PAPERLESS HEALTHCARE: AS A TOOL TO BOOST AMERICAN HEALTHCARE AND ASSOCIATED CHALLENGES

Doctor of Economics, Professor **B.A. Islamov**
Professor of Tashkent State University of Economics,
Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor., Uzbekistan

PhD in Management, **Teshayev R.K**
Doctoral student at International Westminster University in Tashkent.

Abstract: *The increased use of information technology (IT) in healthcare settings, particularly through the use of electronic health records (EHRs), which enable information to be easily shared and communicated among healthcare providers, has been advocated as a way to enhance care quality and support long-term cost control. However, rushing the installation of healthcare, IT would result in significant short-term financial outlays as well as a number of other issues that need to be resolved. Nevertheless, as a result of tracking patients, managing identities, creating medical records, and processing insurance claims, the healthcare industry will become a data-intensive industry. Therefore, security is important to maintain the confidentiality and integrity of such data in addition to other quality standards. Attention has been paid to IT technology as a way to support safe transactions and records, notably in the healthcare industry. In doing so, the extraordinary role of this technology in increasing reliability, and ensuring data security has been highlighted.*

Key words: *tools for healthcare development, paperless healthcare, digital healthcare, healthcare IT.*

Jel Classification: O32

Introduction

This qualitative research is going to look at the virtues and advantages of healthcare IT as well as the costs and other difficulties that might prevent its widespread adoption and use making conclusions from the American experience in the field. In order to increase the possibility that widespread expansion in the use of healthcare IT would result in the anticipated advantages, the research is going to conclude with a set of recommendations. In doing so, United States of America were chosen as a relatively more advanced country and an example in this direction. Due to the predominancy and initial head start in paperless healthcare, other countries should focus on the initial period of their experience between 2000 and 2010 of American transformation because this country is far ahead compared to most other countries from technological, financial, and infrastructural viewpoint.

Literature review

Using health information technology as a medical tool to its the full capacity is a long way.

Because of the fact that United States are much more advanced and have started employing paperless healthcare much earlier than most of the other countries, this research focuses on the state of healthcare for the period between the first decade of this millennium and the present state of the American paperless healthcare. This is mainly because the recommendations and the outcomes of the research should be compatible as well as applicable in other countries respectively. For the vast majority of patients, a doctor's appointment or hospital stay still entails doctors and nurses carefully reading a paper chart that details their medical history. The doctor may give the patient a handwritten prescription or a letter directing them to a specialist before they leave. Such a paper-based method of delivering healthcare is rife with possible mistakes and inefficiencies. While a handwritten prescription may result in an unintentional overdose, even a typed prescription becomes useless if the patient has already been intaking other medications and the prescription medication interacts severely with them. In a situation when a patient is sent to a specialist working in a non-affiliated clinic, the expert will not have simple access to the patient's medical file or be able to inform the ordering physician of the visit's findings. The ordering doctor's original inquiry is frequently unknown to the specialist. In the event that a patient contacts to obtain test results via phone, fax, or mail, the information might never make it into the patient's chart, or the individual who answers the phone might inadvertently record a crucial test result. Due to the fact that the information is frequently unavailable during the visit, further tests are run, and some of them are taken repeatedly. This kind of data management leads to a significant amount of costs, long queues, as well as loss of valuable time in an emergency case.

The adoption of information technologies (ITs), which significantly reduce the failure rate of individual process stages and do not carry the inherent limitations of human information processing, can avert many of these problems, even if they are common in an existing healthcare system. As a result, it has been widely acknowledged that IT has the potential to enhance the standard of care and lower healthcare expenses in such countries as the United States (Hillestad et al., 2005; Walker et al., 2005). If IT were used more widely, it is predicted that the States could have saved around $80 billion annually, prevent thousands of errors, improve preventative and chronic care, and deliver all of these benefits at lower costs (Hillestad et al., 2005). However, IT adoption rates in most environments are poor. For instance, according to a national American survey conducted in 2008, only 4% of doctors working in outpatient settings had fully operational electronic health records (EHRs) before 2008, while only 17% employed them (DesRoches et al., 2008). This was surprising outcome if considered the increased digitalization rate in all other American sectors of industry and public in that period. However, today the index reached to about 96% in which doctors employ EHR (The most surprising health tech industry statistics., 2023)

The literature reveals that with an estimated 7.6% of hospitals used to employ a basic EHR in 2000s and 1.5% used a sophisticated system, hospital adoption rates had been significantly lower in the United States in the initial stages of implementation according to Jha et al. (2009), 17% of hospitals had adopted computerized provider order entry (CPOE) for drug orders, which was frequently the first component of an electronic system. The adoption rate of IT was considerably lower in other contexts, such as skilled nursing facilities in most countries (Poon et al., 2006).

The next logical step, as firms implemented IT systems that store data electronically, was to enable electronic data exchange with providers working in other environments. As a result, individuals' medical records might electronically follow them to any location where healthcare is provided. However, only a small number of towns in the United States were engaged in such health information exchange (HIE) in the early stages, and even those initiatives often only exchange a portion of patient data. Adler-Milstein, Bates, & Jha (2009) and Adler-Milstein, McAfee, Bates, & Jha (2008) both found that approximately a quarter of all attempts to establish HIE failed between 2000 and 2008.

