

1 **Physician experiences of electronic health records interoperability and its**
2 **practical impact on care delivery in the English NHS: A cross-sectional survey**
3 **study**

4
5 **Authors:** Edmond Li^{1,2}, Olivia Lounsbury², Mujtaba Hasnain³, Hutan Ashrafian¹, Ara Darzi¹, Ana Luisa
6 Neves^{1,2,5}, Jonathan Clarke^{1,4}

7
8 **Full address of the authors:** Institute of Global Health Innovation, Room 1035/7, QEQM Wing, St
9 Mary's Campus, London W2 1NY

10 ¹ Institute of Global Health Innovation, Department of Surgery and Cancer, Imperial College London,
11 London, United Kingdom

12 ² Global Digital Health Unit, Department of Primary Care and Public Health, Imperial College London,
13 London, United Kingdom

14 ³ School of Medicine, University of Manchester

15 ⁴ Centre for Mathematics of Precision Healthcare, Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London,
16 London, United Kingdom

17 ⁵ Center for Health Technology and Services Research, Department of Community Medicine, Health
18 Information and Decision, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 **Corresponding author**

27 Name: Edmond Li

28 Address: Global Digital Health Unit, Department of Primary Care and Public Health, The Reynolds
29 Building, Charing Cross Campus, Imperial College London, London W6 8RP

30 E-mail: Edmond.li19@imperial.ac.uk

31 Telephone: +44 (0) 207 5943 368

32 Fax number: 02033126309

33 **Word count:** 4482 words

34 **Keywords:** electronic health records, interoperability, patient safety, stakeholder perspectives, survey,
35 health information exchange, digital health

36 Abstract

37 **Background:** The lack of interoperability has been a well-recognised limitation associated with the use of
38 electronic health records (EHR). However, less is known about how it manifests for frontline NHS
39 staff when delivering care, how it impacts patient care, and what are its implications on care efficiency.

40 **Objectives:** (1) To capture the perceptions of physicians regarding the current state of EHRs
41 interoperability, (2) to investigate how poor interoperability affects patient care and safety and (3) to
42 determine the effects on care efficiency in the NHS.

43 **Methods:** An online survey was conducted to explore how physicians perceived the routine use of EHRs,
44 its effects on patient safety, and impact to care efficiency in NHS healthcare facilities. Descriptive
45 statistics was used to report any notable findings observed.

46 **Results:** A total of 636 NHS physicians participated. Participants reported that EHR interoperability is
47 rudimentary across much of the NHS, with limited ability to read but not edit data from within their
48 organisation. Negative perceptions were most pronounced amongst specialties in secondary care settings
49 and those with less than one year of EHR experience or lower self-reported EHR skills. Limited
50 interoperability prolonged hospital stays, lengthened consultation times, and frequently necessitated
51 repeat investigations to be performed. Limited EHR interoperability impaired physician access to clinical
52 data, hampered communication between providers, and was perceived to threatened patient safety.

53 **Conclusion:** As healthcare data continues to increase in complexity and volume, EHR interoperability
54 must evolve to accommodate these growing changes and ensure the continued delivery of safe care. The
55 experiences of physicians provide valuable insight into the practical challenges limited interoperability
56 poses and can contribute to future policy solutions to better integrate EHRs in the clinical environment.

57 Public Interest/Lay Summary

58 Limited interoperability between EHR systems has been a longstanding problem since the technology's
59 introduction in NHS England. However, little research has been done to understand the extent of this
60 problem from the perspective of physicians and the challenges it poses.

61 This study surveyed 636 physicians across England to better understand limited EHR interoperability.
62 Most participants reported that interoperability between NHS facilities was inadequate. Consequences of
63 this included increased duration of hospital stays, lengthened consultation times, and more redundant
64 diagnostic tests performed. Limited interoperability hindered communication between NHS workers and
65 threatened care quality and patient safety. As more healthcare technologies are incorporated into the NHS,
66 gaining greater insight from physicians is critical to finding solutions to address these problems.

67

68

69 Introduction

70 Electronic health records (EHR) are commonplace in many healthcare settings and are often
71 indispensable in care delivery. EHR replace paper-based medical charts to document patient clinical
72 history, disease progression and medications, facilitate billing, and enable communication with other
73 healthcare providers (1–3). However, their implementation in the preceding decades has been fraught
74 with difficulty (3–6). In the English NHS, various national policies and local initiatives have hastened the
75 technology’s introduction into clinical settings (4,7). However, this resulted in a patchwork of EHR
76 systems being adopted, but with limited clinical data sharing capabilities between them (4,7–9). This
77 contributed to considerable data fragmentation across various providers, suboptimal use of health data to
78 improve overall care quality, and a largely inefficient and frustrating care seeking experience for patients
79 (8,10).

80 Interoperability can facilitate effective care coordination, clinical decision support, and healthcare user
81 satisfaction (11–13). However, the inability to easily access, modify, and share clinical information has
82 been highlighted by many (14–18). For physicians and patients, poor EHR interoperability reportedly
83 negatively impacted work productivity, created additional communication barriers between clinical teams,
84 increased clinician burnout, necessitated time-consuming workarounds, and compromised patient safety
85 (12–16,19–21). Poor interoperability was also noted to be detrimental to overall EHR data quality, as it
86 contributed to patient data fragmentation (7,15,22).

87 While research examining EHR implementation is extensive, studies focussing on the interoperability of
88 EHR systems are comparatively scarce (17,23–25). A Canadian study (2018) investigated what elements
89 of interoperable EHR systems in emergency departments in Alberta were most useful to physicians. The
90 authors found that most of the time spent on EHRs pertained to reviewing patient information useful for
91 clinical decision making (26). Clinical settings utilising read-only interoperable EHR systems which
92 lacked built-in patient management or clinical decision support tools, contributed to EHR disuse even
93 when compared to those still reliant on paper-based processes. Altogether, the authors concluded that the
94 clinical impact of using interoperable EHRs remained ‘poorly understood’ (26).

