from the two previously stated domains, most Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) have failed to provide functionalities beyond basic alarms, reminders, summary dashboards, and automated information retrieval systems.[40,41] The majority of hospitals in the United States have not yet adopted any kind of Clinical Decision Support System (CDSS). “Comprehensive” EHR systems encompass decision support functionalities, such as clinical guidelines, clinical reminders, drug-allergy alerts, drug-drug interaction alerts, drug-laboratory interaction alerts, and drug-dosing support; merely 1.5% of 2,952 surveyed hospitals attained a “comprehensive” designation.[42] Limited research on Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) has shown any improvement in outcomes, and the observed benefits have attained very minimal statistical significance.[40] A meta-analysis of 148 randomized clinical studies on CDSS deployment revealed that hardly 20% affected clinical outcomes.[41] Improvements were observed in morbidity outcomes, including hospitalizations, surgical site infections, cardiovascular events, and deep vein thrombosis; however, there was minimal impact on mortality or pharmacologic adverse events[41], indicating that Clinical Decision Support Systems require enhancement before they can consistently deliver clinically significant insights.

Scientific and clinical datasets are often stored in extensive files across many global databases, referred to as "information silos." To transform vast data sets and pertinent information into formats readily accessible to doctors and researchers, it is essential to integrate information silos. Intelligent algorithms must use standardized languages or phenotypes to determine the relevance of material to a certain query. If the extensive patient data in hospital EHR systems is seen as an information silo, how may linkages be established between patient data and source literature for scientific and clinical applications? An effective Clinical Decision Support System (CDSS) would integrate data and insights derived from extensive research, clinical tests, blood analyses, and follow-up information to achieve the clinical target. The integration of information across various domains exemplifies the concept of cooperation in medicine.

5. Progression from data to processed information, to integrated knowledge, to expert systems

Initially, digitized data were saved in files, then in databases, and now in data warehouses and, via the internet, in "the cloud". The vast expansion of data capacity and storage has facilitated contemporary "big data" paradigms and projects that aim to address more intricate scientific and medical inquiries. The primary obstacles to advancement are the fragmented and scattered characteristics of "big data." The objective is to provide methods for integrating or querying the relevant information silos to get necessary insights and solutions to problems.

Scientific research across several fields produces comprehensive findings that consist of novel data and interpretative insights, which are often disseminated to other researchers via publishing in scientific journals and inclusion in databases. The vertical organization of such knowledge often maintains data in silos, creating access hurdles that hinder seamless integration and querying of information. Consequently, to efficiently use new scientific findings and enhance comprehension among scientists in diverse domains, a tool for analyzing data across current information silos is essential.

A prevalent and effective approach for integrating diverse data sources is to use standardized vocabularies and data formats, aiming to diminish complexity and technological obstacles to their integration across various domains of expertise. Scientific information is highly standardized, with data formatting governed by U.S. government institutions such as the government Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH).[43] Health Level Seven International (HL7), the World Health Organization's International Classification of Diseases (ICD9, ICD10, and ICD-O), and the International Health Terminology Standards Development Organization (SNOMED) have established standards for clinical data points and information within electronic health records (EHRs) and various clinical reports, including paper-based physician

or patient charts. To facilitate the incorporation of genomic data into Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) and to elucidate data pertaining to biological concepts, the integration of resources such as Gene Ontology (GO) and HUGO Gene Nomenclature will be essential.

As knowledge progresses, the terminology used to convey this information must be harmonized and included into the foundational framework represented by established standards. Furthermore, new standards must be implemented on existing data to facilitate comparisons between contemporary and historical data. The ongoing debates necessary for developing such standards are substantial and important, sometimes lengthy, hard, and contentious. The ongoing evolution of standards and data presents hurdles to widespread acceptance; yet, the successful application of these 'internationally acknowledged' standards is essential to expedite the use of Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) and improve the quality of patient care.[44]

Emerging research platforms using diverse genomic and other "-omic" technologies produce substantial volumes of raw data necessitating processing via biostatistical methodologies and an array of visualization instruments. Data from new platforms is sometimes challenging to correlate with information produced by previous platforms. In response to this challenge, commercial software firms have created comprehensive tool suites tailored for platform-specific data. Large datasets of gene expression experimental findings are archived in the NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO).[45] Numerous organizations and firms have devised efficient and novel methods to extract diverse gene expression data from GEO, facilitating researchers' access to and analysis of vital information. Domain-specific systems use database technologies that enable the logical integration of information from several databases, hence offering enhanced capabilities to researchers.