Given that IT has been widely accepted in other industries for more than two decades and that the challenges in healthcare are amenable to using IT, it had appeared odd at first that adoption rates for both IT and health information exchange were so low. Medical informatics also has a lengthy history, with pioneers in the field working for more than 50 years and several EHR systems in use now since the 1960s.

However, digging more deeply reveals a complex web of economic, structural, organizational, and technical challenges. These reflections come at a critical moment in the history of health IT (HIT). The Obama Administration had made HIT a focal point of its approach to healthcare reformation and preliminarily planned to direct the first funds of $19 billion to promote the effective use of health IT, with the promise of additional funding; in contrast, the national annual budget for HIT in the prior administration had been $50 million. This escalated investment stimulated a rapid increase in the rate of HIT adoption. Nonetheless, significant challenges remained as

Americans gained a better understanding of the policies and organizational changes required to take advantage of the new capabilities offered by HIT and translate them into efficiency and quality gains.

The context of healthcare IT in the United States

Within the first two decades of the present millennium, a number of publications drew attention to the poor quality of healthcare provided in wealthy countries. Between 44,000 and 98,000 people died from medical errors each year during the first decade in American hospitals, according to the Institute of Medicine's To Err is human factor. The research results illustrated that more than half of these mistakes might have been prevented, which would not only save lives but also potentially economize between $17 and $29 billion annually in costs. A second research study, by the RAND Corporation, found significant underuse of care (McGlynn et al., 2003). RAND researchers concluded that only 54.9% of patients received the needed care after evaluating more than 5,000 medical records. Critics found it simple to mobilize support for safety and quality improvement in the face of fast-rising expenses (Sisko et al., 2009), as a healthcare delivery system that both burdened patients needlessly and failed to provide required care.

Numerous quality problems have human constraints as their underlying reason. Information processing by J. Adler-Milstein and D.W. Bates. Medical care has become so complicated that it is impossible to expect even a stellar group of physicians and nurses to always deliver the best, highest-quality care. Since computers can easily keep current knowledge on topics like drugs and their adverse effects, IT is becoming more and more admitted as a natural tool for assisting clinicians. Doctors utilizing a CPOE system—where all orders are entered electronically—can be stopped from prescribing a drug that would be detrimental to the patient, provided that patient data is connected with the system. In a similar way, computerized decision support systems can give the clinician reminders and evidence-based recommendations at the care spot (Bates et al., 2003a).

Studies assessing the costs and advantages of HIT have sprung up as IT has been used to support healthcare delivery. The advantages of HIT have been assessed by some academics using data from specific institutions (Kaushal et al., 2006; Wang et al., 2003), while other researchers have predicted the potential value of widespread adoption of HIT. Some of the later studies, which were constrained by an insufficient body of evidence, drew partially on evidence of productivity and quality improvements brought about by IT in other industries (Hillestad et al., 2005) or professional estimates of the savings that could be attained from HIT and HIE (Shekelle & Keeler, 2006; Walker et al., 2005). The implementation of HIT and HIE on a national scale was predicted to save an estimated $80 billion annually in two separate studies that were published in 2005. In the United States, opposing parties, including the Congressional Budget Office, or CBO, in particular, criticized their use of estimates and expert opinions for important elements, despite the fact that their complete approach to measuring costs and benefits was useful (Congressional Budget Office, 2008). According to the CBO analysis, the national models showed the potential savings that might be attained in the best-case scenario, in which all hospitals and providers adopt and use health information technology as intended (Walker et al., 2005).

A rising economic sector devoted to offering the underlying answers is growing at a similar rate to the increase in interest in HIT. The market opportunity includes companies that set up the HIE infrastructure, administer middleware, and sell hardware, in addition to manufacturers of inpatient and outpatient IT systems. Additionally, there are probably going to be a lot of chances for suppliers in specialized fields like privacy and security norms and medical knowledge. Additionally, the HIT market's expansion has brought about additional difficulties.

Vendors stand to gain from the extra labor necessary to build fully functional HIT and achieve HIE, which causes implementations to take unanticipatedly long and be expensive. Particularly in the outpatient setting, there are so many vendors that achieving HIE is challenging. Although it's possible that changes to the current HIT certification requirements established by a federally recognized organization—the Certification Commission for Healthcare Information Technology—will make HIE workable even with a lot of vendors, this looks unlikely in the near future.

Assessment of the paperless software for inpatient (treatment within hospital) data processing.

In hospitals, a vast array of departments and sections work together to manage care for the sickest patients. Hospitals are incredibly complex institutions. As a result, many hospital IT systems are actually a conglomeration of several, more specialized IT systems that have been interconnected. Despite the fact that the term "electronic health record" (EHR) is frequently used to refer to both inpatient and outpatient IT systems, there has historically been little consensus over the kind of IT system that falls under this description. Modern attempts to describe EHRs have focused on functionality-based definitions, and this is also apparent in studies on the advantages of EHRs. Clinical documentation, test and imaging findings, computerized provider order input, and decision assistance are the four main types of system functionalities that one schema has recommended (Jha et al., 2009). Though a dimension is absent from functionality-based definitions, several of the most productive time saving programs seem to perform as well as they do because of how effectively different functionalities interact together.

