

1 **Characterizing patient details-related challenges** 2 **from health information technology-related** 3 **incident reports from Swedish healthcare**

4

5

6 ^{1,2}Md Shafiqur Rahman Jabin

7 ¹Ding Pan

8 ¹Evalill Nilsson

9

10

11

12 ¹ Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Linnaeus University

13 ² Faculty of Health Studies, University of Bradford

14

15

16 * Corresponding Author

17

18 Email: mdshafiqur.rahmanjabin@lnu.se

19 mjabin@bradford.ac.uk (MSRJ)

20

21

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

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 –
33 interviews (written and telephone) and/or a set of already existing reports from the local
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"
40 (45%) and "documentation" (20%) were the most common contributing factors. Of 90
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**

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

71
72 There is ample evidence that patient details can go awry; for example, inflexible electronic
73 forms can result in incorrect orders (5), inaccurate medication requests from a medication
74 ordering system (6), or lost patient data in the EHR system (7). Data entry errors caused by the
75 user can result in incorrect or outdated information remaining in the system and reproducing
76 the same error at several stages of the procedure (8, 9). Healthcare professionals can also delay

77 patient information entry due to their busy schedules or frequent interruptions, resulting in
78 outdated or incomplete information for a more extended period (9). 'Patient details', in this
79 context, refer to information-and-documentation-related features of the patient, i.e., any patient
80 information in a healthcare facility is recorded as a document, either in paper or electronic form.
81 For instance, patient demographics and clinical outcomes are usually stored electronically in
82 the health or medical record. Therefore, a record of any patient information has been considered
83 patient details throughout this study.

84
85 Several barriers were identified in a recent study by Bjerkan et al. that negatively impacted the
86 nursing practices' documentation process, including individual, social, organizational, and
87 technological factors (10). It was also reported that healthcare professionals found the process
88 of electronic-record documentation to be onerous, as such records contain too much information
89 (11).

90
91 Jabin et al. demonstrated in 2019 that HIT-related incidents occur at each step of the medical
92 imaging workflow process and that human and technical factors play a role in problems related
93 to patient details (12). The human factor involves interactions among humans and other
94 elements of a system, optimizing human well-being and overall system achievement (13). On
95 the other hand, the technical factor refers to the attributes of practices and devices/systems that
96 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 systems
103 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
127 risk of an incident" (21). It is notable that an incident may have more than one contributing
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
135 published in 2009, with the result of the work developed using a two-stage Delphi survey,
136 participated by 300 experts from a range of fields (21, 23, 24).

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

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

- 147 1. What patient details-related issues occur in the routine clinical practice of Swedish
148 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-related
151 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
163 From the 15 responders, 98 incident reports were collected, three of which were excluded either
164 due to lack of adequate information or inability to categorize it as a HIT incident. The final
165 sample of 95 retrospectively collected HIT incident reports from Swedish healthcare was
166 considered for identifying patient details-related problems and their association with human
167 and technical factors. A detailed description of the participant characteristics from each region,
168 the number of incidents collected, and the time interval of collected incidents are presented in
169 Table 1 (26).

170
171 *Table 1 Participant and incident characteristics*

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

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

172 Data analysis

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

179
 180 Two coders were involved in data analyses (both deductive and inductive) for verification and
 181 reliability of the coding. The primary coder performed the thematic analysis, which the
 182 secondary coder verified, and the incident was re-examined in case of any disagreement
 183 between the coders. An agreement was reached between the coders through dialogue. The
 184 coding of the ICPS (contributing factors and outcomes) was performed by both coders
 185 independently. Interrater reliability using kappa score calculation was performed. A consensus
 186 was reached in case of any difference of opinion.

187 Results

188 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				
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-related				
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	

204 HF = Human factor; TF = Technical factor

205
 206 The problems were also classified to check for association with either human or technical
 207 factors. Of 120 issues identified, 77 were determined to be affected by human factors (64%),
 208 and the remaining 43 by technical factors (36%). Most problems were contributed to by human
 209 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-related
211 issue (see Table 2).

