

# 1 Strategies and Tools for electronic health records 2 and physician workflow alignment: A scoping 3 review protocol 4

## 5 Authors

6 Corresponding Author: Oluwakemi O. Oluwole Faculty of Media Studies, Health Information Science  
7 Department, University of Western Ontario, Canada

8 Nicole Haggarty Ivey School, University of Western Ontario, Canada

9 Uche Ikenyei - Faculty of Media Studies, Health Information Science Department, University of Western  
10 Ontario, Canada

11 Oluwabambi Tinuoye Faculty of Media Studies, Health Information Science Department, University of  
12 Western Ontario, Canada

13 Andreawan Honora - Ivey School, University of Western Ontario, Canada

14 Mohammed Abass Issakah - Faculty of Media Studies, Health Information Science Department, University  
15 of Western Ontario, Canada

## 16 Abstract

17 **Introduction:** The rapid adoption of electronic health records (EHR) across the globe by the healthcare  
18 industry is an indication of the rising digitalization of healthcare functions. Despite the potential benefits of  
19 EHR, achieving a fit between physician workflow and EHR has posed a major challenge, with negative  
20 effects on physician wellbeing and patient outcomes. To this effect, organizations have attempted to align the  
21 EHR with physician workflow in various ways. It is important to understand the strategies and tools that  
22 have been employed and, where possible, the outcome of these engagements as a fundamental insight to  
23 resolving this issue.

24 **Methodology:** The study will employ a methodological framework developed by Arksey and O'Malley to  
25 strategically identify articles that use any type of concept for the alignment of physician workflow and EHR  
26 from Embase (OVID), MEDLINE (OVID), PubMed, CINAHL, and Scopus databases. It will follow the  
27 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Extension for Scoping Reviews  
28 (PRISMA-ScR) checklist to report findings. The articles will be extracted into the Covidence software,  
29 screened, and relevant data will be extracted from the selected articles. A qualitative thematic approach will  
30 be used to analyze the data. No ethical approval was sought because the data were collected from sources in  
31 the public domain.

32 **Result:** The scoping review is scheduled to be completed by April 2024. The results will be presented in tabular  
33 and narrative form and published in a reputable journal and through conference presentations.

34 **Conclusion:** The outcome of the review aims to provide a systematic toolkit of activities and strategies and,  
35 where possible, the corresponding effectiveness that organizations can use to optimize EHR-to-physician  
36 workflow alignment. The outcome would also help make appropriate recommendations for  
37 alignment. Subsequently, it can improve patient outcomes such as the reduction of medication errors and  
38 improvement of patient-centered, improve physician well-being and reduce burnout.

39 **Keywords:** physician workflow, EHR, EHR optimization, workflow alignment, EHR usability, physician  
40 wellbeing.

## 41 Introduction

42 The adoption of electronic health records (EHRs) is increasing across national and international healthcare  
43 systems [1]. EHRs are rapidly becoming an acceptable means of digitalizing health data, making it more  
44 accessible to patients, and improving quality and analytical opportunities that improve patient outcomes [2, 3].  
45 Notwithstanding the acknowledged potential of the EHR to improve healthcare, the claim that it improves  
46 workflow efficiency and productivity appears to be overstated.

47 A workflow is a collection of activities organized sequentially into processes; it also includes the resources  
48 required to complete the task [4]. A workflow is a series of steps linked together. It is different from a task  
49 because it is based on the flow paradigm. A workflow is a model that represents the steps involved in a real  
50 work environment to achieve a specified goal. It is used to map out the sequential tasks required in taking a  
51 work description from 'initiated' to 'processed'. For example, steps involved in patient-physician interaction  
52 from a patient's arrival at the physician's office to their departure from the office can be captured as a workflow  
53 [5]. Oftentimes, workflow design represents a consistent sequence of tasks involved in the operation. However,  
54 the complex and emergent nature of healthcare and variation in treatment processes sometimes conflict with  
55 the use of standardized processes in the EHR [5], which generates workflow challenges. While the duties of  
56 some health professionals, such as nurses, lean more toward standard routines, the duties of physicians vary  
57 greatly with each physician and patient [6]. Using a standard EHR workflow design for physicians can be  
58 difficult.

