# Characterizing patient details-related challenges from health information technology-related incident reports from Swedish healthcare

4	
5	
6	<sup>1, 2</sup> Md Shafiqur Rahman Jabin
7	<sup>1</sup> Ding Pan
8	<sup>1</sup> Evalill Nilsson
9	
10	
11	
12	<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Linnaeus University
13 14 15	<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Health Studies, University of Bradford
15 16 17	* Corresponding Author
17 18 19 20 21	Email: <u>mdshafiqur.rahmanjabin@lnu.se</u> <u>mjabin@bradford.ac.uk</u> (MSRJ)
22 23	MSRJ, EN, and DP researched literature, obtained ethical advice, and performed data analysis.
24	MSRJ was involved in protocol development and writing the drafts of the manuscript. Both
25	MSRJ and EN reviewed and edited the manuscript and approved the final version of the
26	manuscript.
27	

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

## 28 Abstract

29 This study examined health information technology-related (HIT) incidents to identify patient 30 details-related issues, their association with contributing factors, and outcomes. Sources of 31 information comprised retrospectively collected incident reports (n=95) using two sampling 32 methods, i.e., purposive and snowball sampling. The reports were collected in two formats interviews (written and telephone) and/or a set of already existing reports from the local 33 34 database. The incident reports were analyzed using both the inductive method (thematic 35 analysis) and the deductive approach using an existing framework, i.e., the International 36 Classification for Patient Safety. The studies identified 90 incidents with 120 patient details-37 related issues-categorized as either information-related (48%) or documentation-related 38 (52%) problems; around two-thirds of the 120 issues were characterized by human factors. Of 39 the total sample, 87 contributing factors were identified, of which "medical device/system" (45%) and "documentation" (20%) were the most common contributing factors. Of 90 40 41 incidents, more than half (59%) comprised patient-related outcomes-patient inconvenience 42 (47%) and patient harm (12%) and the remaining 41% (n=37) included staff or organization-43 related outcomes. The study confirms that patient details-related problems with HIT systems 44 were more likely to affect patient care delivery - more than half of the incidents resulted in 45 patient-related outcomes, namely patient inconvenience and patient harm, including disease 46 risks, severe health deterioration, injury, and even patient death. Incidents associated with 47 patient details can cause deleterious effects; therefore, characterizing them should be a routine 48 part of clinical practice to improve the constantly changing healthcare system.

# 49 Author Summary

50 The rapid advances in HIT systems have made healthcare a truly complex socio-technical 51 system than ever before. No matter what changes are introduced in healthcare, new, unforeseen 52 problems always arise. Our research focuses on improving the already existing HIT systems 53 and the care delivery around those systems by solving the clinical problems we encounter in 54 our day-to-day clinical practice rather than building new technologies. The foundation builds 55 on collecting and analyzing incident reports to illuminate the current challenges of Swedish 56 digital healthcare systems and provide a basis for preventive and corrective strategies, thus 57 improving clinical practice. Although a host of mainly technical problems was expected, around 58 two-thirds of the issues were identified to be generated by failures due to human factors. 59 Therefore, several strategies to mitigate these risks can be implemented, such as training 60 healthcare professionals before integrating new HIT systems and designing out the "error-prone 61 features". Our study provided insight into patient information/documentation-related problems 62 associated with HIT systems and how human and technical factors affect patient care delivery. 63 The analyses may also help the reporters and analysts regarding where preventive and 64 corrective strategies should be addressed to improve the constantly changing healthcare system.

### 65 Introduction

It is evident that Health Information Technology (HIT)-related interventions create viable and timely opportunities to improve accuracy and efficiency in modern medicine (1-3). However, a survey of a nationally representative sample of medical group practices in the US suggested that adopting HIT, such as Electronic Health Record (EHR), is slow and complex and requires a great deal of support (4).

71

There is ample evidence that patient details can go awry; for example, inflexible electronic forms can result in incorrect orders (5), inaccurate medication requests from a medication ordering system (6), or lost patient data in the EHR system (7). Data entry errors caused by the user can result in incorrect or outdated information remaining in the system and reproducing the same error at several stages of the procedure (8, 9). Healthcare professionals can also delay patient information entry due to their busy schedules or frequent interruptions, resulting in outdated or incomplete information for a more extended period (9). 'Patient details', in this context, refer to information-and-documentation-related features of the patient, i.e., any patient information in a healthcare facility is recorded as a document, either in paper or electronic form. For instance, patient demographics and clinical outcomes are usually stored electronically in the health or medical record. Therefore, a record of any patient information has been considered patient details throughout this study.

84

Several barriers were identified in a recent study by Bjerkan et al. that negatively impacted the nursing practices' documentation process, including individual, social, organizational, and technological factors (10). It was also reported that healthcare professionals found the process of electronic-record documentation to be onerous, as such records contain too much information (11).

90

Jabin et al. demonstrated in 2019 that HIT-related incidents occur at each step of the medical imaging workflow process and that human and technical factors play a role in problems related to patient details (12). The human factor involves interactions among humans and other elements of a system, optimizing human well-being and overall system achievement (13). On the other hand, the technical factor refers to the attributes of practices and devices/systems that can influence the performance of an organization (14).

97

98 The Swedish Medical Products Agency (MPA) aims to deliver, accord, and contribute to 99 improved healthcare in collaboration with the Swedish eHealth Agency and the Swedish 100 Authority for Privacy Protection. The healthcare providers were recommended to strengthen 101 process measurement and provide leadership to reduce the risks associated with HIT systems

102 (15). Moreover, all Swedish county councils have established computerized reporting systems103 to which any healthcare practitioner can submit incident reports (16).

104 According to Magrabi et al., incident reports could be one source among a range of information 105 repositories (16). Reports of HIT-related incidents indicate the gap between the expected and 106 empirically-supported HIT advances; therefore, continuous incident reports and analysis could 107 bridge the gap (12, 17-19). An integrated framework for safety, quality, and risk management, 108 including incident management and information system, was proposed by Runciman et al. (20). 109 The concepts and terms were established in the form of the International Classification for 110 Patient Safety (ICPS)-classification of incident reports and measurement of safety (21). The 111 ICPS helps collect and analyze incident reports to understand what went wrong and how it went 112 wrong.

113 The incident reports generally consist of information regarding the circumstances surrounding 114 the incidents (type of incident), such as what contributed to these events occurring and their 115 outcomes. "Incident type is a descriptive term for a category made up of incidents of a common 116 nature grouped because of shared, agreed features" (21). One incident may be classified into 117 more than one type of issue, for example, information-related issues and documentation-related 118 issues. Information-related issues may reflect on patient information or characteristics, for 119 example, the reason for seeking care, primary diagnosis, and patient status (12, 22). The 120 document-related issues may include any written, typed, drawn, stamped, or printed text or any 121 document where patient information has been entered. Documents may include nursing medical 122 records, protocols or policies, patient labels, stickers, requests, reports, and medical images (12, 123 22).