6. CONCLUSIONS

We have reached an age in which computers, tablets, and smartphones facilitate the recording of practically all information in digital format. Computer-based systems capable of hosting all scientific and clinical data are essential for producing endpoint knowledge that directly enhances the understanding and treatment of illness for each patient. The convergence of supercomputing, research, and medicine has rendered the transformation of data into knowledge, along with its dissemination, essential for realizing precision medicine and individualized patient care.

REFERENCES

1. "Clinical Informatics". Home. N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Dec. 2013. http://www.amia.org/applications-informatics/clinical-informatics.
2. "New Clinical Informatics Subspecialty and First Class of Diplomates Signal Pivot in Healthcare Delivery". Home. N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Dec. 2013. http://www.amia.org/news-and-publications/press-release/new-clinical-informatics-subspecialty-and-first-class-diplomates.
3. "Translational Bioinformatics". Home. N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Dec. 2013. http://www.amia.org/applications-informatics/translational-bioinformatics.
4. Häyrinen K, Saranto K, Nykänen P. Definition, structure, content, use and impacts of electronic health records: a review of the research literature. Int J Med Inform, 2008; 77(5): 291–304.
5. Katayama T, Arakawa K, Nakao M, Ono K, Aoki-Kinoshita KF, Yamamoto Y, et al. The DBCLS BioHackathon: standardization and interoperability for bioinformatics web services and workflows. The DBCLS BioHackathon Consortium*. J Biomed Semant, 2010; 1(1): 8.
6. Defrancesco L. Life Technologies promises $1,000 genome. Nat Biotechnol, 2012; 30(2): 126.
7. Steinbrook R. Health care and the American recovery and reinvestment act. N Engl J Med., 2009; 360(11): 1057–60.
8. Friedman CP, Wong AK, Blumenthal D. Achieving a nationwide learning health system. Sci Transl Med., 2010; 2(57): 57.
9. Blumenthal D. Launching HITECH. N Engl J Med., 2010; 362(5): 382–5.
10. Ash JS, Bates DW. Factors and forces affecting EHR system adoption: report of a 2004 ACMI discussion. J Am Med Inform Assoc, 2005; 12(1): 8–12.
11. Holroyd-Leduc JM, Lorenzetti D, Straus SE, Sykes L, Quan H. The impact of the electronic medical record on structure, process, and outcomes within primary care: a systematic review of the evidence. J Am Med Inform Assoc, 2011; 18(6): 732–7. doi:10.1136/amiajnl-2010-000019.
12. Blake PM, Decker DA, Glennon TM, Liang YM, Losko S, Navin N, et al. Toward an integrated knowledge environment to support modern oncology. Cancer J., 2011; 17(4): 257–63.
13. Suh KS, Sarojini S, Youssif M, Nalley K, Milinovikj N, Elloumi F, et al. Tissue banking, bioinformatics, and electronic medical records: the front end requirements for personalized medicine. J Oncol, 2013; 2013: 368751.
14. The Kaiser permanente health record: transforming and streamlining modalities of care. Health Aff., 2009; 28(2): 323–333.
15. Hsiao C-J, Hing E. Use and characteristics of electronic health record systems among office-based physician practices: United States, 2001–2013. NCHS data brief, no 143. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics, 2014.
16. Desroches CM, Charles D, Furukawa MF, Joshi MS, Kralovec P, Mostashari F, et al. Adoption of electronic health records grows rapidly, but fewer than half of US hospitals had at least a basic system