212

213 Interrater reliability for the outcomes was κ (weighted) = 0.89 ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI 0.81–0.98),
214 and for the contributing factors was κ (weighted) = 0.87 ($p < 0.001$, 95% CI 0.78–0.96).

215

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

220 **Information-related issues**

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

224

225 Of the 58 patient information-related problems, more than two-thirds involved medical records
226 ($n=41$; 71%) (see Table 3). Of these 41 issues, 38 were associated with human factors and three
227 with technical factors (see Table 2). For instance, the physician prescribing an incorrect
228 medication was considered to be associated with the human factor, whereas doctors and
229 pharmacists did not have the same view of the medication list attributed to technical factor-
230 related issues. The most common problem with medical records was "incorrect information"
231 ($n=18$), 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 information			
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
<i>No retrieval of personal/ demographic data</i>	<i>TF</i>	2	3.45
Invalid/ irrelevant/ outdated information			
Invalid information of diagnosis/treatment/care	HF	4	6.90
Irrelevant personal information	HF	1	1.72
<i>Outdated personal data</i>	<i>TF</i>	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 information			
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 information			
No/missing/lost information			
Missing concluding information (summary)	HF	1	1.72
Incorrect information			
<i>Incorrect display of information in medical image</i>	<i>TF</i>	1	1.72
Invalid/ irrelevant/ outdated information			
Invalid (multiple) tumor iso-centre	HF	1	1.72
Total		3	5.17
Other information			
No/missing/lost information			
<i>No/missing administrative information</i>	<i>TF</i>	2	3.45
Total		2	3.45
Grand total		58	

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

234
235

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 information		
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 information		
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
<i>Referral</i>	3	3.37
Examination request	1	1.12
Total	12	13.48
Pathophysiological (disease)-related information		
<i>Hypersensitivity</i>	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 measures		
Weight	2	2.25
Back	1	1.12
Hearing	1	1.12
Height	1	1.12
Vision	1	1.12
Total	6	6.74
Examination/Test related		
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 imaging		
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	

242
 243 Patient details-related issues associated with patient information fell into four categories:
 244 incorrect information, no/missing/lost information, invalid/irrelevant/outdated information, or
 245 incomplete information. There were consistent indications of the things going wrong in which
 246 human failures played a major role. Among information-related issues, human factors
 247 manifested "incorrect information" (27 of 28) and "no/missing/lost information" (16 of 20) (see
 248 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

253 Of the 120 problems, 52% (n=62) were document-related issues (see Table 6). An illustration
 254 of documentation-related issues may involve multiple imaging requests that were required to
 255 be written in paper form because of a malfunction of the radiology ordering system.

256
 257 *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 documentation			
No/missing/lost documentation			
<i>Missing patient record</i>	<i>TF</i>	5	8.06
<i>No/Missing sick/medical certificate</i>	<i>TF</i>	3	4.84
<i>No/missing request/order/appointment form</i>	<i>TF</i>	3	4.84
<i>Missing patient report</i>	<i>TF</i>	2	3.23
<i>Missing waiting list entry</i>	<i>TF</i>	1	1.61
Incorrect documentation			
Incorrect patient record	HF	6	9.68
Incorrect request/order/appointment form	HF	3	4.84
<i>Another patient's request form</i>	<i>TF</i>	1	1.61
Invalid/ outdated documentation			
Unauthorized access/process to medical record	HF	5	8.06
<i>Outdated documentation</i>	<i>TF</i>	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 documentation			
No/missing/lost documentation			
<i>Missing prescription</i>	<i>TF</i>	3	4.84
<i>No display of "terms of benefit"</i>	<i>TF</i>	1	1.61
No medical prescription sent	HF	1	1.61
Invalid/ outdated documentation			
<i>Outdated prescription</i>	<i>TF</i>	2	3.23
<i>Different drug list</i>	<i>TF</i>	2	3.23
Incorrect documentation			
Another patient's prescription	HF	2	3.23
Incomplete documentation			
<i>Incomplete display of prescription</i>	<i>TF</i>	1	1.61

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

258 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%).