Implementation process

When it comes to adoption process, hospitals often start with test and imaging findings, then move on to computerized provider order input and clinical decision support (which are often related), and lastly medical paperwork including disease history (that is of highest difficulty). Thus, hospitals in the United States were able to develop electronic delivery of test and imaging data, with 77% or 78% of hospitals giving lab and radiology reports online, respectively (Jha et al., 2009). Electronic physician notes and issue lists for medical recording are less often digitalized; they are available in electronic form in 12% and 27% of medical institutions, respectively (Jha et al., 2009). The Leapfrog Group criteria (Galvin, Delbanco, Milstein, & Belden, 2005) and one of the most frequently supported functions, CPOE, both have low adoption rates in the United States: 20% for lab tests and 17% for pharmaceuticals, respectively (Jha et al., 2009). Hospitals and emergencies in remote rural areas are less likely to possess the fundamental parts of an EHR than larger, metropolitan, and teaching hospitals.

Benefits

If to assess its positive impact, hospital HIT studies typically evaluate the effects of particular system capabilities on a limited range of outcomes (Bates, 2009). For instance, strong evidence supports the effect of CPOE on lowering medication error rates, and there is some support for the idea that CPOE lowers the frequency of adverse drug events, or ADEs (Shamliyan, Duval, Du, & Kane, 2008; Bates et al., 1998, 1999). The major medication error rate decreased by 55%, preventable adverse drug events (ADEs) decreased by 17%, and non-intercepted potential adverse drug events (PADEs) decreased by 84% in the first comprehensive investigation of the effect of inpatient CPOE on medication error rates (Bates et al., 1998). Given that the typical preventable ADE represents a $4,685 expense (Bates et al., 1997), these advantages result in actual cost savings. CPOE systems may also reduce the use of drugs and tests while increasing productivity and workflow, both of which lead to cost savings (Kaushal, Shojania, & Bates, 2003; Teich et al., 2000). Decision assistance features can also help decrease medication-related errors and increase adherence to guidelines (Dexter et al., 2001; Kaushal et al., 2003; Shiffman, Liaw, Brandt, & Corb, 1999). However, there is still a lack of investigation which looks at how clinical decision assistance affects patient outcomes; when they have, the findings have been contradictory, in large part because many of the studies had sufficient power (Garg et al., 2005). Although it is unclear whether these connections were causal, a recent multi-site cross-sectional analysis indicated a correlation between hospitals with advanced EHR features and fewer complications, reduced death rates, and lower expenditures (Amarasingham et al., 2009).

Costs

Financially, hospital systems are costly due to their complexity. The anticipated implementation cost for hardware and software for a big hospital (with more than 400 beds) is between $20 and $50 million upfront, with ongoing maintenance expenses estimated at around 25% yearly in the early stages (Kaushal et al., 2005). Brigham and Women's Hospital in Boston spent $11.8 million between 1993 and 2002 on developing, implementing, and running CPOE (Kaushal et al., 2006). Adoption comes with significant secondary costs as well. These expenses, which can easily exceed the cost of the system itself, are mostly made up of people's time spent on system selection and negotiation, local customization, training, project management, and change management. Although many of these expenses are not included in cost estimates, they are significant.

Key challenges connected to the implementation of paperless healthcare system.

One of the heavy stumbling blocks to the adoption is the high upfront cost of healthcare systems. In many hospitals, CPOE may be the only major capital investment a hospital will make over a five-year period. Additionally, many hospitals—particularly those in small towns and rural areas—are cash-strapped. According to a recent survey, the main obstacle to implementation stated by 74% of hospitals without EHRs was a lack of funding for the purchase (Jha et al., 2009). The organizational resource drain can be just as daunting for a hospital as the system's cost, which is problematic given the narrow hospital margins (American Hospital Association, 2002). The degree to which hospitals want to adapt the system to their particular setting must be decided because the introduction of IT has the potential to be quite disruptive. But even a fully tailored system still needs the workflow to be redesigned and other complimentary process adjustments to be made, which can add significantly to the cost. Early on in the adoption process, this could make clinical work take longer, but over time, physicians frequently become more effective (Overhage, Perkins, Tierney, & McDonald, 2001).

Organizational upheaval is made worse by the particular physician employment agreement with hospitals. The majority of doctors work for themselves, and hospitals depend on doctors to draw in patients and provide services for which they are compensated. Therefore, support from doctors is essential for system adoption. The fact that 36% of hospitals in one survey indicated physician reluctance as a barrier to implementation (Jha et al., 2009) raises serious concerns. Physicians protested over a multimillion-dollar, three-year CPOE implementation at Cedars-Sinai Hospital in Los Angeles, arguing the design of the decision support added too much time to their work. ‘‘One of the most important lessons gained to date is the complexity of human change’’ the CMO at Cedars-Sinai stated in his analysis.