124

125 According to the ICPS, "contributing factors are the circumstances, actions or influences which 126 are thought to have played a part in the origin or development of an incident or to increase the risk of an incident" (21). It is notable that an incident may have more than one contributing 127 128 factor, and one incident may be a contributing factor to another incident (a "recursive" model). 129 "Patient outcome relates to the impact upon a patient which is wholly or partially attributable 130 to an incident" (21). On the other hand, "organizational outcomes" refer to the impacts upon an 131 organization which is wholly or partially attributable to an incident" (21). However, readers 132 interested in the conceptual framework, key concepts, terms, and definitions of the 'classes' 133 comprising the ICPS may follow a series of articles published by the World Health Organization 134 with the formation of the World Alliance for Patient Safety. Three scientific papers were published in 2009, with the result of the work developed using a two-stage Delphi survey, 135 136 participated by 300 experts from a range of fields (21, 23, 24).

The thematic analyses and deductive approaches of the ICPS (25) are suitable for analyzing and interpreting HIT incidents in Swedish healthcare. Since little research has been conducted that has focused on issues related to patient details reported in HIT incidents, there is a need for qualitative analysis, both deductive and inductive. This will help explore the challenges related to patient details (information and documentation) that arise in routine clinical practice in Swedish healthcare.

The overall aim of this study was to explore HIT-related incidents and identify patient detailsrelated problems, as well as their association with human and technical factors, using thematic analysis. The study also examines each HIT incident's contributing factors and outcome using the ICPS. This paper explores the following research questions:

147 1. What patient details-related issues occur in the routine clinical practice of Swedish148 healthcare?

- 149 2. How are these problems associated with human and technical factors?
- 150 3. What are the other contributing factors and outcomes of these patient details-related151 issues?

# 152 Methods

#### 153 **Data collection**

154 Initially, a list of 55 participants was made using purposive sampling, covering 21 regions of 155 Sweden, targeting physicians, nurses, medical engineers, and healthcare quality managers. Of 156 the 55 participants contacted, only five responses were received. Due to this low response, 157 additional 19 participants were approached using snowball sampling, of which 15 responses 158 were collected. The incident reports were collected in two formats depending on the availability 159 and accessibility of the participants. The participants were requested either to participate in 160 interviews (written and telephone) and/or provide a set of retrospectively collected incident 161 reports from their local database.

162

From the 15 responders, 98 incident reports were collected, three of which were excluded either due to lack of adequate information or inability to categorize it as a HIT incident. The final sample of 95 retrospectively collected HIT incident reports from Swedish healthcare was considered for identifying patient details-related problems and their association with human and technical factors. A detailed description of the participant characteristics from each region, the number of incidents collected, and the time interval of collected incidents are presented in Table 1 (26).

170 171

Table 1 Participant and incident characteristics

ParticipantRegionCharacteristics		Region	No. of incidents collected from				Time period of incidents	
No.	Occupation			Written response	Telephone interviews	Existing database	Total	

1	Quality manager <sup>1</sup>	Kalmar	1		26	27	01/2016 - 04/2021
2	Quality Manager <sup>2</sup>	Kronoberg	1		0	1	03/2021
3	Quality Manager <sup>3</sup>	Uppsala	0		38	38	06/2019 - 06/2021
4	Medical Engineer <sup>1</sup>	Kalmar	1		0	1	03/2021
5	Medical Engineer <sup>2</sup>	Kronoberg	1		0	1	03/2021
6	Medical Engineer <sup>3</sup>	Gävle	0	2	14	16	03/2020 - 04/2021
7	Medical Engineer <sup>4</sup>	Gävle	0	3	0	3	05/2021
8	Physician <sup>1</sup>	Kalmar	1		0	1	04/2021
9	Physician <sup>2</sup>	Kronobeg	1		0	1	04/2021
10	Physician <sup>3</sup>	Kronobeg	2		0	2	04/2021
11	Physician <sup>4</sup>	Kronobeg	2		0	2	04/2021
12	Physician <sup>5</sup>	Kronobeg	2		0	2	04/2021
13	Physician <sup>6</sup>	Stockholm	1		0	1	04/2021
14	Nurse <sup>1</sup>	Stockholm	1		0	1	03/2021
15	Nurse <sup>2</sup>	Stockholm	1		0	1	04/2021
	Grand total					98	

#### 172 **Data analysis**

Incident reports (in the form of free-text narratives) were analyzed using both inductive and deductive methods in order to extract detailed information. The inductive approach involved thematic analysis, proposed by Braun and Clarke(27), whereas the deductive included the ICPS. The thematic analysis was used to determine the incidents with patient details from the total sample (n=95). The ICPS was used to identify the contributing factors and outcomes of the incidents. Each identified issue was then characterized by either human or technical factors.

179

Two coders were involved in data analyses (both deductive and inductive) for verification and reliability of the coding. The primary coder performed the thematic analysis, which the secondary coder verified, and the incident was re-examined in case of any disagreement between the coders. An agreement was reached between the coders through dialogue. The coding of the ICPS (contributing factors and outcomes) was performed by both coders independently. Interrater reliability using kappa score calculation was performed. A consensus was reached in case of any difference of opinion.

# 187 **Results**

Of 95 included incident reports, 77 were from the existing databases of the local hospitals, and 189 18 were collected through interviews. Of the 18 incident reports collected via interview, 13 190 were written responses, and five were telephone interviews. All 95 incidents were aggregated 191 for data analysis. The incidents were reported between January 2016 and May 2021.

192

193 Of the total sample (n=95), 90 incidents were associated with problems with patient details 194 using thematic analysis, and 120 issues were identified from these problems (see Table 2). Of 195 90 incidents, 24 incidents comprised two issues, and three incidents resulted in three problems; 196 however, no particular pattern or common theme was found for the incidents with multiple 197 issues. The 90 incidents fell into three main categories: medical records, e-prescribing, and 198 medical imaging. A fourth category, "other," included clinical chemistry and psychological 199 treatment, which did not fall into the main three categories. When the 90 HIT incidents were 200 allocated to thematic analysis, 120 issues with patient details were identified, more associated 201 with documentation (n=62, 52%) than information (n=58, 48%) (see Table 2).

202 203

Table 2 Types of patient detail issues and their association with human and technical factors

Types of patient detail issues	HF	TF	n	%
Medical record-related	1			
Information				
Incorrect information	18	0	18	15.00
No/missing/lost information	12	2	14	11.67
Invalid/ irrelevant/ unknown information	6	1	7	5.83
Incomplete information	2	0	2	1.67
Subtotal (information)	38	3	41	34.17
Documentation				
No/missing/lost documentation	0	14	14	11.67
Incorrect documentation	9	1	10	8.33
Invalid documentation	6	2	8	6.67
Incomplete documentation	3	0	3	2.50
Subtotal (documentation)	18	17	35	29.17
Total (information + documentation)	56	20	76	63.33

e-Prescribing-related				
Information				
Incorrect information	9	0	9	7.50
No/missing/lost information	3	0	3	2.50
Subtotal (information)	10	0	12	10.00
Documentation				
No/missing/lost documentation	1	4	5	4.17
Invalid documentation	0	4	4	3.33
Incorrect documentation	2	0	2	1.67
Incomplete documentation	0	1	1	0.83
Subtotal (documentation)	3	9	12	10.00
Total (information + documentation)	13	9	24	20.00
Medical imaging-rel	ated			
Information				
No/missing/lost information	1	0	1	0.83
Incorrect information	0	1	1	0.83
Invalid information	1	0	1	0.83
Subtotal (information)	2	1	3	2.50
Documentation				
Incorrect documentation	4	1	5	4.17
No/missing/lost documentation	0	4	4	3.33
Subtotal (documentation)	4	5	9	7.50
Total (information + documentation)	6	6	12	10.00
Other				
Information				
No/missing/lost information	0	2	2	1.67
Subtotal (information)	0	2	2	1.67
Documentation				
No/missing/lost documentation	0	2	2	1.67
Delayed documentation	0	2	2	1.67
Incorrect documentation	0	1	1	0.83
Invalid documentation	0	1	1	0.83
Subtotal (documentation)	0	6	6	5.00
Total (information + documentation)	0	8	8	6.67
Grand Total (information + documentation)	77	43	120	
HF = Human factor: TF = Technical factor				1