266
 267 *Table 7 Type of documentation involved in the documentation-related issues*

Type of document involved	n	%
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

Medication-related document		
Prescription	8	14.55
Drug lists	2	3.64
Total	10	18.18
Medical imaging-related document		
Medical image	8	14.55
Imaging report	2	3.64
Total	10	18.18
Request/booking form		
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
 269 Documentation-related patient-detail problems fell into five categories: no/missing/lost
 270 documentation, incorrect documentation, invalid/outdated documentation, incomplete
 271 information, or delayed documentation. Among these, human factors predominated in the
 272 causation of "incorrect documentation" (15 of 18), while technical factors predominated in
 273 "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**

278 The ICPS was used to capture detailed information about the types of contributing factors
 279 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 *Table 9 Types of contributing factors involved in the patient details-related issues*
 283

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	3.45
Fail to carry out duty	1	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	

284
 285 Among medical device/system-related factors, "device/system usability" (n=16) was most
 286 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
292 However, staff-related factors were largely unclear or not known due to insufficient narration
293 of the incident descriptions (see Table 9). In these cases, it was quite clear that healthcare staff
294 contributed to an incident, but information about the type of contributing factor was lacking.
295 For example, a report indicated that staff omitted information or wrote inaccuracies in the
296 medical record, but no indication was given of their reason for doing so.

297
298 Regarding "medical device/system," the most common factor was "device or system usability"
299 (n=16; 18%), indicating that users or healthcare staff had difficulty using the system, which
300 contributed to the incident. For example, a user could not enter complete patient prescription
301 details because benefit terms were not displayed in the intended context. 11% of incidents
302 comprised the communication factor, of which communication was "not conducted" in six cases
303 (see Table 9).

304
305 Moreover, "medical device/system" and "documentation" were the most common contributing
306 factors, especially when the incidents themselves were HIT system issues (in nature) and
307 involved documentation-related problems (through thematic analysis). This phenomenon
308 confirms the recursive nature of errors and the frequent correlation between types of problems
309 and specific contributing factors. Therefore, the phenomenon may be considered an issue, a
310 contributing factor, or both based on the incident's features or characteristics in that specific
311 context.

312 Outcomes

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

319
 320 *Table 10 Types of outcomes resulting from the patient details-related issues*

Outcomes	N	%
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
 322 Within patient inconvenience, delays in care management (diagnosis/procedure/treatment)
 323 accounted for 19% (n=17) of outcomes. Such delays included investigation of the patient
 324 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
337 Six cases resulted in pathophysiological disease-related harm to the patient, including risks of
338 disease or severe deterioration of health due to wrong medication. These comprised four cases
339 of serious injury and one patient death. However, no further information regarding the injury
340 was reported, and the death was not reported to be directly caused by the incident (see Table
341 10).

342
343 Of the staff or organization-related outcomes, 16% (n=14) resulted in more
344 equipment/services/resources being used in the form of similar systems or USB sticks, manual
345 extraction/entry of data, or other healthcare professionals, including medical engineers or IT
346 experts. 11% of outcomes resulted in delays in using facilities/service/systems, for example,
347 storage server access delays due to system shutdown; 8% led to increased documentation, such
348 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 Table
350 10).