Another hurdle to adoption noted by 32% of hospitals without EHRs is an uncertain return on investment (ROI) (Jha et al., 2009). While the majority of hospitals receive a bundled, prospective payment for the people they treat, any decrease in utilization related to the use of the EHR translates into lost income for the hospital for patients who pay on a fee-for-service basis. Hospitals have a higher incentive to invest in EHRs than ambulatory settings, where fee-for-service is typical. According to the Congressional Budget Office (2008), initiatives that alter the incentive structure could result in a sharp rise in hospital adoption.

Assessment of the paperless software for outpatient data processing.

Despite providing equivalent functionality to their inpatient counterparts, outpatient systems are less sophisticated, in part due to the simpler nature of the treatment provided in this context. Healthcare documentation, managing test results, typing digital order, and decision support are the same four functions that a system in a small primary care practice may have, but the range of circumstances that the system must handle is much less diverse. Large, multi-specialty practices have systems that lie in between those of a hospital and a single-specialty practice.

Implementation process.

The most widespread health record software that is designed to keep information regarding patient demographics, illness history, doctor’s prescriptions, medical notes, order entry for medications, and viewing of lab and radiology test results is used by 17% of doctors, according to recent data on adoption rates of EHRs in the outpatient setting (DesRoches et al., 2008). Only 4% of doctors, however, use a sophisticated system with extra features like clinical decision assistance. Electronic health record systems are more prevalent among primary care physicians, those who work in big groups, hospitals, or other healthcare facilities, and those who practice in the western part of the country (DesRoches et al., 2008). Massachusetts is one state in the US that has much higher digitalization rates than the average (Simon et al., 2007). Additionally, in several significant integrated delivery systems that have made EHR adoption a priority, such the Veterans Hospital Administration, Geisinger, Kaiser, and Partners Healthcare, adoption is almost ubiquitous. Adoption in primary care is very common in many other industrialized countries (Bates, Ebell, Gotlieb, Zapp, & Mullins, 2003).

Benefits of digitalization (inpatient systems)

A number of studies have looked at the effects of particular outpatient HIT system functions from the perspective of quality. It is obvious that decision support may enhance performance for many metrics when properly applied. For instance, a systematic study of clinical decision assistance revealed gains of 12 to 20 points in protocol and guideline adherence among doctors who used advanced and successfully installed software at their hospitals (Chaudhry et al., 2006). EHR deployment alone does not, however, seem to be enough to improve performance. For 14 of 17 quality metrics, for instance, a nationwide cross-sectional research revealed no statistically significant performance difference between visits with and without the use of an EHR (Linder, Ma, Bates, Middleton, & Stafford, 2007). However, it should be highlighted that the study lacked information on the degree of decision support. Even in integrated delivery systems, the outcomes haven't always been favorable; for instance, a Kaiser system study revealed that its EHR caused a decline in age-adjusted office visit rates but had no effect on quality of medical services (Garrido, Jamieson, Zhou, Wiesenthal, & Liang, 2005).

In investigations that examine the effects of EHRs on medical usage and related costs, particular service categories, such radiology and laboratory testing, frequently see declines (Chin & Wallace, 1999; Garrido et al., 2005; Tierney, Miller, & McDonald, 1990). In contrast, one research (Welch et al., 2007) looked at changes in overall medical expenses and found no effect. Reducing transcriptions, chart pulls, and related support staff results in efficiency advantages, according to studies that look at how EHR-related changes in practices' operational expenses (Miller, West, Brown, Sim, & Ganchoff, 2005; Overhage et al., 2001). Evidence about how EHRs affect physician productivity is contradictory (Overhage et al., 2001; Pizziferri et al., 2005). According to Miller et al. (2005), EHRs have also been linked to higher coding standards and fewer denied claims. One thorough study (Wang et al., 2003) projected significant aggregate advantages resulting from averted graph pulls, prevented transcription expenses, usage decrease (for doctors getting capitated payment), and enhanced charge record in addition to billing precision (for doctors receiving fee-for-service payment).

Costs of adoption

According to the clinic's size, kind of system, and amount of customization, outpatient systems generally cost between $20,000 and $50,000 per physician; however, these prices are anticipated to decline with time. Initial EHR expenses per full-time equivalent provider averaged $44,000, while ongoing expenditures per provider per year averaged $8,500 in an investigation of 14 individual and small-group primary care clinics employing EHRs from two manufacturers (Miller et al., 2005). This includes lost income due to decreased productivity as well as software training, hardware installation, and IT assistance.

Key challenges to overcome.

Identically to those that hospitals face, outpatient obstacles differ in regards to their significance (Bates, 2005; DesRoches et al., 2008). The cost of HIT systems is a significant worry, particularly for primary care clinics, but this is partially mitigated by the cheaper outpatient systems. The second most often mentioned obstacle was an uncertain payback on expenditure (50%). Although there is proof that practices can provide a positive return on investment in a period of two to three years, one research found that much of this ROI was generated through enhanced charge collecting and coding, which indicates a transfer to the health care sector rather than a net savings (Miller et al., 2005). Models, however, indicate that implementation may be very affordable for the system altogether (Wang et al., 2003). However, the payers and purchasers who are responsible for paying for treatment are the main beneficiaries of the real savings from usage reduction achieved by HIT. According to one research, these populations will receive 30% of the benefit (Walker et al., 2005).