204 205

The problems were also classified to check for association with either human or technical factors. Of 120 issues identified, 77 were determined to be affected by human factors (64%), and the remaining 43 by technical factors (36%). Most problems were contributed to by human factors (n=77; 64%), and the rest by technical factors (n=44; 36%). Within these four groups,

210 each issue was further categorized as either an information-related or documentation-related211 issue (see Table 2).

212

Interrater reliability for the outcomes was  $\kappa$  (weighted) = 0.89 (p < 0.001, 95% CI 0.81–0.98),

and for the contributing factors was  $\kappa$  (weighted) = 0.87 (p<0.001, 95% CI 0.78–0.96).

215

NB: It was assumed that all incidents would be associated with patient details; however, five incident descriptions did not contain patient-related information or documentation. For example, the narration of an incident described a service for automatic drug dispensing for which the service unit failed to cut the seam between medicine bags.

# 220 Information-related issues

Of the 120 issues, 48% (n=58) comprised information-related problems (see Table 3). An example of an information-related issue may include healthcare professionals omitting patient information or writing inaccuracies in the medical record, such as blood pressure medication.

224

Of the 58 patient information-related problems, more than two-thirds involved medical records (n=41; 71%) (see Table 3). Of these 41 issues, 38 were associated with human factors and three with technical factors (see Table 2). For instance, the physician prescribing an incorrect medication was considered to be associated with the human factor, whereas doctors and pharmacists did not have the same view of the medication list attributed to technical factorrelated issues. The most common problem with medical records was "incorrect information" (n=18), and all such problems were attributed to human factors.

232 233

Table 3 Types of information-related issues and their association with human and technical factors

Types of information-related issues	HF/TF	n	%
-------------------------------------	-------	---	---

Medical record-related inform	nation		
Incorrect information			
Incorrect patient status of care	HF	5	8.62
Incorrect information on diagnosis/treatment/care	HF	5	8.62
Incorrect personal/demographic data	HF	4	6.90
Incorrect information about appointment/booking	HF	3	5.17
Incorrect examination/test data	HF	1	1.72
No/missing/lost information			
No/Missing personal/demographic data	HF	5	8.62
No/missing information about appointment/booking	HF	3	5.17
Missing information about student's health status	HF	2	3.45
No/Missing examination/test data	HF	2	3.45
No retrieval of personal/ demographic data	TF	2	3.45
Invalid/ irrelevant/ outdated information			
Invalid information of diagnosis/treatment/care	HF	4	6.90
Irrelevant personal information	HF	1	1.72
Outdated personal data	TF	1	1.72
Unknown examination data	HF	1	1.72
Incomplete information			
Incomplete clinical history	HF	2	3.45
Total		41	70.69
e-Prescribing-related inform	ation	1	
Incorrect information			
Incorrect dispensing time of medication	HF	4	6.90
Incorrect dose of medication	HF	4	6.90
Incorrect drugs prescribed	HF	1	1.72
No/missing/lost information			
Missing information about hypersensitivity (drugs/foods)	HF	3	5.17
Total		12	20.69
Medical imaging-related infor	mation		
No/missing/lost information			
Missing concluding information (summary)	HF	1	1.72
Incorrect information			
Incorrect display of information in medical image	TF	1	1.72
Invalid/ irrelevant/ outdated information			
Invalid (multiple) tumor iso-centre	HF	1	1.72
	1 111	1	1
Total		3	5.17
Total Other information		3	5.17
Total Other information No/missing/lost information		3	5.17
Total         Other information         No/missing lost information         No/missing administrative information	TF	<b>3</b>	<b>5.17</b> 3.45
Total         Other information         No/missing administrative information         Total	TF	3 2 2 2	<b>5.17</b> 3.45 <b>3.45</b>

- 236 A single patient information-related problem may include more than one type of information.
- 237 For example, incorrect medical record information may encompass several types of
- 238 demographic or personal information, including name, social security number, or sex. A list of
- 239 the different types of information is presented in Table 4.
- 240 241
  - Table 4 Type of information involved in the information-related issues

Type of information	n	%			
Clinical inform	ation				
Diagnostic information	6	6.74			
Patient status	4	4.49			
Care measures	3	3.37			
Care plan	2	2.25			
Vaccination registration	2	2.25			
Alcohol history	1	1.12			
Investigation	1	1.12			
Intervention (type)	1	1.12			
Total	20	22.47			
Demographic/personal information					
Patient name	7	7.87			
Patient identity	3	3.37			
Social security number	3	3.37			
Sex	3	3.37			
Student guardians information	2	2.25			
Student class affiliation	1	1.12			
Total	19	21.35			
Medication-related i	nformatio	1			
Drug dose	5	5.62			
Medicine	4	4.49			
Drug dispensing information	3	3.37			
Total	12	13.48			
Requests/referral	related				
Appointments	4	4.49			
Electronic order	3	3.37			
Referral	3	3.37			
Examination request	1	1.12			
Total	12	13.48			
Pathophysiological (disease)-	related inf	ormation			
Hypersensitivity	4	4.49			
Aortic rupture	1	1.12			
Emergency medical care	1	1.12			
Cardiac arrest event	1	1.12			

Bleeding	1	1.12			
Suicide	1	1.12			
Total	9	10.11			
Personal meas	ures				
Weight	2	2.25			
Back	1	1.12			
Hearing	1	1.12			
Height	1	1.12			
Vision	1	1.12			
Total	6	6.74			
<b>Examination/Test related</b>					
Examination items	1	1.12			
Sampling time	1	1.12			
Sampling responses	1	1.12			
Test date	1	1.12			
Type of examination	1	1.12			
Total	5	5.62			
Administration	related				
Patient bed	1	1.12			
Staff categories	1	1.12			
Term of benefit	1	1.12			
Total	3	3.37			
Medical imag	ging				
Tumor isocentre central	1	1.12			
Tooth graphic	1	1.12			
Total	2	2.25			
Communication-	related				
Health follow-up	1	1.12			
Total	1	1.12			
Grand Total	89				

<sup>242</sup> 

Patient details-related issues associated with patient information fell into four categories: incorrect information, no/missing/lost information, invalid/irrelevant/outdated information, or incomplete information. There were consistent indications of the things going wrong in which human failures played a major role. Among information-related issues, human factors manifested "incorrect information" (27 of 28) and "no/missing/lost information" (16 of 20) (see Table 5).