351 **Discussion**

352 In the last three decades, healthcare quality and safety have been on the agenda because the
353 healthcare system can harm patients; for example, a single large-scale event may even affect
354 multiple patients' care management (26). Even though HIT has improved efficiency, its design,
355 use, and implementation can negatively impact patient care and safety (12, 28). The Joint
356 Commission that accredits healthcare organizations in the US suggested that diligent adherence
357 to protocol, cross-checking HIT systems' information and documents, and the use of interpreters
358 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**

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

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

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

395
396 Human error is difficult (if not impossible) to prevent because neither seniority nor experience
397 offers immunity (33). An error occurs through various unintended and unknown cognitive
398 mechanisms beyond human control (34). Even though using the "forcing function" was
399 suggested to prevent such human errors by Norman (34), it would cause "over-
400 proceduralization" that may detract from surveillance and situational awareness. Therefore, it
401 would rather be suitable to design the system in such a way as to prevent incidents from
402 occurring, as well as provide training to system users (17).

403
404 Healthcare professionals are seldom provided with sufficient training or education for the
405 proper use and operation of HIT systems, manifesting as a lack of proficiency in handling them
406 in healthcare settings (35). For example, a review of 436 HIT incidents by Jabin et al. suggests
407 that system integration and software update-related issues do contribute to human error, causing
408 incorrect entry of patient information and workflow disruptions (17).

409
410 Since human error remains an enduring part of the complex healthcare system, it is critically
411 essential to establish an ongoing training process for healthcare professionals in connection
412 with vendors (17). The Joint Commission suggested that healthcare professionals, as the major
413 contributor to HIT-related problems, should be adequately trained (29). Therefore, training
414 healthcare professionals before integrating HIT systems and software updates, and preparing
415 them for unexpected system failures, will result in better use of the HIT systems and greater
416 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

443 The concept of 'human error' as it applies in complex sociotechnical systems, combined with
444 the lack of human-centered HIT design, causes the system to be unsafe and suffer from usability
445 issues (45). The great majority of data reported, therefore, are, in fact, human factors-related
446 issues. Therefore, blaming the end-user of these systems as contributors to these incidents
447 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**

460 In this study, approximately 41% of cases had a staff/organization-related outcome. There was
461 a clear indication that workflow disruptions resulted in additional system/service/resource use
462 and delays in using facilities/service/systems. More than one-third of problems in this study
463 were associated with incorrect patient information or documentation (n=46; 38%). These events
464 caused several risks to patients, such as increased radiation risks, unnecessary procedures, or
465 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
508 It was a limited data source, and thus it is assumed that incidents were not detected in many
509 cases and not reported even if they were detected (55). Moreover, the total number or frequency
510 of events (failures) can never be compared to successful actions that occur in healthcare.
511 Therefore, the analyses cannot manifest the absolute frequency of the issues, contributing
512 factors, or the identified outcomes. However, the numbers and frequency do provide a salient
513 sense of HIT issues that occur in day-to-day clinical practice and demonstrate the harmful role
514 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

536 Even though minimal studies on incident analysis have been published, Sweden currently has
537 a comprehensive program on medical device and HIT systems managed by the MPA to ensure
538 quality improvement in Swedish healthcare. Therefore, the results obtained, i.e., the broader
539 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 risk
541 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**