95 Another study explored the experiences of EHR use in primary care and community-based behavioural
96 health settings in the US (27). The study highlighted that providers often resorted to various workarounds
97 to compensate for a lack of EHR interoperability (27). These included the duplication of data entry and
98 documentation, physically printing documents to scan or fax to share, relying on patients’ and clinicians’
99 recollection for information and using ‘freestanding’ tracking systems (*e.g.*, an Excel spreadsheet) (27).
100 Another American study explored the facilitators and barriers to interoperability through interviews with
101 hospital leaders, primary care providers, behavioural health providers, and regional health information
102 exchange networks (23). The authors found that the expansion of HIT applications to suit differing needs
103 but are otherwise not interoperable can contribute to data fragmentation and information overload for end-
104 users (23). The resulting siloing of clinical information was recognised to potentially jeopardise the
105 safety, quality, and efficiency of care (23).

106 To the best of our knowledge, few have quantified and mapped the prevalence of poor EHR
107 interoperability and its perceived effects on quality and safety from physician perspectives (18,28). This
108 study aimed to understand how physicians perceive a lack of interoperability impacts their day-to-day
109 clinical activities, affects patient safety and changes the productivity of their work.

110 **Aims**

111 The overall aims of this study are threefold:

- 112 (1) To capture the perceptions of physicians regarding the current state of EHR interoperability;
- 113 (2) To investigate how a lack of interoperability affects patient care and patient safety;
- 114 (3) To estimate the effect of a lack of EHR interoperability on care efficiency and costs.

115 **Methods**

116 **Study Population**

117 Participants were practicing NHS doctors at different stages of training, ranging from trainees to
118 consultants across both community and hospital-based settings. This included a wide range of specialties
119 such as internal medicine, surgery, emergency medicine, anaesthesia, general practice, paediatrics, and
120 psychiatry.

121 **Sampling**

122 The calculated minimum sample size required for this study was 287 respondents. This was determined
123 using Cochran's Formula based on a desired 95% confidence level, 5% margin of error, an anticipated
124 response rate of 25%, for a population size of 67,066 physicians currently working in the four main
125 specialties most commonly associated with providing care for patients with chronic conditions (*i.e.*,
126 internal medicine, surgery, emergency medicine, general practice (GP)) currently employed in the NHS,
127 reported as of September 2020 (29). A more conservative anticipated response rate was selected due to
128 the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic at the time this study was being conducted. However, this value is still
129 consistent with similar estimates found in the literature regarding the use of web-based surveys (30–33).
130 Convenience sampling and snowballing techniques were used.

131 **Participant Recruitment**

132 The research team emailed existing contacts at Health Education England (HEE) deaneries and other
133 relevant institutions (*e.g.*, Royal College of General Practitioners) with a request to circulate the study
134 advertisements widely via e-mail with members in their immediate clinical networks who met the
135 inclusion criteria, as well as to personal contacts in other clinical settings. Study advertisements were
136 circulated amongst trainee physicians by local heads of departments or trainee representatives who have
137 agreed with advertising the study in their healthcare facilities and via electronic newsletters. Reminders
138 via e-mail and newsletters were sent out approximately every fortnight during the data collection period.
139 No financial compensation was provided to participants. No follow-up assessments were held after data
140 collection ended. Data collection lasted from June to October 2021.

141 **Description of Questionnaire**

142 The questionnaire comprised 42 questions and was available in English only (**Appendix 1**). The content
143 was developed based the existing literature and feedback from frontline NHS physicians. This was
144 organised into four sections:

- 145 • Part 1: Basic participant demographic information
- 146 • Part 2: Physician EHR usage experience

- 147 • Part 3: Implications of EHR interoperability on patient safety and clinical care
148 • Part 4: Costs of healthcare resources accrued due to poor EHR interoperability in NHS hospitals.

149 The survey was piloted with four doctors (one GP, two surgical registrars, and one internal medicine
150 trainee) and iteratively refined. The survey was hosted on Qualtrics, a web-based survey platform (34,35).

151 **Data Analysis**

152 Descriptive statistics were calculated for survey respondents, with cross-tabulations of respondent
153 characteristics against survey responses also performed. Response rates per question were calculated and
154 the characteristics of respondents to each question were examined to identify any bias due to attrition over
155 the survey course.

156 For questions exploring redundant diagnostic investigations performed, responses to individual types of
157 tests (*e.g.*, FBC, urine dipstick, X-ray) were aggregated into ‘investigation-type’ categories (*e.g.*, blood-
158 based, urine-based, radiological). An aggregated list of investigations is provided in **Appendix 2**). When
159 grouping responses within each ‘investigation-type’, the most frequent response for any constituent test
160 was used to represent the maximum number of tests conducted per category.

161 Two-tailed χ^2 tests were performed to identify the relationship between participant characteristics of those
162 who started the survey and completed it, with those participants who started the survey but did not
163 complete the survey. All statistical analyses were performed using Stata 13.1.

164 **Results**

165 **Participant Characteristics**

166 A total of 636 NHS doctors participated in the survey, of which 218 (34.3%) have completed it in its
167 entirety. A full description of the respondents is provided in **Table 1**. Of those who responded, 47.4%
168 were females, 37.2% were aged between 30-39. London (n=155, 28%) and Northwest England (n=131,
169 23.7%) received the greatest number of responses, and 48.1% were working in academic hospital settings.
170 GPs comprised the largest clinical training group amongst participants (n=266, 44.1%). Participants who
171 completed the survey were typically older in age, held more senior clinical roles, worked in internal
172 medicine and had no formal EHR training (**Appendix 3**).