249 250

Table 5 Finite categories of information-related issues and their association with human and technical factors

Finite categories of information-related issues	HF	TF	n	%
---	----	----	---	---

Incorrect information	27	1	28	48.28
No/missing/lost information	16	4	20	34.48
Invalid/ irrelevant/ outdated information	7	1	8	13.79
Incomplete information	2	0	2	3.45
Total	52	6	58	

251 HF = Human factor; TF = Technical factor

### 252 **Documentation-related issues**

Of the 120 problems, 52% (n=62) were document-related issues (see Table 6). An illustration of documentation-related issues may involve multiple imaging requests that were required to

be written in paper form because of a malfunction of the radiology ordering system.

256 257

7 Table 6 Types of documentation-related issues and their association with human and technical factors

Types of documentation-related issues	HF/TF	n	%
Medical records-related doc	umentatio	n	
No/missing/lost documentation			
Missing patient record	TF	5	8.06
No/Missing sick/medical certificate	TF	3	4.84
No/missing request/order/appointment form	TF	3	4.84
Missing patient report	TF	2	3.23
Missing waiting list entry	TF	1	1.61
Incorrect documentation			
Incorrect patient record	HF	6	9.68
Incorrect request/order/appointment form	HF	3	4.84
Another patient's request form	TF	1	1.61
Invalid/ outdated documentation			
Unauthorized access/process to medical record	HF	5	8.06
Outdated documentation	TF	2	3.23
Confused medical record	HF	1	1.61
Incomplete documentation			
Incomplete document for care plan	HF	3	4.84
Total		35	56.45
e-Prescribing-related docu	mentation		
No/missing/lost documentation			
Missing prescription	TF	3	4.84
No display of "terms of benefit"	TF	1	1.61
No medical prescription sent	HF	1	1.61
Invalid/ outdated documentation			
Outdated prescription	TF	2	3.23
Different drug list	TF	2	3.23
Incorrect documentation			
Another patient's prescription	HF	2	3.23
Incomplete documentation			
Incomplete display of prescription	TF	1	1.61

Total		12	19.35		
Medical Imaging-related documentation					
Incorrect documentation					
Incorrect medical image obtained/transferred	HF	4	6.45		
Incorrect generation of X-ray referral	TF	1	1.61		
No/missing/lost documentation					
No retrieval of medical image	TF	3	4.84		
No transfer of image	TF	1	1.61		
Total		9	14.52		
Other documentat	ion		•		
No/missing/lost documentation					
No message/chat	TF	2	3.23		
Delayed documentation					
Delayed delivery of the message	TF	2	3.23		
Incorrect documentation					
Incorrect message delivered	TF	1	1.61		
Invalid documentation					
Different alarm logs	TF	1	1.61		
Total		6	9.68		
Grand Total		62			

<sup>258</sup> 

HF = Human factor (non-italics); TF = Technical factor (Italics)

259

260 Of the 62 documentation-related problems, more than half were associated with medical records 261 (n=35; 56%) (see Table 4). Of these 35 issues, 18 were attributed to human factors and 17 to 262 technical factors (see Table 6). The most common issue with medical records was 263 "no/lost/missing documentation" (n=14), of which all were associated with technical factors. A 264 list of document types is presented in Table 7, of which fewer than half comprised clinical 265 documents (n=24; 44%).

Table 7 Type of documentation involved in the documentation-related issues

Type of document involved	n	%				
Clinical document	Clinical document					
Medical record	11	20.00				
Patient report	5	9.09				
Certificates (sick)	4	7.27				
Patient meeting documentation	1	1.82				
Waiting list	1	1.82				
Checklist	1	1.82				
Treatment template	1	1.82				
Total	24	43.64				

<sup>266</sup> 267

Medication-related document			
Prescription	8	14.55	
Drug lists	2	3.64	
Total	10	18.18	
Medical imaging-related do	cument		
Medical image	8	14.55	
Imaging report	2	3.64	
Total	10	18.18	
Request/booking for	n		
Request form	3	5.45	
Booking form	2	3.64	
Total	5	9.09	
Communication-related document			
Message (chat)	5	9.09	
Total	5	9.09	
Other documents			
Alarm logs	1	1.82	
Total	1	1.82	
Grand Total	55		

268

Documentation-related patient-detail problems fell into five categories: no/missing/lost documentation, incorrect documentation, invalid/outdated documentation, incomplete information, or delayed documentation. Among these, human factors predominated in the causation of "incorrect documentation" (15 of 18), while technical factors predominated in "no/missing/lost documentation" (24 of 25) (see Table 8).

274 275

Table 8 Finite categories of documentation-related issues and their association with human and technical factors

Finite categories of documentation-related issues	HF	TF	n	%
No/missing/lost documentation	1	24	25	40.32
Incorrect documentation	15	3	18	29.03
Invalid/ outdated documentation	6	7	13	20.97
Incomplete documentation	3	1	4	6.45
Delayed documentation	0	2	2	3.23
Total	25	37	62	51.67

276 HF = Human factor; TF = Technical factor

# 277 **Contributing factors**

The ICPS was used to capture detailed information about the types of contributing factors associated with those 90 incidents involving patient details-related issues. Of these 90 incidents,

#### 280 87 contributing factors were identified, of which fewer than half (45%) comprised "medical

- 281 device/system" factors (n=39) (see Table 9).
- 282 283

3 Table 9 Types of contributing factors involved in the patient details-related issues

Contributing factors	n	%		
Medical device/ system factor				
Device or system usability	16	18.39		
Device or system not working/slow/ failed	11	12.64		
Device or system suitability for purpose	9	10.34		
Device or system unavailable/inaccessible	2	2.30		
Device or system unfamiliar	1	1.15		
Subtotal	39	44.83		
Documentation factor				
Missing/unavailable documentation	7	8.05		
Unclear/ambiguous/ duplicated documentation	4	4.60		
Breach of privacy	4	4.60		
Inadequate/ incomplete documentation	2	2.30		
Subtotal	17	19.54		
Staff factor				
Unknown/ Not clear	10	11.49		
Inattention/distraction/negligence	3	3.45		
Knowledge/skills/awareness		3.45		
Fail to carry out duty		1.15		
Subtotal	17	19.54		
Communication factor				
Not conducted	6	6.90		
Inaccurate information communicated	3	3.45		
Incomplete	1	1.15		
Subtotal	10	11.49		
Policy/guideline-related factor				
Policy/guideline not followed	2	2.30		
Subtotal	2	2.30		
Patient factor				
Inattention/distraction/negligence	1	1.15		
Knowledge/skills/awareness	1	1.15		
Subtotal	2	2.30		
Total	87			

<sup>284</sup> 

Among medical device/system-related factors, "device/system usability" (n=16) was most common; for instance, the computer system malfunctioned at the beginning of imaging because

287 the imaging modality was turned on in haste. Both documentation (n=17) and staff (n=17) each

288	contributed to one-fifth (20%) of the total factors (see Table 9). Documentation factors were
289	mainly associated with "missing/unavailable documentation" (n=7); for example, a patient
290	summary could not be retrieved because the patient record was missing.