59 Several physician workflow challenges have also been documented in the EHR literature [7, 8] For example,  
60 some authors have mentioned that EHR designers who are non-healthcare professionals are sometimes  
61 unaware of the need to make EHRs adaptable, flexible, and responsive to the unpredictable nature of routine

62 physician workflows [5, 9]. EHR designers may intend to increase the value of EHRs at the expense of  
63 physicians' clinical routines and workflow, resulting in usability obstacles. EHRs are not designed to automate  
64 physicians' exact paper-based workflows [5]. The corresponding effects of workflow interference on  
65 physicians are unpleasant and have been recognized as a significant contributor to physician burnout [10, 7,  
66 8]. Furthermore, physician workflow design in the EHR can fail to support foundational physician-  
67 patient interaction, limit assessment and treatment, and increase the risk of medication errors [11]. Suboptimal  
68 EHR-mediated workflows can inform EHR evasion, leading to workarounds. Workarounds are other ways of  
69 using EHRs other than the recommended methods after system implementation [12]. This mismatch is often  
70 associated with physician stress [13], which can result in inadequate and erroneous patient documentation [4].  
71 Given that physician workflow is an important determinant of maximizing the benefits of the EHR [14],  
72 understanding the EHR-physician workflow alignment is of prime importance to achieving successful  
73 EHR implementation and use.

74 Despite the rapid growth and proliferation of studies on the development of strategies and tools to improve  
75 alignment between physicians and EHR workflows, the existing knowledge is highly heterogeneous and  
76 fragmented, presenting gaps that hinder a comprehensive and holistic view. We argue that to advance our  
77 understanding of how EHR-physician workflow alignment should be performed, it is essential to map the  
78 intellectual structure of current knowledge. This would be achieved by synthesizing the concepts in all  
79 publications that focus on EHR-physician workflow alignment through a scoping review. Therefore, the aim  
80 of this study is to identify the strategies and tools that organizations have used to optimize physician workflow  
81 and to create a systematic toolkit of concepts and activities to achieve maximum alignment and minimize  
82 obstacles to physician workflow in EHR implementations. This study will provide an overview and assessment  
83 of the tools and strategies used in the literature to build a systematic toolkit and identify potential research

84 gaps. This protocol explains the objectives, plans, and steps that reviewers will take to extract data, analyze it,  
85 and report the results of the review.

## 86 [Search for similar scoping reviews](#)

87 Before starting a scoping review, it is important that the literature be searched for similar topics and goals. We  
88 found a study by Avendano et al. that compared three randomly chosen EHR-physician alignment strategies  
89 instead of systematically elaborating all of them [15]. Our review intends to identify all strategies and tools  
90 used by organizations to align the EHR with physician workflow. Also, study by Kruse et al. explored the  
91 effect of organizational directed workplace intervention on physician burnout [16]. Although physician  
92 workflow challenges have been associated with EHR, the focus of our review is on the technology, and how  
93 organizations have improved its integration to physician workflow. In August 2023, searches in the Cochrane  
94 and JBI databases did not reveal similar scoping review protocols or title registrations. A scoping review was  
95 chosen to synthesize the strategies and tools used to align EHR and physician workflow, presenting diverse  
96 research innovations, their impacts and to identify potential research gaps.

## 97 [Methods](#)

98 A scoping review method was carefully chosen to synthesize different types of evidence across databases from  
99 published literature [17]. The scoping review was also necessary to map the fundamental concepts to a research  
100 area and to elucidate related definitions. Therefore, this protocol is a proposal for a review of the existing  
101 literature to provide evidence on workflow optimization by aligning EHRs with physician workflow. The  
102 review's goal is to identify the strategies and tools that organizations have employed in an effort to harmonize  
103 physician workflow with the EHR. In addition, this scoping review will provide an overview of the  
104 effectiveness of these strategies on EHR physician workflow.