Lack of skilled employees to facilitate IT installation is another issue in the outpatient scenario. Less than five doctors are present in the majority of American offices. The organizational and technological capabilities necessary to choose a system, prepare for implementation, assistance delivery, much less manage it continuously, are frequently lacking in these activities. Frequently, the doctor is compelled to complete these chores in lieu of visiting patients or outside of normal office hours. Choosing a product might be particularly scary due to the market's immaturity and the sheer number of available solutions. Even the recent governmental initiative to create an accreditation process for ambulatory EHRs hasn't been able to significantly reduce the number of options. Finding an EHR that matches their requirements, along with worries that the software may become outdated, were both reported by 54% of doctors in one research as important barriers to implementation (DesRoches et al., 2008). Practitioners still need assistance even after they have selected a system to implement the slow processes as well as associated modifications required to provide financial and quality gains, even from "out-of-the-box" solutions (Miller & Sim, 2004). In addition, there are issues with security, privacy, and the law that need to be resolved (DesRoches et al., 2008).

Exchange of medical data

While the implementation of specific technologies was covered in the earlier sections, the deployment of medical data sharing demands linking these networks so that the information they hold may move easily across organizations. When a group uses a single system, this is often done internally, either concurrently with software installation or by fusing together already-existing systems. However, because patients frequently receive treatment at institutions that are not connected with them, making it possible for their medical records to accompany them can boost productivity and quality of the cure delivery.

Implementations process

In order to achieve countrywide HIE in the U.S., local and regional projects to connect local organizations with medical data—such as medical clinics, labs, and hospitals—and construct the basis for HIE have emerged. 55 practical initiatives, referred to as RHIOs: Regional Health Information Organizations, were discovered in a recent study of such initiatives (Adler-Milstein et al., 2009). 44 of them were significant, sharing information about over 5,000 patients, but the majority of them were more concerned with sharing test results than a more complete collection of data.

Benefits of digitalization (inpatient systems)

The main analysis of the usefulness of HIE used an economic framework that predicted reductions of $78 billion from avoiding unnecessary radiology and laboratory tests as well as productivity improvements from switching from hand-held to digital interchange of data (Walker et al., 2005). Only anecdotal reports of prevented adverse drug events and skipped testing as a result of RHIOs exchanging test data and medication histories have been used as empirical proof (Frisse, 2005; McDonald et al., 2005).

Costs of implementation

The price of adopting HIE across the country has been estimated in two different ways. According to one analysis that took into account the present level of HIT adoption, a five-year capital investment would cost $156 billion, and a yearly operational cost would be $48 billion. The acquisition of system features would account for roughly two thirds of the initial expenses, with the other thirty percent going toward linking systems. Performance and interoperability would be more equally represented in ongoing expenditures (Kaushal et al., 2005).

Key challenges to overcome.

In order to achieve national health information sharing, a number of obstacles must be overcome. Integrating objectives is the first step. The laboratories and imaging centers that perform redundant tests are currently generating money from it (Walker et al., 2005). Additionally, if the doctors ordering the tests are compensated on a basis of fee-for-service, they don't have any motivation to stop requesting more tests even if they believe they will only be marginally useful. Worse still, HIE makes it simpler for patients to transfer healthcare providers, which may result in people leaving hospitals and doctors (Grossman, Kushner, & November, 2008). It is reasonable that medical information providers (hospitals and clinics) are incensed that they are asked to provide funding for HIE while those who pay for care get the most from it. Payers counter that there is currently little motivation for providers to use such data, particularly when it necessitates substantial changes to workflow as suppliers examine newly available data, and many payers are not persuaded that it is worth their time in the absence of corresponding changes in reimbursement. Therefore, the majority of HIE initiatives to date have been concentrated on electronic distribution of test findings to the ordering physician, which generates real savings by doing away with expensive manual reporting while avoiding the consequences for competition. This, nevertheless, falls well short of realizing the full potential usefulness of HIE, which makes comprehensive information accessible to all doctors caring for a particular patient.

Launching a RHIO has significant up-front expenditures as well since connecting non-interoperable systems requires a complicated technological infrastructure. New RHIO initiatives now have access to a sizeable grant budget. Such a strategy runs the danger of towns pursuing HIE because of grant cash availability rather than out of genuine commitment to HIE. Participants in this scenario must continue these efforts once grant funding dwindles. For instance, a well-known RHIO project in Santa Barbara, USA, that had been awarded an amount equal to a ten million grant, eventually came to an end when stakeholders ceased to support it once the grant money ran out (Miller, 2007).

HIE initiatives must also deal with the complex problem of technological standards. Without such standards, each system sending and receiving data requires a different interface. This may be quite expensive; according to Walker et al. (2005), the savings from standardized HIE over irregular HIE were in the billions. At the federal level, efforts were made to advance toward a set of standards that had been agreed upon for various forms of data. Although most of the important data types now have standards, several are still not often utilized in vendor implementations. The implementation of even reasonably mature standards may be unexpectedly difficult because this is a political process (Diamond & Shirky, 2008; Hammond, 2005).