291

However, staff-related factors were largely unclear or not known due to insufficient narration
of the incident descriptions (see Table 9). In these cases, it was quite clear that healthcare staff
contributed to an incident, but information about the type of contributing factor was lacking.
For example, a report indicated that staff omitted information or wrote inaccuracies in the
medical record, but no indication was given of their reason for doing so.

297

Regarding "medical device/system," the most common factor was "device or system usability" (n=16; 18%), indicating that users or healthcare staff had difficulty using the system, which contributed to the incident. For example, a user could not enter complete patient prescription details because benefit terms were not displayed in the intended context. 11% of incidents comprised the communication factor, of which communication was "not conducted" in six cases (see Table 9).

304

Moreover, "medical device/system" and "documentation" were the most common contributing factors, especially when the incidents themselves were HIT system issues (in nature) and involved documentation-related problems (through thematic analysis). This phenomenon confirms the recursive nature of errors and the frequent correlation between types of problems and specific contributing factors. Therefore, the phenomenon may be considered an issue, a contributing factor, or both based on the incident's features or characteristics in that specific context.

#### 312 **Outcomes**

The outcomes of all 90 incidents were identified using the ICPS, and each incident was assigned one outcome. The outcomes were broadly classified into two categories, namely, patientrelated, comprising patient inconvenience and patient harm, or staff/organization-related. Of 90 incidents, more than half (59%) comprised patient-related outcomes (n=53)—patient inconvenience (n=42; 47%) and patient harm (n=11; 12%). The remaining 41% (n=37) comprised staff or organization-related outcomes (see Table 10).

319 320

Table 10 Types o	of outcomes	resulting from	the patient	details-related	issues
------------------	-------------	----------------	-------------	-----------------	--------

Outcomes	Ν	%		
Patient-related outcomes				
Patient inconvenience				
Delays in management diagnosis/procedure/treatment	17	18.89		
Unnecessary treatment	9	10.00		
Patient dissatisfaction	8	8.89		
Repeated or additional diagnosis/procedure/treatment	5	5.56		
Financial implications	3	3.33		
Subtotal	42	46.67		
Patient harm				
Pathophysiological disease related	6	6.67		
Injury	4	4.44		
Death	1	1.11		
Subtotal	11	12.22		
Total	53	58.89		
Staff or organization-related outcomes				
More system/service/resource used	14	15.56		
Delays in using facilities/service/system	10	11.11		
Increased documentation	7	7.78		
Phone calls/review/follow-up	6	6.67		
Subtotal	37	41.11		
Total	37	41.11		
Grand total	90			

321

Within patient inconvenience, delays in care management (diagnosis/procedure/treatment) accounted for 19% (n=17) of outcomes. Such delays included investigation of the patient treatment plan, care measures, acquisition of images, or medication management. Unnecessary

325 treatment (n=9; 10%) included patient treatment that was not required; for example, patient 326 treatment with blood pressure medication despite any such symptoms or imaging with 327 unnecessary radiation dose. Patient dissatisfaction (n=8; 9%) was expressed either in informal 328 complaints or expressions of dissatisfaction, including decreased confidence in care delivery, 329 suspicions of unauthorized medical records access, or concerns about the competence of the 330 care providers. Repeated or additional diagnosis/procedure/treatment (n=5; 6%) was performed 331 when the healthcare professionals found that the wrong patient was treated/imaged or that the 332 right patient underwent the wrong treatment or examination. These problems caused the same 333 patient to undergo the same imaging, examination, or treatment twice. Three cases of financial 334 implications for patients were identified, including denial of payment or failure to pay 335 compensation or sickness benefit (see Table 10).

336

Six cases resulted in pathophysiological disease-related harm to the patient, including risks of disease or severe deterioration of health due to wrong medication. These comprised four cases of serious injury and one patient death. However, no further information regarding the injury was reported, and the death was not reported to be directly caused by the incident (see Table 10).

342

Of the staff or organization-related outcomes, 16% (n=14) resulted in more equipment/services/resources being used in the form of similar systems or USB sticks, manual extraction/entry of data, or other healthcare professionals, including medical engineers or IT experts. 11% of outcomes resulted in delays in using facilities/service/systems, for example, storage server access delays due to system shutdown; 8% led to increased documentation, such as rewriting imaging orders in paper form; and the remaining 7% resulted in phone

349 calls/review/follow-up, such as contacting other staff involved in the same treatment (see Table350 10).

# 351 **Discussion**

In the last three decades, healthcare quality and safety have been on the agenda because the healthcare system can harm patients; for example, a single large-scale event may even affect multiple patients' care management (26). Even though HIT has improved efficiency, its design, use, and implementation can negatively impact patient care and safety (12, 28). The Joint Commission that accredits healthcare organizations in the US suggested that diligent adherence to protocol, cross-checking HIT systems' information and documents, and the use of interpreters for foreign patients could potentially detect and mitigate such problems (29).

359

360 A report in Australia suggests that patient information and documentation issues were 361 significant modifiable risks in medical imaging, nuclear medicine, radiation therapy, and oral 362 surgery. These risks persisted even after developing and implementing the Correct Patient, 363 Correct Site, and Correct Procedure (3Cs) Protocol in 2004 (30). However, caution is advised 364 since the daily average volume of medical exams read by radiologists has increased sevenfold 365 in the last seven years. As thousands of patients are processed, transported, treated, and 366 examined by hundreds of healthcare staff in the day-to-day clinical routine, the risks for such 367 failures are enormous (30). The report further indicated that the factors contributing to such 368 incidents include "heavy workload" and "policies/guidelines not followed", suggesting that 369 healthcare professionals do not receive enough time to follow the protocol (30).

#### 370 Human versus technical factors

Healthcare is a complex sociotechnical system in which various human factors, including behavior, performance, and culture, play a vital role in building an intimate relationship with the HIT systems. These factors can improve healthcare quality and safety or cause harm and disrupt healthcare processes (31). Even though many technical issues and failures were identified in the reports, we did not expect that more than half of the issues would be caused by human factors (n=77; 64%). However, the incident reports did not contain adequate information to explore further any connection with human behavior, performance, and culture.

378

379 Despite the analysis providing no indication of the absolute frequencies of these issues, it does 380 assures the fact that human errors play a vital role in HIT incidents (32). The advantage of 381 systems is that they can be incrementally improved, while the errors of human users are 382 inevitable and remain an inherent part of the complex sociotechnical healthcare system. "Whilst 383 system issues can be progressively "designed out", it would seem that in the meantime, the 384 rapid availability of experts to diagnose and apply a digital solution to such problems would be 385 highly desirable" (17). Therefore, more considerable thought should be placed on the HIT 386 systems to be designed to prevent specific issues from occurring. This can also be backed up by 387 observational and ethnographic studies that would prevent the occurrence of issues such as those 388 listed throughout this study (28, 32).