173 *Table 1: Characteristics of study participants. Percentages expressed in the ‘Missing’ rows are based on the total number of*
174 *study participants.*

Characteristics	n	Out of total number of participants, (%)	Of those who responded, (%)
Gender			
Female	282	44.3%	47.4%
Male	313	49.2%	52.6%
Missing	41	6.5%	
Age band (years)			
Under 30	122	19.2%	20.2%
30-39	224	35.2%	37.2%
40-49	145	22.8%	24.1%
50-59	84	13.2%	13.9%
60+	28	4.4%	4.6%

Missing	33	5.2%	
Clinical role			
Foundation year (FY1-2)	59	9.3%	9.8%
Senior house officers (ST1-2)	98	15.4%	16.3%
Registrar/Senior registrar (ST3+)	180	28.3%	29.9%
Consultant/GP	266	41.8%	44.1%
Missing	33	5.2%	
Location of practice			
East of England	52	8.2%	9.4%
London	155	24.4%	28%
Midlands	54	8.5%	9.8%
North East and Yorkshire	91	14.3%	16.4%
North West	131	20.6%	23.7%
South East	30	4.7%	5.4%
South West	41	6.5%	7.4%
Missing	82	12.9%	
Medical specialty training			
Internal medicine and subspecialties	226	35.5%	37.7%
Surgery and subspecialties	123	19.3%	20.5%
A&E	56	8.8%	9.3%
Anaesthesia	48	7.6%	8%
GP/Family medicine	50	7.9%	8.3%
Paediatrics	43	6.8%	7.2%
Psychiatry	41	6.5%	6.8%
Other	13	2%	2.2%
Missing	36	5.7%	
Type of healthcare facility			
Academic/teaching hospital	290	45.6%	48.1%
District general/community hospital	244	38.4%	40.5%
GP practice	42	6.6%	7%
Other	27	4.3%	4.5%
Missing	33	5.2%	
Number of organisations interacting with			
None	7	1.1%	1.5%
1-2	58	9.1%	12%
3-4	144	22.6%	29.8%
5+	275	43.2%	56.8%
Missing	152	23.9%	
Received formal EHR training			
Yes	256	40.3%	56.5%
No	197	30%	43.5%
Missing	183	28.8%	
Self-reported EHR proficiency level			
Beginner	23	3.62%	5%
Moderate	235	37%	50.7%
Advanced	167	26.3%	36%
Expert	39	6.1%	8.4%
Missing	172	27%	
Years of experience using EHR			
Less than 1 year	25	3.9%	5.4%
1-2 years	101	16%	22%
3-5 years	138	21.7%	30%
6-10 years	115	18.1%	25%
More than 10 years	83	13.1%	18%
Number of clinical sessions per week			

None	1	0.2%	2.3%
1-2	7	1.1%	16.3%
3-4	10	1.6%	23.3%
5+	25	3.9%	58.1%
Missing	593	93.2%	
Frequency of EHR use			
Less than once a month	2	0.3%	0.4%
At least once a month	7	1.1%	1.5%
At least once a week	31	4.9%	6.7%
Every day	424	66.7%	91.4%
Missing	172	27%	

175 **Perceptions of Healthcare Providers Regarding the Current State of EHR** 176 **Interoperability**

177 **Interoperability-related EHR functions currently available and in use**

178 Recognising that what interoperability-related EHR functions (*i.e.*, functions which involve the input and
179 transfer of health data between two or more EHR elements or users) are available to NHS doctors may not
180 necessarily align with what are routinely used, participants were asked to identify which functions were
181 present and in common use at their workplace (**Table 2**). The three most commonly available functions
182 highlighted by respondents were (1) retrieval of patient’s previous health information (n=429/461,
183 93.1%), (2) inputting orders for investigations and medications (n=411/461, 89.2%), and (3) planning
184 patient disposition and discharges (n=329/461, 71.4%). The most frequently used functions reported were
185 (1) retrieval of patient’s previous health information (n=291/461, 63.1%), (2) inputting orders for
186 investigations and medications (n=261/461, 56.6%), and communicating with other healthcare
187 professionals (n=163/461, 35.4%).

188 *Table 2: EHR functions commonly available and in use by NHS doctors¹*

	My available EHR can perform these functions, n (%)	I often perform these functions using my EHR, n (%)
Hospital administrative processes and reporting	327 (70.9%)	139 (30.2%)
Input orders for investigations/medications	411 (89.2%)	261 (56.6%)
Public health surveillance and reporting	129 (28%)	56 (12.1%)
Planning patient disposition/discharges	329 (71.4%)	154 (33.4%)
Aid in clinical decision-making	282 (61.2%)	157 (34.1%)
Retrieve patient’s previous health information	429 (93.1%)	291 (63.1%)
Communicate with other healthcare professionals	299 (64.9%)	163 (35.4%)
Communicate with and support patients	162 (35.1%)	82 (17.9%)

189 **Directionality of interoperability present in existing EHR systems**

190 Most respondents reported that they can view clinical information inputted by other healthcare providers
191 within their own healthcare setting or facility (n=418/461, 90.7%). However, visibility of clinical

¹ It was not possible to differentiate between respondents who did not complete this question and those who completed the question but chose not to select any options. As such, the number of respondents who completed the next question in the survey (n=461), is taken as a denominator for the purpose of calculating percentages.

192 information outside of their immediate healthcare setting (n=175/460, 38%) and the ability for external
 193 healthcare providers to see their inputted data (n=74/457, 16.2%), were markedly lower.

194 Most respondents stated that they cannot edit clinical information within participants' healthcare setting
 195 (n=225/460, 48.9%) and that from external healthcare providers (n=381/452, 84.3%). Conversely, clinical
 196 information in the participant's hospital or clinic is typically not viewable and editable by most external
 197 healthcare providers (n=309/456, 67.8%). Of note was the increase in the number of 'I do not know'
 198 responses corresponding with EHR interactions of increasing complexity.