Concerned parties mention their unease with concerns pertaining to privacy, security, information management, and responsibility in addition to the economic and technology related obstacles (Grossman et al., 2008; Miller & Miller, 2007). It becomes unclear who controls the information and who specifically is responsible for a breach when medical data is shared. Furthermore, there is no established legal precedence to establish whether doctors may be held accountable for information obtained from a RHIO or whether failing to pay attention to it might be considered malpractice.

Conclusion

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009's HITECH provision's passage was anticipated to bring in a new stage of HIT adoption. If this happened, the U.S. would climb the adoption curve quickly and be in a position to make significant financial rewards from the investment. However, installing computers in clinics and hospitals alone would not result in these improvements, and neither will using these systems on a regular basis. Many clinics and hospitals on their own are likely to become limited to minimum levels of utilization. To overcome the issues stated earlier, complementary adjustments in the structure of organizations and state/federal laws must be put into place in order to attain more advanced levels. The possibility that the investment in HIT reaches, if not surpasses, the multi-billion dollar reductions predictions and significantly enhances the quality of treatment, in our opinion, would be greatly increased by the seven suggestions below. Next, we look at subsections 1 through 4's suggestions for both inpatient and outpatient settings as well as subsections 5 through 7's suggestions for health information sharing.

Support for technical adoption

Health information systems experts will be needed to provide technical assistance for hospitals and clinics using HIT. They must be capable of bridging the gap between technological and medical setting. In 2010, there were just a few courses of study in the United States, but according to projections, demand for these professionals will significantly surpass supply (Hersh, 2006). Organizations will require people to assist them in implementing HIT, but they will also require people to teach their own employees (Safran & Detmer, 2005). Although the HITECH provision provides some financing for worker training to aid in the deployment of HIT, it is not clear if this will be enough (Blumenthal, 2009). Along with technical assistance, effective implementation will include helping providers choose systems, negotiating contracts, and implementing corresponding restructuring in work process as well as work habits. This is especially true for small practices. In Massachusetts and New York City, a potential approach has just come to light (Mostashari, Tripathi, & Kendall, 2009). In these experiments, a body was created to offer central project management, practice counseling, and financial support for EHR adoption expenses. These initiatives quickly led to the broad deployment of EHRs in a range of situations. Replicating such models, in our opinion, is preferable to just handing providers cash and then anticipating them to deploy EHRs on themselves.

System certification

The standard has been set low by the existing method of HIT system certification by CCHIT. The strategy has thus far failed to significantly reduce the amount of available options, particularly in the outpatient context. Additionally, since actual implementations are not included, system certification may not accurately reflect how well systems function in actual use. Policies that restrict the number of suppliers in a certain area and align vendor incentives to ensure functional interoperability have to be taken into consideration. To guarantee that certified systems regularly deliver on expectations, we advise raising certification standards and incorporating genuine implementations into the certification process.

Decision support

HIT will need to be used in a more comprehensive way than simply switching from a paper-based to a digital network. The potential quality advantages of HIT will be greatly realized by the broad deployment of decision support features that locate possibilities for better treatment and offer supportive advice to clinicians. According to the research and data collected, the government's definition of "meaningful use" should center on this. By combining efforts to provide the recommendations that power decision support systems, a minimum for the basic elements part of decision assistance, economies of scale can be gained. A unified archive would make it possible for institutions and businesses to benefit from the extensive effort that comes into developing recommendations. When there is a lack of sufficient evidence to back up a clinical recommendation, leveraging EHR data to undertake observational studies presents an opportunity to expedite the process.

Empirical investigations on the complements of organization.

Health IT is a part of a larger system of work that may be seen and analyzed as a whole. However, little of the research addressed here adopts this viewpoint, and as a result, we still know very little about the structural changes that must follow the adoption of HIT. This is particularly troubling in light of three significant results from studies investigating the connection between technology and efficiency in other sectors: (1) there is substantial variation throughout companies in the impact of IT on efficiency; (2) companies that understand improved efficiency from IT must undergo severe reorganizing in order to take benefit of the novel abilities provided by IT; and (3) companies that fail to implement such modifications are disadvantaged than had they avoided investing in IT. Instead of pushing the construction of IT systems around present work habits and workflow, we advise sponsoring study centered on these complementing reforms. This is probably going to reinforce poor habits and limit the true potential of HIT.

Research findings on the usefulness of HIE

There isn't any solid research-based proof of the worth that HIE creates or who advantages from it. Many parties involved, especially providers and companies who stand to gain from decreased repetitive use, are reticent to become engaged and promote RHIOs in the absence of compelling data. The model-based forecasts of value would be complemented by funding a comprehensive assessment of several RHIOs. All RHIOs receiving HITECH money must be compelled to take part in assessments, and funding ought to be made available so that scientists may carry out these evaluations.