# 389 Humans as the weak link, and the need for training for healthcare 390 professionals

A review of 436 HIT incident reports by Jabin et al. reported that human factors are inevitable
in the genesis of over 58% of the issues in most complex sociotechnical systems (12). Magrabi

et al., in a review of 850 incidents, summarized that human factors were responsible for patientharm four times more often than technical factors (18).

395

Human error is difficult (if not impossible) to prevent because neither seniority nor experience offers immunity (33). An error occurs through various unintended and unknown cognitive mechanisms beyond human control (34). Even though using the "forcing function" was suggested to prevent such human errors by Norman (34), it would cause "overproceduralization" that may detract from surveillance and situational awareness. Therefore, it would rather be suitable to design the system in such a way as to prevent incidents from occurring, as well as provide training to system users (17).

403

Healthcare professionals are seldom provided with sufficient training or education for the
proper use and operation of HIT systems, manifesting as a lack of proficiency in handling them
in healthcare settings (35). For example, a review of 436 HIT incidents by Jabin et al. suggests
that system integration and software update-related issues do contribute to human error, causing
incorrect entry of patient information and workflow disruptions (17).

409

Since human error remains an enduring part of the complex healthcare system, it is critically essential to establish an ongoing training process for healthcare professionals in connection with vendors (17). The Joint Commission suggested that healthcare professionals, as the major contributor to HIT-related problems, should be adequately trained (29). Therefore, training healthcare professionals before integrating HIT systems and software updates, and preparing them for unexpected system failures, will result in better use of the HIT systems and greater user satisfaction, thus mitigating the risks of human problems.

417

418 However, professional development to acquire HIT-related skills and competencies can affect 419 patient safety as it hinders clinicians from regular routine practice, such as patient care activities 420 (36). One of the effective approaches to overcome this barrier is to combine conventional 421 classroom training with simulation-based training (37). This approach is useful for novice user 422 but not for experienced participants who may intend to refrain from any additional training (37). 423 Another approach is to set aside adequate paid time for balancing the training and their day-to-424 day clinical practice (17). These approaches can also be supplemented by basic health literacy 425 programs, which may involve patients in managing their own care (38). For example, a defense 426 mechanism in the general healthcare system can be improved by identifying incorrect 427 prescriptions by means of providing basic health literacy to patients (39).

428

429 Therefore, training healthcare professionals before integrating HIT systems and software 430 updates, and preparing them for unexpected system failures, will result in better use of the HIT 431 systems and greater user satisfaction, thus mitigating the risks of human problems.

#### 432 Lack of human-centered design of HIT systems

433 Even if it is called the "human factor" or "human errors", it should be clarified that often it is 434 not individuals who are to be blamed. Rather, it is the complex systems the healthcare 435 professionals work in that are not sufficiently designed (40). Although there was a separation 436 of the human factors from the technical in this study, humans constantly interact with multiple 437 other systems or elements when performing their jobs in complex systems. These include 438 people, job tasks, technology, physical and social environments, the organization of work, and 439 external issues such as regulation and research findings (41, 42). Often, systemic influences and 440 reasons that are either unknown/or unknowable fall under the category of system design-human 441 interaction issues (43, 44).

442

The concept of 'human error' as it applies in complex sociotechnical systems, combined with the lack of human-centered HIT design, causes the system to be unsafe and suffer from usability issues (45). The great majority of data reported, therefore, are, in fact, human factors-related issues. Therefore, blaming the end-user of these systems as contributors to these incidents without extensive evidence occurring in day-to-day clinical practice is not appropriate.

448

449 Human error can potentially be mitigated by designing systems to prevent incidents from 450 occurring and designing out the "error-prone features". With considerable thought and 451 ingenuity, the National Health Service (NHS) and the US National Institute of Standards and 452 Technology (NIST) developed and published guidelines and standards for interface design for 453 clinical user interface (45) and EMR usability (46). The HIT industries and national 454 standardization bodies should step in for the design and development of well-established 455 guidelines and standards for safety-critical software. These guidelines and measures should be 456 established based on coveted and suitable working procedures, maintained by national 457 standardization bodies, and backed by government authorities (47).

# 458 Disruptions in the clinical workflow and the need for a holistic view of 459 healthcare

In this study, approximately 41% of cases had a staff/organization-related outcome. There was a clear indication that workflow disruptions resulted in additional system/service/resource use and delays in using facilities/service/systems. More than one-third of problems in this study were associated with incorrect patient information or documentation (n=46; 38%). These events caused several risks to patients, such as increased radiation risks, unnecessary procedures, or delays in obtaining correct procedures or medication. Such delays in procedure further delayed

466 diagnosis, treatment initiation, treatment impact monitoring, and decisions regarding future 467 treatment options (continuation, discontinuation, or change in treatment). Once an incorrect 468 piece of information or document is introduced into the system, an "automation bias" tends to 469 consider it correct (48).

470

471 Over the decades, health informatics researchers have been studying the effect of patient 472 information and documentation-related problems that affect the clinical workflow. A review of 473 149 HIT incidents by Warm and Edwards in 2012 reported that around 34% of the total sample 474 was patient information-related issues, which were categorized into information output (n=25; 475 16%), information transfer (n=7; 5%), and information input (n=19; 13%) (49). Other studies 476 reported that the quality of the care delivery was compromised by less-than-optimal care, or the 477 risks to patient safety were caused by things going wrong with care delivery (17, 50). Some of 478 the negative impacts include delayed procedures (5), confusion about the patient treatments 479 (51), inappropriate decision-making based on incorrect or outdated information (52), and 480 patient harm (51, 53).

481

482 A holistic view of the healthcare workflow is necessary to understand and identify the risks. 483 This could include an assessment of risks among various healthcare departments, such as 484 medical imaging, emergency departments, theatres, and Intensive Care Units (ICU). This risk 485 assessment should be accompanied by the ongoing development of new effective strategies to 486 mitigate risk. For example, Jabin et al. reported that failures related to patient information or 487 documentation can occur at any stage, such as clinical consultation to clinical action with 488 particular focus on the medical imaging workflow process (12). This is true even in our study 489 of the incidents associated with patient identification issues, irrespective of the process 490 workflow in medical imaging or e-prescribing. However, the present study did not consider

491 clinical workflow stages or their association with patient detail issues. Therefore, it is essential
492 to examine different types of patient information and documentation problems, their causation,
493 and their effects on the clinical workflow. This can further help develop the workflow and
494 design solutions addressing particular issues for each healthcare department.

#### 495 Strengths and limitations of this study

496 Incident reports are voluntary, subject to bias, and self-reported. The low response rate was due 497 to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in a smaller sample than planned. The 498 reporters were not experts in HIT (54), as there needed to be more accurate in the reported 499 narrative texts, making it impossible to categorize three incidents. For example, an incident was 500 assigned at least one contributing factor; however, it was impossible to classify three incidents 501 to identify even one contributing factor due to insufficient incident description. Therefore, 12% 502 of staff factor-related incidents were categorized as "unknown/unclear" (see Table 7). The 503 inadequacy in the reports also affected the categorization of information-/documentation-504 related issues; for example, "no" information/documentation was merged with "missing/lost" 505 information/documentation. In addition, most of the issues affected by the "staff factor" could 506 not be identified for the same reason-insufficient narrative texts in the report.