199 *Table 3: Directionality of interoperability of existing EHR systems.*

	Yes, n (%)	No, n (%)	I do not know, n (%)
I can SEE clinical information inputted by other healthcare providers WITHIN my healthcare setting. (n=461)	418 (90.7%)	36 (7.8%)	7 (1.5%)
I can SEE clinical information inputted by healthcare providers FROM EXTERNAL hospitals/clinics. (n=460)	175 (38%)	251 (54.6%)	34 (7.4%)
I can both SEE & EDIT clinical information inputted by other healthcare providers WITHIN my healthcare setting. (n=460)	197 (42.8%)	225 (48.9%)	38 (8.3%)
I can both SEE & EDIT clinical information inputted by healthcare providers FROM EXTERNAL hospitals/clinics. (n=452)	23 (5.1%)	381 (84.3%)	48 (10.6%)
Healthcare providers FROM EXTERNAL hospitals/clinics, can SEE all the clinical information I have inputted. (n=457)	74 (16.2%)	259 (56.7%)	124 (27.1%)
Healthcare providers FROM EXTERNAL hospitals/clinics, can both SEE & EDIT the clinical information I have inputted. (n=456)	16 (3.5%)	309 (67.8%)	131 (28.7%)

200 **Impact of EHR interoperability on patient care**

201 Most participants (n=396/413, 95.9%) reported that they have experienced difficulties retrieving clinical
 202 information from EHR systems. Of these, a quarter (n=100, 24.2%) stated that this occurred most of the
 203 time or always. Most respondents reported that poor EHR interoperability negatively impacted their day-
 204 to-day clinical workflow (n=386/412, 93.7%), of which 127 (n=127, 30.8%) stated that this occurred most
 205 of their time or always. Similarly, 81.5% (n=335/411) of respondents reported that they felt poor EHR
 206 interoperability posed a potential risk patient safety, with 19.2% (n=79) describing it as a risk most of the
 207 time or always. Most clinicians reported that poor EHR interoperability negatively affected their ability to
 208 share clinical information with other healthcare professionals (n=450/411, 91.8%). Similarly, 352 of 409
 209 respondents (86.1%) described it as being detrimental to them communicating with patients and
 210 caregivers.

211 *Table 4: Impact of interoperability on patient care, safety, and clinical workflow.*

	Always, n (%)	Most of the time, n (%)	About half the time, n (%)	Sometimes, n (%)	Never, n (%)
--	---------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	------------------	--------------

Difficulty accessing and retrieving clinical information through the EHR systems currently in use. (n= 413)	38 (9.2%)	62 (15%)	64 (15.5%)	232 (56.2%)	17 (4.1%)
Difficulty with accessing and retrieving this clinical information negatively affects my day-to-day clinical workflow. (n=412)	55 (13.4%)	72 (17.5%)	56 (13.6%)	203 (49.3%)	26 (6.3%)
Difficulty with accessing and retrieving this clinical information poses a potential risk to patient safety during my routine shifts in the hospital/clinic. (n=411)	30 (7.3%)	49 (11.9%)	27 (6.6%)	229 (55.7%)	76 (18.5%)
Difficulty with accessing and retrieving this clinical information negatively impacts my ability to share clinical information with other healthcare professionals. (n=411)	46 (11.2%)	72 (17.5%)	55 (13.4%)	198 (48.2%)	40 (9.7%)
Difficulty with accessing and retrieving this clinical information negatively impacts my ability to share clinical information with my patients and/or their caregivers. (n=409)	47 (11.5%)	56 (13.7%)	46 (11.3%)	203 (49.6%)	57 (13.9%)
Thinking about your patients' expectations regarding the accessibility of their health records, do you feel that the EHR systems you currently use allow you to meet these expectations? (n=408)	21 (5.2%)	76 (18.6%)	70 (17.2%)	165 (40.4%)	76 (18.6%)

212 **Impact on EHR Data Visibility and Tasks**

213 Three problems associated with data visibility and completion of EHR tasks most frequently identified by
 214 respondents were: (1) Difficulty retrieving patient information available in another healthcare (n=300,
 215 83.6%), (2) Difficulty accessing patient information even when you know that information is available
 216 locally within the system (n= 217, 60.5%), and (3) Difficulty conveying clinical information for another
 217 healthcare professional (n=216, 60.2%).

218 *Table 5: Difficulties with EHR data availability and tasks due to poor interoperability²*


	Yes, n (%)
Do not know if the information is available in the EHR system or one that is connected to it.	201 (56%)

² It was not possible to differentiate between respondents who did not complete this question and those who completed the question but chose not to select any options. As such, the number of respondents who completed the next question in the survey (n=359), is taken as a denominator for the purpose of calculating percentages.

Difficulty accessing patient information even when you know that information is available within the system	217 (60.5%)
Difficulty retrieving patient information you know is available in another healthcare facility frequented by the patient	300 (83.6%)
Difficulty following up on an order (e.g., test results) you inputted previously	152 (42.3%)
Difficulty conveying clinical information for another healthcare professional	216 (60.2%)


219 **How Interoperability Affects Patient Care Safety**

220 When asked to rate their overall experience of EHRs and interoperability in the current workplace,
221 participants reported largely positive ('Good', n=124, 30%) or neutral experiences ('Neutral', n=117,
222 28.3%). 'Bad' (n=90, 21.7%), 'Very bad' (n=55, 13.3%), and 'Very good' (n=28, 6.8%) comprised the
223 remainder of responses received. A large proportion of negative experiences (Very bad and Bad) was
224 reported by those having a lower self-reported EHR proficiency. Conversely, GPs and doctors practicing
225 in non-secondary care centres, tended to report comparatively positive experiences with EHR
226 interoperability in contrast to other specialties. The reported experiences cross tabulated against the
227 various participant characteristics are shown in **Figure 1**.