REFERENCES

Adler-Milstein, J., Bates, D.W. and Jha, A.K. (2009) 'U.S. Regional Health Information Organizations: Progress and Challenges', Health Affairs, 28(2), pp. 483–492. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.28.2.483.
Adler-Milstein, J. and Bates, D.W. (2010) 'Paperless Healthcare: Progress and challenges of an IT-enabled healthcare system', Business Horizons, 53(2), pp. 119–130. doi:10.1016/j.bushor.2009.10.004.
Amarasingham, R. et al. (2009) 'Clinical Information Technologies and inpatient outcomes', Archives of Internal Medicine, 169(2), p. 108. doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2008.520.
'Regional Health Information Organizations' (2008) Optometry - Journal of the American Optometric Association, 79(12), pp. 746–754. doi:10.1016/j.optm.2008.09.012.
'Regional Health Information Organizations' (2008) Optometry - Journal of the American Optometric Association, 79(12), pp. 746–754. doi:10.1016/j.optm.2008.09.012.
Bates, D.W. (2005) 'Physicians and Ambulatory Electronic Health Records', Health Affairs, 24(5), pp. 1180–1189. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.24.5.1180.
Bates, D.W. (2009) 'The effects of Health Information Technology on Inpatient Care', Archives of Internal Medicine, 169(2), p. 105. doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2008.542.
Bates, D.W. et al. (2003) 'A proposal for electronic medical records in U.S. primary care', Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 10(1), pp. 1–10. doi:10.1197/jamia.m1097.
Bates, D.W. et al. (2003) 'Ten commandments for effective clinical decision support: Making the practice of evidence-based medicine a reality', Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 10(6), pp. 523–530. doi:10.1197/jamia.m1370.
Bates, D.W. (1998) 'Effect of computerized physician order entry and a team intervention on prevention of serious medication errors', JAMA, 280(15), p. 1311. doi:10.1001/jama.280.15.1311.

Bates, D.W. (1997) 'The costs of adverse drug events in hospitalized patients. Adverse Drug Events Prevention Study Group', JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association, 277(4), pp. 307–311. doi:10.1001/jama.277.4.307.
Blumenthal, D. (2009) 'Stimulating the adoption of Health Information Technology', New England Journal of Medicine, 360(15), pp. 1477–1479. doi:10.1056/nejmp0901592.
Brynjolfsson, E. and Hitt, L.M. (1998) 'Beyond the productivity paradox', Communications of the ACM, 41(8), pp. 49–55. doi:10.1145/280324.280332.
'The Information Technology–Organizational Design Relationship Information Technology and new organizational forms' (2013) Strategic Information Management, pp. 441–473. doi:10.4324/9780080481135-25.
Chaudhry, B. et al. (2006) 'Systematic review: Impact of health information technology on quality, efficiency, and costs of medical care', Annals of Internal Medicine, 144(10), p. 742. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-144-10-200605160-00125.
'Computerized physician order entry: Accomplishments and remaining challenges' (2010) Forefront Group [Preprint]. doi:10.1377/forefront.20100406.004611.
'Federal Government's Environmental Health Structure' (2006) Environmental Policy and Public Health, pp. 109–170. doi:10.1201/9780849384370-8.
'Framework for a high performance health system for the United States' (2006) Commonwealth Fund Fund Reports [Preprint]. doi:10.2510/387153.
Evidence on the costs and benefits of Health Information Technology (2008) Congressional Budget Office. Available at: https://www.cbo.gov/publication/41690 (Accessed: 03 August 2023).
DesRoches, C.M. et al. (2008) 'Electronic Health Records in Ambulatory Care — a national survey of physicians', New England Journal of Medicine, 359(1), pp. 50–60. doi:10.1056/nejmsa0802005.
Dexter, P.R. et al. (2001) 'A computerized reminder system to increase the use of preventive care for hospitalized patients', New England Journal of Medicine, 345(13), pp. 965–970. doi:10.1056/nejmsa010181.
Diamond, C.C. and Shirky, C. (2008) 'Health Information Technology: A few years of magical thinking?', Health Affairs, 27(Suppl1). doi:10.1377/hlthaff.27.5.w383.
Frisse, M.E. (2005) 'State and community-based efforts to foster interoperability', Health Affairs, 24(5), pp. 1190–1196. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.24.5.1190.
Galvin, R.S. et al. (2005) 'Has the Leapfrog Group had an impact on the health care market?', Health Affairs, 24(1), pp. 228–233. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.24.1.228.
Garg, A.X. et al. (2005) 'Effects of computerized clinical decision support systems on practitioner performance and patient outcomes', JAMA, 293(10), p. 1223. doi:10.1001/jama.293.10.1223.
Center for studying Health System Change (no date) HSC Research Brief No. 2. Available at: http://www.hschange.org/CONTENT/970/ (Accessed: 03 August 2023).
Garrido, T. et al. (2005) 'Effect of electronic health records in ambulatory care: Retrospective, Serial, Cross Sectional Study', BMJ, 330(7491), p. 581. doi:10.1136/bmj.330.7491.581.