in 2012. Health Aff (Millwood), 2013; 32(8): 1478–85.
17. Charles D, King J, Patel V, Furukawa MF. "Adoption of Electronic Health Record Systems among U.S. Non-federal Acute Care Hospitals: 2008–2012", ONC Data Brief, no 9. Washington, DC: Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology, 2013.
18. Department of Health & Human Services. Electronic Health Record Vendors Reported by Health Care Providers Participating in Federal EHR Incentive Programs, 2014.
19. Boonstra A, Broekhuis M. Barriers to the acceptance of electronic medical records by physicians from systematic review to taxonomy and interventions. BMC Health Serv Res., 2010; 10: 231.
20. Von Eschenbach AC, Buetow K. Cancer informatics vision: caBIG. Cancer Inform, 2006; 2: 22–4.
21. Osheroff JA, Teich JM, Middleton B, Steen EB, Wright A, Detmer DE. A roadmap for national action on clinical decision support. J Am Med Inform Assoc, 2007; 14(2): 141–5.
22. 2014 ACEP Polling Survey Results. April 2014. Accessed November 3, 2014.
23. Petterson SM, Liaw WR, Phillips RL, Rabin DL, Meyers DS, Bazemore AW. Projecting US primary care physician workforce needs: 2010–2025. Ann Fam Med., 2012; 10(6): 503–9.
24. Association of American Medical Colleges. GME Funding: How to Fix the Doctor Shortage. Available at: https://www.aamc.org/advocacy/campaigns_and_coalitions/fixdocshortage/.
25. Social Security Administration Annual Performance Plan for fiscal year 2012. Available at: http://www.ssa.gov/agency/performance/2012/APP%202012%20508%20PDF.pdf
26. Schiff GD, Hasan O, Kim S, Abrams R, Cosby K, Lambert BL, et al. Diagnostic error in medicine: analysis of 583 physician-reported errors. Arch Intern Med., 2009; 169(20): 1881–7.
27. Singh H, Graber M. Reducing diagnostic error through medical home-based primary care reform. JAMA, 2010; 304(4): 463–4.
28. Shojania KG, Burton EC, Mcdonald KM, Goldman L. Changes in rates of autopsy-detected diagnostic errors over time: a systematic review. JAMA., 2003; 289(21): 2849–56.
29. Singh H, Giardina TD, Meyer AN, Forjuoh SN, Reis MD, Thomas EJ. Types and origins of diagnostic errors in primary care settings. JAMA Int Med., 2013; 173(6): 418–25.
30. Graber ML, Franklin N, Gordon R. Diagnostic error in internal medicine. Arch Intern Med., 2005; 165(13): 1493–9.
31. Sabertehrani AS, Lee H, Mathews SC, Shore A, Makary MA, Pronovost PJ, et al. 25-Year summary of US malpractice claims for diagnostic errors 1986–2010: an analysis from the national practitioner data bank. BMJ Qual Saf., 2013; 22(8): 672–80.
32. Kuperman GJ, Bobb A, Payne TH, Avery AJ, Gandhi TK, Burns G, et al. Medication-related clinical decision support in computerized provider order entry systems: a review. J Am Med Inform Assoc, 2007; 14(1): 29–40.
33. Kaushal R, Shojania KG, Bates DW. Effects of computerized physician order entry and clinical decision support systems on medication safety: a systematic review. Arch Intern Med., 2003; 163(12): 1409–16.
34. Chertow GM, Lee J, Kuperman GJ, Burdick E, Horsky J, Seger DL, et al. Guided medication dosing for inpatients with renal insufficiency. JAMA., 2001; 286(22): 2839–44.
35. Bates DW, Teich JM, Lee J, Seger D, Kuperman GJ, MaLuf N, et al. The impact of computerized physician order entry on medication error prevention. J Am Med Inform Assoc, 1999; 6(4): 313–21.
36. Welch BM, Kawamoto K. Clinical decision support for genetically guided personalized medicine: a systematic review. J Am Med Inform Assoc, 2013; 20(2): 388–400.
37. Stathonikos N, Veta M, Huisman A, Van Diest PJ. Going fully digital: perspective of a Dutch academic pathology lab. J Pathol Inf., 2013; 4: 15.
38. minaga O, Abbas M, Hinkelammert R, Bettendorf O, Eltze E, Ozgur E, et al. CMDX©-based single source information system for simplified quality management and clinical research in prostate cancer. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak., 2012; 12: 141.
39. Berry DA, Iversen Jr ES, Gudbjartsson DF, Hiller EH, Garber JE, Peshkin BN, et al. BRCAPRO validation, sensitivity of genetic testing of BRCA1/BRCA2, and prevalence of other breast cancer susceptibility genes. J Clin Oncol, 2002; 20: 2701e12.
40. Jaspers MW, Smeulers M, Vermeulen H, Peute LW. Effects of clinical decision-support systems on practitioner performance and patient outcomes: a synthesis of high-quality systematic review findings. J Am Med Inform Assoc, 2011; 18(3): 327–34.
41. Bright TJ, Wong A, Dhurjati R, Bristow E, Bastian L, Coeytaux RR, et al. Effect of clinical decision-support systems: a systematic review. Ann Intern Med., 2012; 157(1): 29–43. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-157-1-201207030-00450.
42. Jha AK, Desroches CM, Campbell EG, Donelan K, Rao SR, Ferris TG, et al. Use of electronic health records in U.S. hospitals. N Engl J Med., 2009; 360(16): 1628–38.
43. National Institute of Standards and Technology. Available at: http://www.nist.gov/. Accessed November 3, 2014.
44. Averill RF, Mullin RL, Steinbeck BA, Goldfield NI, Grant TM. Development of the ICD-10 procedure coding system (ICD-10-PCS). J AHIMA., 1998; 69(5): 65–72.