507

It was a limited data source, and thus it is assumed that incidents were not detected in many cases and not reported even if they were detected (55). Moreover, the total number or frequency of events (failures) can never be compared to successful actions that occur in healthcare. Therefore, the analyses cannot manifest the absolute frequency of the issues, contributing factors, or the identified outcomes. However, the numbers and frequency do provide a salient sense of HIT issues that occur in day-to-day clinical practice and demonstrate the harmful role of human error in patient details-related problems.

515

516 The incident reports were analyzed using thematic analysis and classified using the ICPS by an 517 expert analyst who previously investigated, analyzed, and classified a large set of incident 518 reports—around 5,000 medical imaging incident reports in Australia. The secondary coder was 519 extensively trained to classify the incidents using the ICPS. Also, the ICPS was initially 520 developed without considering the HIT system; therefore, a slight modification of the 521 contributing factor nomenclature "medical device/system" has been considered for this study. 522 Moreover, a combination of both deductive and inductive approaches made it possible to extract 523 information that may not be evident using any one method of analysis. Moreover, the recursive 524 model of the descriptions of errors and how they occurred constitutes a measure of internal 525 validation for the incident reporting and classification process.

526

527 The collection of incident reports ranged over a significant period, validating the feasibility of 528 monitoring incidents regularly. Therefore, new features of the existing problems may have 529 emerged, and new, unforeseen, and unprecedented issues may have been identified. The issues 530 identified in this study are compliant with amelioration and mitigation through a systemic 531 approach and rigorous research, such as providing training to healthcare professionals, vigilant 532 system design and implementation, and redesigning the clinical workflow. The issues can be 533 mitigated by permitting timely application of preventive and corrective strategies at systemic 534 and local levels.

535

Even though minimal studies on incident analysis have been published, Sweden currently has a comprehensive program on medical device and HIT systems managed by the MPA to ensure quality improvement in Swedish healthcare. Therefore, the results obtained, i.e., the broader categories of the issues, are similar to those previously identified in Australia (32) and the UK 540 (49). This means the lessons learned may be suitable and applicable elsewhere to maintain risk541 management standards.

# 542 Conclusion

- 543 This study provided insight into patient information/documentation-related problems vis-à-vis
- 544 HIT and how human and technical factors affect patient care delivery. The deductive and
- 545 inductive approaches analyses provided useful context to the reporters and analysts regarding
- 546 where preventive and corrective strategies should be addressed. Therefore, characterizing such
- 547 HIT incidents and identifying patient details-related problems should be a routine part of
- 548 clinical practice to improve the constantly changing healthcare system.

# 549 Acknowledgment

- 550 The authors wish to thank Sofia Backåberg and Pauline Johansson, Senior Lecturers at Linnaeus
- 551 University for their help and support.

# 552 **Reference**

- Bates DW, Gawande AA. Improving safety with information technology. N Engl
   J Med. 2003;348(25):2526-34.
- Petersen LA, Orav EJ, Teich JM, O'Neil AC, Brennan TA. Using a computerized
   sign-out program to improve continuity of inpatient care and prevent adverse events. Jt Comm
   J Qual Improv. 1998;24(2):77-87.
- 558 3. Patient Safety: Achieving a New Standard for Care. [press release]. Washington,
  559 D.C.: National Academy Press2004.
- Gans D, Kralewski J, Hammons T, Dowd B. Medical groups' adoption of
  electronic health records and information systems. Health Aff (Millwood). 2005;24(5):132333.
- 563 5. Koppel R, Metlay JP, Cohen A, Abaluck B, Localio AR, Kimmel SE, et al. Role 564 of computerized physician order entry systems in facilitating medication errors. JAMA. 565 2005;293(10):1197-203.
- Abramson EL, Patel V, Malhotra S, Pfoh ER, Nena Osorio S, Cheriff A, et al.
  Physician experiences transitioning between an older versus newer electronic health record for
  electronic prescribing. Int J Med Inform. 2012;81(8):539-48.

569 7. Sittig DF, Singh H. Defining health information technology-related errors: new
570 developments since to err is human. Archives of internal medicine. 2011;171(14):1281-4.

571 8. Siegler EL, Adelman R. Copy and paste: a remediable hazard of electronic health 572 records. Am J Med. 2009;122(6):495-6.

573 9. Collins SA, Bakken S, Vawdrey DK, Coiera E, Currie L. Model development for
574 EHR interdisciplinary information exchange of ICU common goals. Int J Med Inform.
575 2011;80(8):e141-9.

576 10. Bjerkan J, Valderaune V, Olsen RM. Patient Safety Through Nursing
577 Documentation: Barriers Identified by Healthcare Professionals and Students. Frontiers in
578 Computer Science. 2021;3.

579 11. Clynch N, Kellett J. Medical documentation: part of the solution, or part of the
580 problem? A narrative review of the literature on the time spent on and value of medical
581 documentation. Int J Med Inform. 2015;84(4):221-8.

Jabin MSR, Mandel C, Schultz T, Hibbert P, Magrabi F, Runciman W, editors.
Identifying and Characterizing the 18 Steps of Medical Imaging Process Workflow as a Basis
for Targeting Improvements in Clinical Practice. 2019 IEEE International Conference on
Imaging Systems and Techniques (IST); 2019. Abu Dhabi: IEEE Xplore; 2020.

58613.Salvendy G. Handbook of Human Factors and Ergonomics: John Wiley and Sons,587Inc.; 2012.

588 14. Ashbourn J. Practical Biometrics. London: Springer; 2015.

589 15. Swedish Medical Products Agency. Reporting adverse reactions, events and
 590 incidents 2017 [

591 16. Magrabi F, Ong MS, Runciman W, Coiera E. An analysis of computer-related
592 patient safety incidents to inform the development of a classification. J Am Med Inform Assoc.
593 2010;17(6):663-70.

Jabin MSR, Magrabi F, Hibbert P, Schultz T, Bessen T, Runciman W, editors.
Identifying and characterizing system issues of health information technology in medical
imaging as a basis for recommendations. 2019 IEEE International Conference on Imaging
Systems and Techniques (IST); 2019. Abu Dhabi: IEEE Xplore; 2020.

Magrabi F, Baker M, Sinha I, Ong MS, Harrison S, Kidd MR, et al. Clinical safety
of England's national programme for IT: a retrospective analysis of all reported safety events
2005 to 2011. Int J Med Inform. 2015;84(3):198-206.

601 19. Castro GM, Buczkowski L, Hafner JM. The Contribution of Sociotechnical
602 Factors to Health Information Technology-Related Sentinel Events. Jt Comm J Qual Patient
603 Saf. 2016;42(2):70-6.

Runciman WB, Williamson JA, Deakin A, Benveniste KA, Bannon K, Hibbert
PD. An integrated framework for safety, quality and risk management: an information and
incident management system based on a universal patient safety classification. Qual Saf Health
Care. 2006;15 Suppl 1:i82-90.

Runciman WB, Hibbert P, Thomson R, Van Der Schaaf T, Sherman H, Lewalle
P. Towards an International Classification for Patient Safety: key concepts and terms. Int J Qual
Health Care. 2009;21(1):18-26.