Gracia, D. (2013) 'Institute of Medicine (IOM). The Learning Healthcare System: Workshop Summary. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2007.', EIDON no 39 [Preprint]. doi:10.13184/eidon.39.2013.89-91.
Hammond, W.E. (2005) 'The making and adoption of Health Data Standards', Health Affairs, 24(5), pp. 1205–1213. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.24.5.1205.
Hersh, W. (2006) 'Who are the informaticians? what we know and should know', Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 13(2), pp. 166–170. doi:10.1197/jamia.m1912.
Hillestad, R. et al. (2005) 'Can Electronic Medical Record Systems Transform Health Care? potential health benefits, savings, and costs', Health Affairs, 24(5), pp. 1103–1117. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.24.5.1103.
Himmelstein, D.U. and Woolhandler, S. (2005) 'Hope and hype: Predicting the impact of Electronic Medical Records', Health Affairs, 24(5), pp. 1121–1123. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.24.5.1121.
Kaushal, R. et al. (2005) 'The costs of a National Health Information Network', Annals of Internal Medicine, 143(3), p. 165. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-143-3-200508020-00002.
Kaushal, R. et al. (2006) 'Return on investment for a computerized physician order entry system', Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 13(3), pp. 261–266. doi:10.1197/jamia.m1984.
Kaushal, R., Shojania, K.G. and Bates, D.W. (2003) 'Effects of computerized physician Order Entry and clinical decision support systems on Medication Safety', Archives of Internal Medicine, 163(12), p. 1409. doi:10.1001/archinte.163.12.1409.
Linder, J.A. et al. (2007) 'Electronic health record use and the quality of ambulatory care in the United States', Archives of Internal Medicine, 167(13), p. 1400. doi:10.1001/archinte.167.13.1400.
'Electronic Health Records in hospitals' (2009) New England Journal of Medicine, 361(4), pp. 421–422. doi:10.1056/nejmc091044.
McDonald, C.J. et al. (2005) 'The Indiana Network for Patient Care: A Working Local Health Information Infrastructure', Health Affairs, 24(5), pp. 1214–1220. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.24.5.1214.
Miller, R.H. and Miller, B.S. (2007) 'The Santa Barbara County Care Data Exchange: What happened?', Health Affairs, 26(Suppl2). doi:10.1377/hlthaff.26.5.w568.
Miller, R.H. and Sim, I. (2004) 'Physicians' use of electronic medical records: Barriers and solutions', Health Affairs, 23(2), pp. 116–126. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.23.2.116.
Miller, R.H. et al. (2005) 'The value of electronic health records in solo or small group practices', Health Affairs, 24(5), pp. 1127–1137. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.24.5.1127.
Mostashari, F., Tripathi, M. and Kendall, M. (2009) 'A tale of two large community electronic health record extension projects', Health Affairs, 28(2), pp. 345–356. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.28.2.345.
Overhage, J.M. et al. (2001) 'Controlled trial of direct physician order entry: Effects on physicians' time utilization in ambulatory primary care internal medicine practices',

Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 8(4), pp. 361–371. doi:10.1136/jamia.2001.0080361.
Pizziferri, L. et al. (2005) 'Primary care physician time utilization before and after implementation of an electronic health record: A Time-Motion Study', Journal of Biomedical Informatics, 38(3), pp. 176–188. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2004.11.009.
Poon, E.G. et al. (2006) 'Assessing the level of healthcare information technology adoption in the United States: A Snapshot', BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making, 6(1). doi:10.1186/1472-6947-6-1.
'Computerized physician order entry systems and medication errors' (2005) JAMA, 294(2), p. 178. doi:10.1001/jama.294.2.179-c.
'Quality of health care delivered to adults in the United States' (2003) New England Journal of Medicine, 349(19), pp. 1866–1868. doi:10.1056/nejm200311063491916.
Shekelle, P.G., Morton, S.C. and Keeler, E.B. (2006) Costs and benefits of Health Information Technology [Preprint]. doi:10.23970/ahrqepcerta132.
Shiffman, R.N. et al. (1999) 'Computer-based Guideline Implementation Systems: A systematic review of functionality and effectiveness', Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 6(2), pp. 104–114. doi:10.1136/jamia.1999.0060104.
Sidorov, J. (2006) 'It ain't necessarily so: The electronic health record and the unlikely prospect of reducing health care costs', Health Affairs, 25(4), pp. 1079–1085. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.25.4.1079.
Simon, S.R. et al. (2007) 'Correlates of electronic health record adoption in office practices: A statewide survey', Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 14(1), pp. 110–117. doi:10.1197/jamia.m2187.
Sisko, A. et al. (2009) 'Health spending projections through 2018: Recession effects add uncertainty to the outlook', Health Affairs, 28(Supplement 1). doi:10.1377/hlthaff.28.2.w346.
Teich, J.M. et al. (2000) 'Effects of computerized physician order entry on prescribing practices', Archives of Internal Medicine, 160(18), p. 2741. doi:10.1001/archinte.160.18.2741.
Tierney, W.M., Miller, M.E. and McDonald, C.J. (1990) 'The effect on test ordering of informing physicians of the charges for outpatient diagnostic tests', New England Journal of Medicine, 322(21), pp. 1499–1504. doi:10.1056/nejm199005243222105.
Walker, J. et al. (2005) 'The value of Health Care Information Exchange and interoperability', Health Affairs, 24(Suppl1). doi:10.1377/hlthaff.w5.10.
Welch, W.P. et al. (2007) 'Electronic health records in four community physician practices: Impact on quality and cost of care', Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 14(3), pp. 320–328. doi:10.1197/jamia.m2125.