45. Edgar R, Domrachev M, Lash AE. Gene expression omnibus: NCBI gene expression and hybridization array data repository. Nucleic Acids Res., 2002; 30(1): 207–10.

تحليلات البيانات في السجلات الصحية المتكاملة: تحسين التنبؤ بالنتائج الصحية عبر خدمات الطوارئ والتمريض والصيدلة والمختبرات

الملخص

الخلفية :تلعب الإرشادات السريرية (CPGs) دورًا حيويًا في توحيد تقديم الرعاية الصحية بهدف تحسين نتائج المرضى. ومع ذلك، فإن الالتزام بهذه الإرشادات يختلف بشكل كبير عبر المجالات الصحية، لا سيما في البيئات متعددة التخصصات مثل خدمات الطوارئ والتمريض والصيدلة والسجلات الطبية والمختبرات. يُعد فهم العوامل الجوهرية والخارجية التي تؤثر على الالتزام ضروريًا لتحديد الفجوات وتحسين الممارسات الصحية.

الطرق :اعتمدت هذه الدراسة على مراجعة منهجية مختلطة باستخدام نهج تكاملي متقارب. تم جمع الأدبيات ذات الصلة من المجلات المحكمة وقواعد البيانات والمصادر الرمادية. تضمنت التحليل بيانات نوعية وكمية لدراسة العوامل الشخصية والمعرفية والتنظيمية والتكنولوجية التي تؤثر على الالتزام بالإرشادات السريرية. تم دمج التوليف الموضوعي للنتائج النوعية مع النتائج الكمية لضمان فهم شامل للعوائق والعوامل المساعدة.

النتائج :حددت المراجعة العديد من العوامل المتكررة التي تؤثر على الالتزام عبر التخصصات. شملت العوامل الجوهرية معرفة ومواقف ودوافع العاملين في الرعاية الصحية، بينما تضمنت العوامل الخارجية الدعم التنظيمي، وتوافر الموارد، ودمج أنظمة دعم القرار السريري ضمن السجلات الصحية الإلكترونية (EHRs). أبلغت فرق الطوارئ والتمريض عن تحديات تتعلق بحجم المرضى المرتفع والقيود الزمنية، في حين سلطت خدمات الصيدلة والمختبرات الضوء على أهمية التواصل الدقيق وتوحيد البيانات. وارتبط تحسين الالتزام ببرامج التدريب ودعم القيادة وأنظمة التكنولوجيا القابلة للتشغيل البيني.

الاستنتاج :يتأثر الالتزام بالإرشادات السريرية في البيئات متعددة التخصصات بعوامل معقدة ومترابطة. يمكن أن يؤدي التصدي للعوائق الجوهرية والخارجية من خلال تدخلات مستهدفة تشمل التعليم، وتعزيز التعاون، وتكامل التكنولوجيا إلى تحسين الالتزام بالإرشادات وجودة رعاية المرضى بشكل كبير. تؤكد النتائج على الحاجة إلى نهج متماسك لتقديم الرعاية الصحية يستفيد من نقاط القوة متعددة التخصصات.

الكلمات المفتاحية :الإرشادات السريرية، الرعاية الصحية متعددة التخصصات، الالتزام، السجلات الصحية الإلكترونية، المراجعة المنهجية.