105

106 Furthermore, the review is expected to provide insight into the gaps in the effort to align the EHR with  
107 physician workflow and provide a direction for further studies on the subject. To maximize rigor, this study  
108 will follow the guidelines provided by Arksey and O'Malley's framework for scoping review [17]. The  
109 guideline provides the following steps: identifying the research question for the study, identifying studies  
110 relevant to the research question, study selection, data charting, result collation, summarization, and reporting.  
111 All members of the research team designed, reviewed, and approved this protocol. The Preferred Reporting  
112 Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR)  
113 checklist informed the development of the protocol. This will enhance the completeness of the report and  
114 provide transparency [18].

### 115 [Step 1: Formulate a research question](#)

116 This study seeks to address one key question; what strategies and tools are used by organization in the attempt  
117 to align EHR to physician workflow?

### 118 [Population of the Study](#)

119 The targeted population for this study was physicians. Article selection will be limited to those with  
120 physicians who have direct interaction with patients. Non-patient-engaging physicians, such as pathologists,  
121 will be excluded from the study because they interact with the EHR in a different way and face different  
122 challenges than physicians, who need to combine documentation and review with patient interaction. This  
123 study will consider articles that focus on physicians within outpatient or inpatient hospitals and primary  
124 health care settings. In addition, Peters et al. argued that the focus of the study should be established by  
125 indicating the population, concept, and context (PCC) [19]. Table 1 shows the PCC of the study.

126

127 Table 1: Population, context and concept (PCC) adopted in the study

Population	Physicians
Concept	EHR to physician workflow alignment.
Context	Workflow of physicians that have direct contact with patients in any context (in-patient, out-patient, hospitals, and primary health care) will be included.

128 **Concept**

129 The concept explored in this review is the alignment of EHR with physician workflow. Although many authors  
130 do not refer to this concept as alignment, the phrases ‘EHR workflow optimization’ and ‘workflow  
131 optimization’ are often used. However, this study will focus on EHR optimization, which seeks to align  
132 physician workflow with EHR design.

133 **Context**

134 The context of physician workflow considered in this review is based on the EHR. All studies that do not  
135 consider physician workflow with respect to the EHR will be excluded. The context of the study will not be  
136 limited to physicians working in hospitals or primary care physicians because the objective of the study is to  
137 understand the concepts and methodologies that have been applied to align physicians’ workflow with EHRs  
138 and their effectiveness. Furthermore, studies that are based on electronic medical records but meet the  
139 identified inclusion criteria for EHRs will be included. This is because the study is not concerned with the  
140 complexity of the information system in terms of its network or interconnectivity but with the improvement  
141 of physicians’ experience of the EHRs in terms of their workflow. There will be no restrictions on the search

142 strategy in terms of year or research design, but it will be limited to publications disseminated in English  
143 to reduce translation challenges.

144 Although the workflow of physicians in primary healthcare, hospital settings, and different specialties (such  
145 as surgery and pediatrics) may differ, the goal of this study is to provide a broad understanding of the  
146 subject. Therefore, all studies conducted in hospital environments, primary health care, the public and  
147 private sectors, and all areas of specialization such as emergency medicine, general practice, and surgery will  
148 be included without bias for countries or continents.

## 149 [Step 2: Identification of relevant studies](#)

150 To achieve this goal, both free text and controlled terms will be used and refined repeatedly. The study will  
151 search the following databases for published articles: Embase (OVID), MEDLINE (OVID), [CINAHL](#),  
152 PubMed, and Scopus. Published articles will be extracted on the basis of the following terms and keywords:  
153 physician workflow, EHRs/Electronic Medical Records (EMR), clinician workflow, and optimization. The  
154 ancestry method for screening the references of selected articles will be performed manually to determine if  
155 there are articles that are still relevant to the study. Abstracts of relevant articles will be retrieved and reviewed  
156 on the basis of the inclusion and exclusion criteria. The references to newly selected studies will be screened  
157 for relevant articles; this process will continue iteratively until studies relevant to the review are  
158 exhausted. Google Scholar and ProQuest databases will be searched for unpublished articles. For example, by  
159 using free text terms in the preliminary search of the PubMed database, 14 articles were returned. The sample  
160 search strategy is presented in Table 2. This strategy will be repeated for all listed databases.