611 22. Jabin MSR, Magrabi F, Hibbert P, Schultz T, Runciman W, editors. Identifying
612 Clusters and Themes from Incidents Related to Health Information Technology in Medical
613 Imaging as a Basis for Improvements in Practice. 2019 IEEE International Conference on
614 Imaging Systems and Techniques (IST); 2019. Abu Dhabi: IEEE Xplore; 2020.

615 23. Sherman H, Castro G, Fletcher M, World Alliance for Patient S, Hatlie M, Hibbert

616 P, et al. Towards an International Classification for Patient Safety: the conceptual framework.

617 Int J Qual Health Care. 2009;21(1):2-8.

618 Thomson R, Lewalle P, Sherman H, Hibbert P, Runciman W, Castro G. Towards 24. 619 an International Classification for Patient Safety: a Delphi survey. Int J Qual Health Care. 620 2009;21(1):9-17. 621 World Health Organisation. Conceptual Framework for the International 25. 622 Classification for Patient Safety: Version 1.1. 2009. 623 Jabin MSR, Pan D, Nilsson E. Characterizing healthcare incidents in Sweden 26. 624 related to health information technology affecting care management of multiple patients. Health 625 Inform J. 2022;28(2):14604582221105440. Braun V, Clarke V. What can "thematic analysis" offer health and wellbeing 626 27. 627 researchers? International journal of qualitative studies on health and well-being. 628 2014;9:26152-. 629 Jabin MSR, Magrabi F, Hibbert P, Schultz T, Runciman W, editors. Identifying 28. 630 and Classifying Incidents Related to Health Information Technology in Medical Imaging as a Basis for Improvements in Practice. 2019 IEEE International Conference on Imaging Systems 631 632 and Techniques (IST); 2019. Abu Dhabi: IEEE Xplore; 2020. 633 29. The Joint Commission. Moving Quality Improvement from a Project to a Way of 634 Leading an Organization. Journal on Quality and Patient Safety. 2016;42(2). 635 Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. Ensuring Correct 30. 636 Patient, Correct Site. Correct Procedure Protocol2014. Available from: 637 www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/patient-identification/patient-procedure-638 matchingprotocols/expanding-the-3cs-into-other-therapeutic-areas/. 639 31 Coiera E, Magrabi F. Information system safety. Guide to Health Informatics: 640 Boca Raton, FL, USA: CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group; 2015. 641 Jabin MSR. Identifying and characterising problems arising from interactions 32. 642 between medical imaging and health information technology as a basis for improvements in 643 practice. Adelaide: University of South Australia; 2019. 644 Allnutt MF. Human factors in accidents. Br J Anaesth. 1987;59(7):856-64. 33. 645 34. Norman D. The Psychology of Everyday Things: New York: Basic Books; 1988. 646 Watson L, Odle TG. The technologist's role in patient safety and quality in 35. 647 medical imaging. Radiol Technol. 2013;84(5):536-41. 648 Wilbanks BA, Aroke EN. Using Clinical Simulations to Train Healthcare 36. 649 Professionals to Use Electronic Health Records: A Literature Review. CIN: Computers, 650 Informatics, Nursing. 2020;38(11). Stroup K, Sanders B, Bernstein B, Scherzer L, Pachter LM. A New EHR Training 651 37. 652 Curriculum and Assessment for Pediatric Residents. Appl Clin Inform. 2017;8(4):994-1002. 653 Qvarfordt M, Throfast V, Petersson G, Hammar T, Hellström L. Web-based 38. 654 education of the elderly improves drug utilization literacy: A randomized controlled trial. Health Informatics J. 2021;27(1):1460458220977585. 655 656 Vincent C, Davis R. Patients and families as safety experts. CMAJ : Canadian 39. 657 Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne. 2012;184(1):15-658 6. 659 Russ A, Fairbanks R, Karsh B, Militello L, Saleem J, Wears R. The science of 40. 660 human factors: separating fact from fiction. BMJ Qual Saf. 2013 Oct; 22 (10): 802-8. doi: 661 10.1136/bmjqs-2012-001450. 662 41. Melles M, Albayrak A, Goossens R. Innovating health care: key characteristics 663 of human-centered design. International Journal for Quality in Health Care. 664 2021;33(Supplement 1):37-44. 665 Russ AL, Saleem JJ. Ten factors to consider when developing usability scenarios 42. 666 and tasks for health information technology. J Biomed Inform. 2018;78:123-33.

Karsh BT, Holden RJ, Alper SJ, Or CK. A human factors engineering paradigm
for patient safety: designing to support the performance of the healthcare professional. Qual Saf
Health Care. 2006;15 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):i59-65.

44. Saleem JJ, Russ AL, Sanderson P, Johnson TR, Zhang J, Sittig DF. Current
challenges and opportunities for better integration of human factors research with development
of clinical information systems. Yearb Med Inform. 2009:48-58.

67345.NHSCfH.CommonUserInterface2011[Availablefrom:674<a href="http://www.connectingforhealth.nhs.uk/systemsandservices/data/cui">http://www.connectingforhealth.nhs.uk/systemsandservices/data/cui</a>.

46. NIST. Evaluation, Testing, and Validation of theUsability of Electronic Health
Records: US National Instituteof Standards and Technology (NISTIR 7804). 2012 [Available
from: <u>http://www.nist.gov/manuscript-publication-search.cfm?pub\_id=909701</u>.

47. Jabin MSR, Hammar T. Issues with the Swedish e-prescribing system – An
analysis of health information technology-related incident reports using an existing
classification system. DIGITAL HEALTH. 2022;8:20552076221131139.

48. Parasuraman R, Mouloua M, Hillsdale NJ. Automation and human performance:
theory and applications. England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1996.

Warm D, Edwards P. Classifying health information technology patient safety
related incidents - an approach used in Wales. Applied clinical informatics. 2012;3(2):248-57.

50. Kruse CS, Mileski M, Syal R, MacNeil L, Chabarria E, Basch C. Evaluating the
relationship between health information technology and safer-prescribing in the long-term care
setting: A systematic review. Technol Health Care. 2021;29(1):1-14.

Ash JS, Berg M, Coiera E. Some unintended consequences of information
technology in health care: the nature of patient care information system-related errors. Journal
of the American Medical Informatics Association : JAMIA. 2004;11(2):104-12.

691 52. Park SY, Lee SY, Chen Y. The effects of EMR deployment on doctors' work
692 practices: a qualitative study in the emergency department of a teaching hospital. Int J Med
693 Inform. 2012;81(3):204-17.

53. Taib IA, McIntosh AS, Caponecchia C, Baysari MT. A review of medical error
taxonomies: A human factors perspective. Safety Science. 2011;49(5):607-15.

54. Jabin MSR, Steen M, Wepa D, Bergman P. Assessing the healthcare quality issues
for digital incident reporting in Sweden: Incident reports analysis. DIGITAL HEALTH.
2023;9:20552076231174307.

Magrabi F, Liaw ST, Arachi D, Runciman W, Coiera E, Kidd MR. Identifying
patient safety problems associated with information technology in general practice: an analysis
of incident reports. BMJ Qual Saf. 2015.

702