228
229 *Figure 1: Breakdown of characteristics of doctors reporting experiences of EHR interoperability at their workplace.*

230 Out of 413 responses received, most participants (n=366, 88.6%) indicated they believed that the lack of
231 EHR interoperability does or may pose a risk to patient safety, with 224 (52.2%) providing a 'Yes'
232 response. The perceived risk to patient safety is most prevalent amongst doctors in specialties based in
233 secondary care centres (e.g., surgery, A&E, and paediatrics), and those have had less than a year's
234 experience using EHRs. For a breakdown of the responses by participant characteristics, please see
235 **Figure 2.**



236

237 *Figure 2: Doctor perceptions of whether limited EHR interoperability poses a patient safety risk.*

238 **Mapping impact of the lack of EHR interoperability along pathway of care**

239 To identify where along the clinical care pathway the lack of EHR interoperability typically occurs,
 240 participants were asked when they find it most impeding to their clinical work during a routine clinical
 241 shift. Out of the total number of study participants, only 310 (48.7%) completed this question (**Table 6**).
 242 The most common response was when receiving patients from a secondary or tertiary healthcare facility
 243 (n=224, 72.3%), followed by medication reconciliation (n=178, 57.4%), and transferring patients to
 244 another healthcare facility (n=175, 56.5%).

245 *Table 6: When is the lack of interoperable EHRs most impeding to your clinical work during a routine clinical shift?*

	Yes, n (%)	No, n (%)
Admitting a new patient from the community	152 (49%)	158 (51%)
Receiving a patient from a secondary/tertiary healthcare facility	224 (72.3%)	86 (27.7%)
During handover of patients from other members within my immediate clinical team	51 (16.5%)	259 (83.5%)
During handover of a patient from another clinical team/clinician within my hospital	71 (22.9%)	239 (77.1%)
Following up on an order from another clinical team/clinician in my hospital	102 (32.9%)	208 (67.1%)
Discharging patient from my hospital back into the community	102 (32.9%)	208 (67.1%)
Transferring a patient from my hospital to another secondary/tertiary healthcare facility	175 (56.5%)	135 (43.6%)
Medication reconciliation	178 (57.4%)	132 (42.6%)
Other	28 (9%)	282 (91%)

246 **Care Inefficiencies and Associated Healthcare Costs Incurred**

247 To gain a better understanding of the impact on physician productivity resulting from poor EHR
 248 interoperability, participants were asked whether they felt poor EHR interoperability has negatively
 249 impacted their workflow in terms of: (1) repeat diagnostic investigations, (2) prolonged length of stay in
 250 hospital, and (3) prolonged clinic preparation and consultation times. Participants who responded ‘Yes’
 251 were then asked to quantify their response for each category.

252 **Repeat diagnostic investigations**

253 For repeat diagnostic investigations, participant responses were aggregated into investigation type
 254 categories (**Table 7**). Responses for each investigation type are detailed in **Appendix 2**.

255 *Table 7: Repeat diagnostic investigations performed because of poor EHR interoperability as reported by 289 respondents who*
 256 *completed the question.*

	Bloodwork, n (%)	Blood Gases, n (%)	Urine-based, n (%)	Infectious Panel, n (%)	Radiology, n (%)
Never	108 (37.4%)	207 (76.1%)	125 (46.8%)	21 (8%)	123 (42.9%)
Once a week	114 (39.5%)	48 (17.7%)	87 (32.6%)	33 (12.5%)	125 (43.6%)
2-3 times a week	35 (12.1%)	11 (4%)	30 (11.2%)	13 (4.9%)	25 (8.7%)
4-6 times a week	15 (5.2%)	3 (1.1%)	12 (4.5%)	3 (1.1%)	5 (1.7%)
Daily	17 (5.9%)	3 (1.1%)	13 (4.9%)	194 (73.5%)	9 (3.1%)

257
 258 Infectious panels were reported to be the most repeated on a daily basis due to poor interoperability
 259 (n=194, 73.5%). Radiological investigations were the second most repeated, with physicians reportedly
 260 needing to do so once per week (n=125, 43.6%). This is followed by bloodwork (n=114, 39.5%) and
 261 urine-based investigations (n=87, 32.6%), both of which are require repeating typically on a weekly basis.

262 **Prolonged length of stay (PLOS) in hospital**

263 When questioned as to whether problems sharing or retrieving clinical information via EHRs with limited
 264 interoperability resulted in keeping patients in hospital longer, 143 out of 222 (64.4%) respondents
 265 responded ‘Yes’. When asked to quantify the extent of delay for patients where limited EHR
 266 interoperability contributed to a problem, 105 (42.9%) participants reported that issues with EHR
 267 interoperability often resulted in several hours in delays in discharging patients, 53 (21.6%) reported that
 268 it typically caused 1-night additional stay in hospital, 52 (21.2%) saw no delays caused, and 35 (13.2%)
 269 caused 2+ nights of additional hospital stay.

270 Delays of several hours were reported most frequently from surgical subspecialties (n=42, 51.9%),
 271 medicine subspecialties (n=21, 29.2%), and A&E (n=17, 51.5%) (**Table 8**). Delays causing one additional
 272 night stay were most reported by medicine subspecialties (n=25, 34.7%), followed by A&E (n=9, 27.3%),
 273 and surgical subspecialties (n=9, 11.1%).

274 *Table 8: Cross tabulation of delays in hospital vs. specialty training. Percentages expressed are for values per row.*

	No delays, n (%)	Several hours delay, n (%)	1-night additional stay in hospital, n (%)	2+ nights additional stay in hospital, n (%)
Internal medicine	6 (8.3%)	21 (29.2%)	25 (34.7%)	20 (27.8%)
Surgery	21 (25.9%)	42 (51.9%)	9 (11.1%)	9 (11.1%)
A&E	5 (15.2%)	17 (51.5%)	9 (27.3%)	2 (6.1%)
Anaesthesia	3 (18.8%)	9 (56.3%)	3 (18.8%)	1 (6.3%)
Paediatrics	8 (36.4%)	11 (50%)	2 (9.1%)	1 (4.6%)
Psychiatry	8 (53.3%)	1 (6.7%)	4 (26.7%)	2 (13.3%)
Other	1 (20%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)

275 **Prolonged clinic consultation times**

276 Most participants stated that interoperability problems have necessitated extra time during routine clinic
 277 consultations (**Table 9**), both when preparing for (n=209, 95.9%) as well as during consultations
 278 themselves (n=211, 96.8%). Most participants required between an extra 15-30 minutes of preparation
 279 time (n=72, 33%) and another 15-30 minutes of consultation time during a routine day of clinic
 280 consultations (n=71, 32.6%).