- 553 1. Bates DW, Gawande AA. Improving safety with information technology. *N Engl*
554 *J Med.* 2003;348(25):2526-34.
- 555 2. Petersen LA, Orav EJ, Teich JM, O'Neil AC, Brennan TA. Using a computerized
556 sign-out program to improve continuity of inpatient care and prevent adverse events. *Jt Comm*
557 *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 Press 2004.
- 560 4. Gans D, Kralewski J, Hammons T, Dowd B. Medical groups' adoption of
561 electronic health records and information systems. *Health Aff (Millwood).* 2005;24(5):1323-
562 33.
- 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.
- 566 6. Abramson EL, Patel V, Malhotra S, Pfoh ER, Nena Osorio S, Cheriff A, et al.
567 Physician experiences transitioning between an older versus newer electronic health record for
568 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.
- 582 12. Jabin MSR, Mandel C, Schultz T, Hibbert P, Magrabi F, Runciman W, editors.
583 Identifying and Characterizing the 18 Steps of Medical Imaging Process Workflow as a Basis
584 for Targeting Improvements in Clinical Practice. 2019 IEEE International Conference on
585 Imaging Systems and Techniques (IST); 2019. Abu Dhabi: IEEE Xplore; 2020.
- 586 13. Salvendy G. *Handbook of Human Factors and Ergonomics*: John Wiley and Sons,
587 Inc.; 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.
- 594 17. Jabin MSR, Magrabi F, Hibbert P, Schultz T, Bessen T, Runciman W, editors.
595 Identifying and characterizing system issues of health information technology in medical
596 imaging as a basis for recommendations. 2019 IEEE International Conference on Imaging
597 Systems and Techniques (IST); 2019. Abu Dhabi: IEEE Xplore; 2020.
- 598 18. Magrabi F, Baker M, Sinha I, Ong MS, Harrison S, Kidd MR, et al. Clinical safety
599 of England's national programme for IT: a retrospective analysis of all reported safety events
600 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.
- 604 20. Runciman WB, Williamson JA, Deakin A, Benveniste KA, Bannon K, Hibbert
605 PD. An integrated framework for safety, quality and risk management: an information and
606 incident management system based on a universal patient safety classification. *Qual Saf Health*
607 *Care*. 2006;15 Suppl 1:i82-90.
- 608 21. Runciman WB, Hibbert P, Thomson R, Van Der Schaaf T, Sherman H, Lewalle
609 P. Towards an International Classification for Patient Safety: key concepts and terms. *Int J Qual*
610 *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 24. Thomson R, Lewalle P, Sherman H, Hibbert P, Runciman W, Castro G. Towards
619 an International Classification for Patient Safety: a Delphi survey. *Int J Qual Health Care.*
620 2009;21(1):9-17.
- 621 25. World Health Organisation. Conceptual Framework for the International
622 Classification for Patient Safety: Version 1.1. 2009.
- 623 26. Jabin MSR, Pan D, Nilsson E. Characterizing healthcare incidents in Sweden
624 related to health information technology affecting care management of multiple patients. *Health*
625 *Inform J.* 2022;28(2):14604582221105440.
- 626 27. Braun V, Clarke V. What can "thematic analysis" offer health and wellbeing
627 researchers? *International journal of qualitative studies on health and well-being.*
628 2014;9:26152-.
- 629 28. Jabin MSR, Magrabi F, Hibbert P, Schultz T, Runciman W, editors. Identifying
630 and Classifying Incidents Related to Health Information Technology in Medical Imaging as a
631 Basis for Improvements in Practice. 2019 IEEE International Conference on Imaging Systems
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 30. Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. Ensuring Correct
636 Patient, Correct Site, Correct Procedure Protocol 2014. Available from:
637 [www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/patient-identification/patient-procedure-](http://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/patient-identification/patient-procedure-matchingprotocols/expanding-the-3cs-into-other-therapeutic-areas/)
638 [matchingprotocols/expanding-the-3cs-into-other-therapeutic-areas/](http://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/patient-identification/patient-procedure-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 32. Jabin MSR. Identifying and characterising problems arising from interactions
642 between medical imaging and health information technology as a basis for improvements in
643 practice. Adelaide: University of South Australia; 2019.
- 644 33. Allnutt MF. Human factors in accidents. *Br J Anaesth.* 1987;59(7):856-64.
- 645 34. Norman D. *The Psychology of Everyday Things:* New York: Basic Books; 1988.
- 646 35. Watson L, Odle TG. The technologist's role in patient safety and quality in
647 medical imaging. *Radiol Technol.* 2013;84(5):536-41.
- 648 36. Wilbanks BA, Aroke EN. Using Clinical Simulations to Train Healthcare
649 Professionals to Use Electronic Health Records: A Literature Review. *CIN: Computers,*
650 *Informatics, Nursing.* 2020;38(11).
- 651 37. Stroup K, Sanders B, Bernstein B, Scherzer L, Pachter LM. A New EHR Training
652 Curriculum and Assessment for Pediatric Residents. *Appl Clin Inform.* 2017;8(4):994-1002.
- 653 38. Qvarfordt M, Throfast V, Petersson G, Hammar T, Hellström L. Web-based
654 education of the elderly improves drug utilization literacy: A randomized controlled trial.
655 *Health Informatics J.* 2021;27(1):1460458220977585.
- 656 39. Vincent C, Davis R. Patients and families as safety experts. *CMAJ : Canadian*
657 *Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne.* 2012;184(1):15-
658 6.
- 659 40. Russ A, Fairbanks R, Karsh B, Militello L, Saleem J, Wears R. The science of
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 42. Russ AL, Saleem JJ. Ten factors to consider when developing usability scenarios
666 and tasks for health information technology. *J Biomed Inform.* 2018;78:123-33.