161



162 Table 2. A sample of the search query

Search number	Search Query	Items found
#1	Search: (((((Electronic Health Records[Title/Abstract]) OR (EHR[Title/Abstract])) OR (Electronic Medical Records[Title/Abstract])) OR (EMR[Title/Abstract])) OR (Computerized physician order entry[Title/Abstract])) OR (Electronic Documentation[Title/Abstract]))	48,182
#2	Search: ((physician workflow[Title/Abstract]) OR (clinician workflow[Title/Abstract])) OR (provider workflow[Title/Abstract])	214
#3	Search: ((optimization[Title/Abstract]) OR (alignment[Title/Abstract])) OR (improvement[Title/Abstract])	1,060,230
	#1 AND #2 AND #3	14

### 163 Step 3: Study selection

164 A scoping review protocol should clarify the criteria for eligibility (inclusion) and the sources of information  
165 used in the study [18]. The selection of an article will be strictly based on whether it focuses on the  
166 optimization of the physician workflow within the EHR. Studies that look at how to make the EHR work best  
167 for physicians by introducing strategies, models, or an understanding of how to align the workflow of  
168 physicians with the EHR will be included. The primary outcome of this study includes themes on strategies,  
169 tools, and an understanding of how to align the EHR with physician workflow and their effectiveness. The  
170 review's secondary goals will be to show how research on the subject has changed over time, to explain  
171 where research is going, and to identify gaps in the literature. Physicians will be the focus of the study, and  
172 the goal of the study will be to systematically document and describe the tools and strategies used to  
173 optimize physician workflow with the EHR. Although some studies on clinician workflow will be included

174 in the search by including the search term "clinician workflow," this is to ensure that studies that combine  
175 physician workflow with nurses' workflow are not missed. Subsequently, we will exclude studies based  
176 solely on nurses' workflow during abstract or full-text screening.

177 Studies that do not focus on physicians but on other healthcare professionals—for example, pharmacists and  
178 laboratory technicians—that focus on workflow for purposes other than optimizing the EHR will be  
179 excluded. We will not include any changes to the workflow that do not fix the misalignment  
180 problem; therefore, functional accessories to the EHR—for example, the study by Dummett et al. that adds  
181 new software functions to the EHR workflow, even though these functions were not part of physician  
182 workflow [20]. However, software integrated to augment physicians' tasks that were not captured well by  
183 EHRs will be included. In addition, studies that investigate the impact of EHR design on physician workflow  
184 and those that assess physician workflow with a focus on meaningful use will be excluded. The objectives of  
185 meaningful use do not focus on the efficiency of EHR physician workflow and its impact on physicians, but  
186 rather on the impact of EHR on adoption and quality of care.

187 Data will be uploaded into the Covidence systematic review software developed by Veritas Health  
188 Innovations. This software will automatically eliminate duplicates, manage inclusion and exclusion criteria,  
189 and track reviewer activities. The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses  
190 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews  
191 (PRISMA-ScR) guidelines will be followed. Two independent reviewers will screen each article for  
192 eligibility. The first phase of screening will be conducted independently, with two reviewers screening each  
193 article based on the publication title and abstract based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. A regular  
194 meeting will be scheduled to resolve disagreements between reviewers; however, when there is doubt, a  
195 more experienced investigator will resolve the difference. A consensus report will be provided to the team to

196 facilitate conversations on eligibility agreements. In the second phase of screening, the full text of each  
197 article will be screened in pairs to determine eligibility.

#### 198 [Step 4: Data extraction](#)

199 Data will be extracted from eligible articles after the full-text reviews into a standardized data extraction  
200 table in Microsoft Excel format for analysis by two reviewers. Two reviewers will design the data extraction  
201 table by adding all the variables that need to be extracted from the publications. The Excel table will be  
202 standardized through the joint efforts of all reviewers, as they will have the opportunity to contribute to the  
203 spreadsheet and discuss the ideas emerging during the review process. The characteristics extracted from  
204 each article will be added to the following variables: author's name, year of publication, setting,  
205 methodology, type of intervention, and outcome. The two reviewers will independently extract the variables  
206 from the selected articles into the standardized extraction table and independently summarize their findings.  
207 These findings will be shared among the five reviewers, and a meeting will be held to further synthesize the  
208 findings.