281 *Table 9: Prolonged clinic times due to issues of EHR interoperability amongst participants who responded (preparation and
 282 during the consultation).*

	Preparing for consultations, n (%)	During consultations, n (%)
No extra time needed	9 (4%)	7 (3.2%)
Less than 5 minutes	18 (8.3%)	22 (10.1%)
5-15 minutes	56 (25.7%)	64 (29.4%)
15-30 minutes	72 (33%)	71 (32.6%)
30-60 minutes	45 (20.6%)	43 (19.7%)
More than an hour	18 (8.3%)	11 (5.1%)

283 **Discussion**

284 **Summary of Principal Results**

285 This survey of 636 NHS doctors in England reveals provides an important insight into how electronic
 286 health record interoperability, or a lack thereof, affects their day-to-day practice.

287 EHRs are widely used by clinicians to retrieve clinical information about their patients, and also to input
288 information into clinical systems, including for the ordering of investigations and medications. Further, a
289 significant minority of doctors report using EHRs to communicate with other healthcare colleagues.

290 While most doctors are able to view patient information in their own hospital EHRs (91%), far fewer are
291 able to edit this information (43%), likely reflecting constraints on editing medical records written by
292 others. Many respondents reported being able to view information from other healthcare organisations
293 (38%) but did not believe other organisations were able to view the information they had inputted (16%).
294 This finding potentially indicates either a lack of reciprocity in EHR interoperability, or a lack of
295 awareness of the interoperability capabilities of providers with whom clinicians regularly share patients.
296 This latter point is supported by increasing numbers of ‘don’t know’ responses to questions pertaining to
297 what was possible at other providers than the respondent’s own. When attempting to map out where
298 issues with limited EHR interoperability typically occur along a patient’s clinical pathway, participants
299 largely highlighted this manifesting during the transition of care between two separate NHS settings, as
300 well as when doctors are completing medication reconciliation.

301 Almost all participants reported experiencing some form of difficulty in accessing clinical information
302 due to poor EHR interoperability. Unsurprisingly, many stated that this was detrimental to their clinical
303 workflow and impaired their communication with patients and other healthcare providers. In terms of
304 current experiences of interoperability at their workplace, negative views were more prevalent amongst
305 doctors who practiced in specialties based in secondary care settings as well as those with less than one
306 year of EHR experience and lower self-reported EHR proficiency levels. Regarding perceived impact on
307 patient safety overall, most doctors reported that limited EHR interoperability they routinely experienced
308 does pose some form of risk. This finding consistently outnumbered those who did not feel it was so
309 across all participant characteristics.

310 However, the impact of lack of EHR interoperability on care efficiency was mixed. Infection panels were
311 repeated by many respondents on a daily basis, with other redundant investigations being done so
312 typically weekly. Most reported that poor EHR interoperability led to extended hospital length of stay and
313 prolonged consultation times, though responses quantifying delays varied between specialties (*e.g.*,
314 surgeons tended to report shorter delays than internists).

315 **Comparison with Prior Work**

316 To better understand EHR systems used across the UK, Warren *et al.*, utilised national-level
317 administrative data to explore the spatial distribution of EHR systems in relation to their use when
318 patients seek care between NHS Trusts (7). The authors found that although a total of 21 different EHR
319 systems were in use and three vendor’s systems made up the majority, most hospitals did not have robust
320 standardised means of electronic clinical data sharing. Even when patients sought care between two trusts
321 which utilised EHRs from the same vendor, only 0.6% of patients were able to take advantage of the
322 greater interoperability possible (7). The authors highlighted that while 20 pairs of Trusts were found to
323 routinely share the same cohort of patients, only one pair utilised EHR systems which were from the same
324 vendor and allowed for some form of interoperability (7). Though this study was valuable in identifying
325 macro-level trends, the secondary data used did not allow for more granular insight into how poor
326 interoperability materialises along a patient’s care pathway.

327 Investigating the amount of additional healthcare expenditure because of poor interoperability has been
328 explored. For example, Stewart *et al.*, examined whether poor interoperability was associated with
329 increases in duplicate medical tests conducted in patients with congenital heart disease being shared

330 between nearby two hospitals with no EHR interoperability in Boston, Massachusetts (36). Of the 27
331 patient records that showed duplicate investigations performed, 17 were not clinically indicated and half
332 had more than one test duplicated (36). The majority of these were conducted during admission from
333 outpatient clinics, with authors speculating that this was likely due to the delays or difficulties
334 encountered during the transfer of test results (36). An estimated US\$ 1255 was thus accrued to all the
335 study patients because of duplicated investigations (US\$ 14.56 per patient). While this sum was modest,
336 the savings from minimising duplicative efforts is likely substantial (36). However, this study's
337 generalisability is limited as it pertained only to a highly specialised patient group and used a narrow
338 definition of 'duplicate test' (36).

339 In a similar attempt to explore the potential cost benefits resultant from increased interoperability, Meyer
340 *et al.*, measured the difference in perceived and actual time spent by nurses completing clinical task
341 orders when using EHR systems with and without interoperability in Geneva-based hospitals (37). An
342 EHR system used in one hospital without interoperability was compared to one introduced at another
343 hospital which had interoperability features available. The authors found that interoperability between the
344 various systems saved on average 26 seconds per order entry, allowing the systems to be utilised
345 approximately three times as fast (37). When extrapolated with the wages for nurses at approximately
346 US\$ 0.73 per minute and roughly 20,000 laboratory orders generated monthly, the authors estimated that
347 incorporating interoperability between the various HIT systems contributed on average, US\$ 6325 of
348 work-time equivalent savings per month (37).