- 667 43. Karsh BT, Holden RJ, Alper SJ, Or CK. A human factors engineering paradigm
668 for patient safety: designing to support the performance of the healthcare professional. *Qual Saf*
669 *Health Care*. 2006;15 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):i59-65.
- 670 44. Saleem JJ, Russ AL, Sanderson P, Johnson TR, Zhang J, Sittig DF. Current
671 challenges and opportunities for better integration of human factors research with development
672 of clinical information systems. *Yearb Med Inform*. 2009;48-58.
- 673 45. NHS CfH. Common User Interface 2011 [Available from:
674 <http://www.connectingforhealth.nhs.uk/systemsandservices/data/cui>.
675
- 676 46. NIST. Evaluation, Testing, and Validation of the Usability of Electronic Health
677 Records: US National Institute of Standards and Technology (NISTIR 7804). 2012 [Available
678 from: http://www.nist.gov/manuscript-publication-search.cfm?pub_id=909701.
679
- 680 47. Jabin MSR, Hammar T. Issues with the Swedish e-prescribing system – An
681 analysis of health information technology-related incident reports using an existing
682 classification system. *DIGITAL HEALTH*. 2022;8:20552076221131139.
- 683 48. Parasuraman R, Mouloua M, Hillsdale NJ. Automation and human performance:
684 theory and applications. England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1996.
- 685 49. Warm D, Edwards P. Classifying health information technology patient safety
686 related incidents - an approach used in Wales. *Applied clinical informatics*. 2012;3(2):248-57.
- 687 50. Kruse CS, Mileski M, Syal R, MacNeil L, Chabarría E, Basch C. Evaluating the
688 relationship between health information technology and safer-prescribing in the long-term care
689 setting: A systematic review. *Technol Health Care*. 2021;29(1):1-14.
- 690 51. Ash JS, Berg M, Coiera E. Some unintended consequences of information
691 technology in health care: the nature of patient care information system-related errors. *Journal*
692 *of the American Medical Informatics Association : JAMIA*. 2004;11(2):104-12.
- 693 52. Park SY, Lee SY, Chen Y. The effects of EMR deployment on doctors' work
694 practices: a qualitative study in the emergency department of a teaching hospital. *Int J Med*
695 *Inform*. 2012;81(3):204-17.
- 696 53. Taib IA, McIntosh AS, Caponecchia C, Baysari MT. A review of medical error
697 taxonomies: A human factors perspective. *Safety Science*. 2011;49(5):607-15.
- 698 54. Jabin MSR, Steen M, Wepa D, Bergman P. Assessing the healthcare quality issues
699 for digital incident reporting in Sweden: Incident reports analysis. *DIGITAL HEALTH*.
700 2023;9:20552076231174307.
- 701 55. Magrabi F, Liaw ST, Arachi D, Runciman W, Coiera E, Kidd MR. Identifying
702 patient safety problems associated with information technology in general practice: an analysis
of incident reports. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2015.