#### 209 [Stage 5: Result collation, summary, and report](#)

210 There will be no generalization of the results because the review does not attempt to validate the quality of the  
211 articles used in the analysis [17]. Using an interpretive translation of the findings, the results will be presented  
212 in a descriptive format that fits the goal of the study. The findings will be presented in a detailed  
213 and organized manner, using tables, figures, and descriptive summaries.

#### 214 [Stage 6: consultation](#)

215 As an important part of the scoping review method, stakeholders should be consulted. Experts in health  
216 information science will be consulted for this study. These experts know how to set up and use an EHR and  
217 how to interpret and share the results. Two stakeholders who are both experts in EHR studies and

218 implementation will be consulted to ensure that the design, interpretation of findings, and knowledge transfer  
219 of the scoping review are relevant to physicians.

## 220 **Result:**

221 Electronic searches of the five databases listed as of October 15, 2023, produced 564 references; after removing  
222 66 duplicates, the Covidence software left 498 articles. Title and abstract screenings have begun. Additional  
223 data will be collected by screening more relevant articles from the references of selected articles. The scoping  
224 review is scheduled to be completed by April 2024. The results will be presented in tabular and narrative form  
225 and published in a reputable journal and through conference presentations. While the utmost effort will be  
226 made to follow the guidelines of this protocol, any deviation, uncovered information, and identified limitations  
227 will be reported.

## 228 **Discussion**

229 The results of this review will inform stakeholders in EHR: policymakers, vendors, designers, developers,  
230 healthcare managers, and physicians. We will provide a toolkit that various organizations have used to  
231 address the misalignment between the EHR and physician workflow across various healthcare organizations  
232 and countries. Also, where possible, provide the impact of each tool and strategy. Thus, healthcare  
233 organizations can improve the alignment between implemented EHRs and physician workflow. It can help  
234 them identify the pitfalls they have encountered in the past and avoid repeating these mistakes. In addition,  
235 the results will provide evidence required by vendors and developers to guide the design and development of  
236 better EHR systems with improved EHR-to-physician workflow alignment. Furthermore, we identified  
237 knowledge gaps for future improvement in the alignment between physician workflow and EHR.

238 **Funding statement**

239 This study was not funded by any public or private organization.

240 **Competing interest statement**

241 There is no known competing interest.

## References

1. Menendez ME, Janssen SJ, Ring D. Electronic health record-based triggers to detect adverse events after outpatient orthopedic surgery. *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2016;25(1):25–30.  
doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616
2. Kruse CS, Goswamy R, Raval Y, Marawi S. Challenges and opportunities of big data in health care: A systematic review. *JMIR Med Inform.* 2016 Oct 1;4(4). doi: [10.2196/medinform.5359](https://doi.org/10.2196/medinform.5359)
3. Willis SJ, Cocoros NM, Randall LM, Ochoa AM, Haney G, Hsu KK, et al. Electronic Health Record Use in Public Health Infectious Disease Surveillance, USA, 2018–2019. *Curr Infect Dis Rep.* 2019 Oct 1;21(10). DOI: 10.1007/s11908-019-0694-5
4. Zheng K, Ratwani RM, Adler-Milstein J. Studying workflow and workarounds in electronic health record-supported work to improve health system performance. *Ann Intern Med.* 2020 Jun 2;172(11):S116–22. doi: [10.7326/M19-0871](https://doi.org/10.7326/M19-0871)
5. Holman GT, Beasley JW, Karsh BT, Stone JA, Smith PD, Wetterneck TB. The myth of standardized workflow in primary care. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association.* 2016 Jan 1;23(1):29-37. doi: [10.1093/jamia/ocv107](https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocv107)
6. Kaipio J, Kuusisto A, Hyppönen H, Heponiemi T, Lääveri T. Physicians’ and nurses’ experiences on EHR usability: Comparison between the professional groups by employment sector and system brand. *Int J Med Inf.* 2020 Feb 1;134. doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2019.104018
7. Thomas Craig KJ, Willis VC, Gruen D, Rhee K, Jackson GP. The burden of the digital environment: a systematic review on organization-directed workplace interventions to mitigate physician burnout. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2021 May 1;28(5):985–97. doi: 10.1093/jamia/ocaa301