349 **Strengths and Limitations**

350 This is the first study exploring challenges posed to NHS physicians when using EHRs with varying
351 levels of interoperability, ascertaining where interoperability-related issues arise on clinical pathways, and
352 examining the impact to productivity in the NHS. This study comprised a relatively large sample size,
353 received responses from physicians across England, and includes participants from hospital and
354 community-based settings. The survey itself is methodologically robust, with the content derived from a
355 systematic review of the wider literature and subsequently piloted with four physicians of varying clinical
356 experience from three different specialties.

357 Limitations are largely inherent to survey studies themselves. Given that the findings are self-reported,
358 there is a risk of self-selection and recall bias. While stratified purposive sampling was initially planned to
359 ensure proportionate representation of physicians from different backgrounds, convenience sampling was
360 eventually used due to practical considerations during the ongoing pandemic circumstances. Another
361 limitation was the relatively high attrition rate amongst certain subgroups to finishing the study.

362 For example, the small number of responses from Foundation Year doctors at the beginning of the survey
363 (n=59), dropping to a handful by the end (n=8), made an analysis of their responses a notable challenge.
364 Given this subgroup tends to interact with EHR more senior staff, the lack of responses from them
365 contribute to a loss of granularity in the overall data captured.

366 **Implications for Practice, Policy, and Further Research**

367 NHS physicians largely reaffirmed that poor EHR interoperability is a widespread problem across the
368 health system which negatively impacts their ability to deliver safe and efficient care.

369 GPs were the only standout group amongst the study cohort who reported comparatively positive
370 experiences with EHR interoperability. This is potentially due to GPs generally having greater control
371 over the EHR systems in use at their clinics and the less frequent need to interact with other clinical teams
372 to facilitate routine patient care. However, given the high number of responses highlighting
373 interoperability-related issues when receiving patients from secondary care (n=224), this suggests that
374 problems with inter-organisational EHR interoperability are more pronounced than that within primary
375 care settings themselves. Together, this may have contributed to mitigating some of the overall negative
376 experiences perceived by GPs compared to doctors in secondary care.

377 The variation in negative views from doctors across the levels of self-reported EHR proficiency also pints
378 to a potential gap in EHR skills for young trainees entering their first clinical workplace. Once junior
379 doctors are familiarised with the EHRs available, the slight reduction of negative views suggest that
380 greater experience may have helped them overcome some of the initial perceived systems shortcomings
381 (e.g., workflow inconveniences). Those who eventually become ‘experts’ with their EHRs are likely to be
382 more vocal about the negative experiences surrounding interoperability issues routinely encountered. This
383 trend is similar regarding the perceived risk to patient safety – those who have had less time using EHRs
384 have yet to recognise it as a threat to patient safety compared to more seasoned users. Nonetheless, this
385 did not alter the prevailing perception amongst most doctors that current levels of EHR interoperability
386 remain inherently unsafe.

387 Regarding impact on clinical tasks, responses largely indicated the inability to view results of recently
388 conducted investigations and difficulty in communicating with other health professionals. The mismatch
389 in responses quantifying the severity of interoperability-related challenges versus the perception of risks
390 to care, might be explained by limited interoperability causing poor end-user experiences, making it easier
391 for errors to occur and indirectly causing harm.

392 Deriving an estimate of the impact of poor interoperability on productivity proved especially challenging.
393 Nonetheless, respondents were able to highlight some notable areas of concern. For example, physicians
394 reported that radiological investigations were the second most repeated type of investigations due to poor
395 interoperability, with this occurring typically once a week. With investigations such as MRIs having a
396 unit cost averaging £161.54, these extra investigations have the potential to add up to more significant
397 costs when extrapolated across the NHS (38,39). While most participants noted that interoperability-
398 related discharge delays were common, surgical subspecialties typically kept patients for several more
399 hours, while medical subspecialties reported longer delays, typically one additional night, and up to 2-3
400 nights. Costs of delays lasting ‘several hours’ are difficult to establish given the imprecise definition, the
401 opportunity costs based on bed location (e.g., A&E versus wards), and the professionals involved. For
402 reference, a non-elective short stay (i.e., two days or less) is estimated to be on average £801 per unit cost
403 (38).

404 Recommendations to mitigate some of these challenges are gradually becoming available. The NHS
405 Interoperability Toolkit, first released in 2010 and recently updated in March 2023, comprises a collection
406 of frameworks, guidance material, and technical reference documentation to streamline validation
407 processes, lower costs, and provide set interoperability standards for vendors (40,41). Policy-based
408 approaches, such as those suggested by Zhang *et al.*, proposed having regulatory bodies (e.g., Care
409 Quality Commission (CQC) and NHSX) promote, enforce, and push for systemic changes which have
410 proven difficult to do with the currently fragmented HIT procurement strategies between trusts and the
411 lack of business incentives for system vendors to do so themselves (42). While regulatory bodies do not

412 have the authority to dictate HIT policies directly, greater regulatory involvement would give a stronger
413 sense of collective strategic direction in realising a more integrated network of EHRs.

414 Future research should capture the perceptions of EHR interoperability from other healthcare workers
415 (e.g., nurses, pharmacists, allied health workers), ascertain how problems arise along clinical pathways,
416 and measure the impact on patient care and safety using standardised key performance indicators. Given
417 that other NHS healthcare professionals such as nurses, pharmacists, and allied health professionals, may
418 be similarly affected by limited EHR interoperability, there is a clear imperative to explore these
419 perspectives. Research examining EHR user experience, technical aspects of interoperability, or
420 tangential areas such as implementation sciences and economic analyses can advance the understanding
421 of the value posed by interoperable EHRs (43).