- 263 8. Tutty MA, Carlasare LE, Lloyd S, Sinsky CA. The complex case of EHRs: Examining the factors  
264 impacting the EHR user experience. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2019 Apr 11;26(7):673–7.  
265 doi: [10.1093/jamia/ocz021](https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocz021)
- 266 9. Triplett P. Psychiatry and the meaningful use of electronic health records. *Perspect Biol Med.*  
267 2013;56(3):407–21. doi: [10.1353/pbm.2013.0028](https://doi.org/10.1353/pbm.2013.0028)
- 268 10. Kopel J, Hier D, Thomas P. Electronic health records: Is mindfulness the solution? *Bayl Univ Med Cent*  
269 *Proc.* 2019 Jul 3;32(3):459–61. doi: [10.1080/08998280.2019.1588839](https://doi.org/10.1080/08998280.2019.1588839)
- 270 11. Sulmasy LS, López AM, Horwitch CA. Ethical Implications of the Electronic Health Record: In the  
271 Service of the Patient. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2017 Aug 1;32(8):935–9. doi: [10.1007/s11606-017-4030-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-017-4030-1)
- 272 12. Safadi H. the role of workarounds during an opensource electronic medical record system  
273 implementation [Internet]. 2010 p. 47. Available from: [http://aisel.aisnet.org/icis2010\\_submissions/47](http://aisel.aisnet.org/icis2010_submissions/47)
- 274 13. DeChant PF, Acs A, Rhee KB, Boulanger TS, Snowdon JL, Tutty MA, et al. Effect of Organization-  
275 Directed Workplace Interventions on Physician Burnout: A Systematic Review. *Mayo Clin Proc Innov*  
276 *Qual Outcomes.* 2019 Dec;3(4):384–408. doi: [10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2019.07.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2019.07.006)
- 277 14. Dandu N, Zmistowski B, Chen AF, Chapman T, Howley M. How are Electronic Health Records  
278 Associated with Provider Productivity and Billing in Orthopaedic Surgery? *Clin Orthop.* 2019 Nov  
279 1;477(11):2443–51. doi: [10.1097/corr.0000000000000896](https://doi.org/10.1097/corr.0000000000000896)
- 280 15. Avendano JP, Gallagher DO, Hawes JD, Boyle J, Glasser L, Aryee J, et al. Interfacing With the  
281 Electronic Health Record (EHR): A Comparative Review of Modes of Documentation. *Cureus.* 2022 Jun  
282 25. doi: [10.7759/cureus.26330](https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.26330)

- 283 16. Kruse CS, Mileski M, Dray G, Johnson Z, Shaw C, Shirodkar H. Physician Burnout and the Electronic  
284 Health Record Leading Up to and During the First Year of COVID-19: Systematic Review. *J Med*  
285 *Internet Res.* 2022; 24(3):e36200–e36200. doi: [10.2196/36200](https://doi.org/10.2196/36200)
- 286 17. Arksey H, O’Malley L. Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *Int J Soc Res Methodol*  
287 *Theory Pract.* 2005 Feb;8(1):19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>
- 288 18. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O’Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping  
289 reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018 Oct 2;169(7):467–73.  
290 doi:10.7326/M18-0850
- 291 19. Peters MDJ, Marnie C, Tricco AC, Pollock D, Munn Z, Alexander L, et al. Updated methodological  
292 guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JBIEvid Synth.* 2020 Oct 1;18(10):2119–26.  
293 doi: [10.11124/JBIES-20-00167](https://doi.org/10.11124/JBIES-20-00167)
- 294 20. Dummett BA, Adams C, Scruth E, Liu V, Guo M, Escobar GJ. Incorporating an early detection system  
295 into routine clinical practice in two community hospitals. *Journal of hospital medicine.* 2016  
296 Nov;11:S25–31. doi: [10.1002/jhm.2661](https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.2661)