422 **Conclusion**

423 In the English NHS, EHR interoperability is minimal, sporadic, and poses a multitude of practical
424 workflow, communication, and potential safety challenges for frontline NHS doctors. While there is a
425 broad consensus regarding its detrimental effects, the perceived impact of poor interoperability is not felt
426 uniformly across the NHS. Certain physician characteristics such as specialty or years of experience using
427 EHRs, influence their perception of interoperability and how they believed it could impact patient care.
428 Poor interoperability was reported to necessitate repeat diagnostics, lengthen hospital stays, and prolong
429 clinic consultations, though the related burdens were not perceived to be severe. However, when
430 extrapolated across the whole of the NHS, these seemingly less significant hinderances would likely
431 culminate in substantial inefficiencies and costs.

432 This study illuminates the perceptions of poor interoperability in practice from users themselves. As the
433 first of its kind in the UK attempting to ‘take the pulse’ of how robust health information exchanges are
434 implemented across various healthcare settings, this study sets the stage for future efforts to more
435 thoroughly investigate the extent the problem that poor EHR interoperability poses. Future efforts at
436 overhauling EHR interoperability must incorporate technical as well as policy-based solutions which
437 closely reflect the practical needs, concerns, and feedback of end-users.

438 **Funding**

439 This work was supported by the Imperial College National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Patient
440 Safety Translational Research Centre (PSTRC) (Reference no. PSTRC-2016-004). AD and ALN are
441 supported by the NIHR North West London Patient Safety Research Collaboration (NIHR NWL PSRC),
442 with infrastructure support from Imperial NIHR Biomedical Research Centre. ALN is also supported by
443 the NIHR North West London Applied Research Collaboration (NIHR NWL ARC). The funders and
444 sponsors have had no role in development and drafting of this manuscript. The views expressed in this
445 publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the National Institute for Health and Care
446 Research.

447 **Ethical Approval**

448 Overall ethical approval for this project was granted by the Imperial College Research Ethics Committee
449 (ICREC) (Reference no. 20IC5906). This is a dedicated ethics oversight body at Imperial College London
450 for all health-related research involving human participants.

451 **Conflict of Interests**

452 HA is chief scientific officer of Pre-emptive Health and Medicine at Flagship Pioneering. AD is executive
453 chair of Pre-emptive Health and Medicine at Flagship Pioneering.

454 **Abbreviations**

455 API – application programming interface
456 CMS – US Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
457 CPOE – computerised provider/physician order entry
458 EHR – electronic health records
459 FHIR - Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources
460 GP – general practitioner
461 HIT – health information technology
462 HL7 – Health Level 7
463 NHS – National Health Service
464 SHO – senior house officer
465 PLOS – patient length of stay

466 **References**

- 467 1. Stanhope V, Matthews EB. Delivering person-centered care with an electronic health record. *BMC*
468 *Medical Informatics and Decision Making*. 2019;19(1): 1–9. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-019-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-019-0897-6)
469 0897-6.
- 470 2. Chin BJ, Sakuda CM i. Transforming and improving health care through meaningful use of health
471 information technology. *Hawai'i journal of medicine & public health* □: *a journal of Asia Pacific*
472 *Medicine & Public Health*. 2012;71(4 Suppl 1): 50–55.
- 473 3. Evans RS. Electronic Health Records: Then, Now, and in the Future. *Yearbook of Medical*
474 *Informatics*. 2016;25(S 01): S48–S61. <https://doi.org/10.15265/IYS-2016-s006>.
- 475 4. Justinia T. The UK's National Programme for IT: Why was it dismantled? *Health Services*
476 *Management Research*. 2017;30(1): 2–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0951484816662492>.
- 477 5. Takian A, Sheikh A, Barber N. We are bitter, but we are better off: Case study of the
478 implementation of an electronic health record system into a mental health hospital in England.
479 *BMC Health Services Research*. 2012;12(1): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-12-484>.
- 480 6. Eason K, Waterson P. The implications of e-health system delivery strategies for integrated
481 healthcare: Lessons from England. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*. 2013;82(5): e96–
482 e106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2012.11.004>.
- 483 7. Warren LR, Clarke JM, Arora S, Darzi AW. Improving data sharing between acute hospitals in
484 England: an overview of health record system distribution and retrospective observational analysis
485 of inter-hospital transitions of care. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(12): e031637.
486 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031637>.
- 487 8. Zhang J, Morley J, Gallifant J, Oddy C, Teo JT, Ashrafian H, et al. *Mapping and evaluating*
488 *national data flows: transparency, privacy, and guiding infrastructural transformation*. *The*
489 *Lancet Digital Health*. 2023. p. e737–e748. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500\(23\)00157-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(23)00157-7).
- 490 9. The Kings Fund. *Interoperability and the NHS: are they incompatible?* | *The King's Fund*. 2016.
491 <https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/blog/2016/08/interoperability-and-nhs> [Accessed 4th July 2023].
- 492 10. Zhang J, Sood H, Harrison OT, Horner B, Sharma N, Budhdeo S. Interoperability in NHS
493 hospitals must be improved: the Care Quality Commission should be a key actor in this process.
494 *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*. 2020;113(3): 101–104.
495 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0141076819894664>.
- 496 11. HIMSS. *Interoperability in Healthcare* | HIMSS.
497 <https://www.himss.org/resources/interoperability-healthcare> [Accessed 4th February 2022].
- 498 12. Bodenheimer T. Coordinating Care — A Perilous Journey through the Health Care System. *New*
499 *England Journal of Medicine*. 2008;358(10): 1064–1071.
500 <https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmhpr0706165>.
- 501 13. Dobrow MJ, Bytautas JP, Tharmalingam S, Hagens S. Interoperable Electronic Health Records
502 and Health Information Exchanges: Systematic Review. *JMIR Medical Informatics*. 2019;7(2):

- 503 e12607. <https://doi.org/10.2196/12607>.
- 504 14. Cohen GR, Adler-Milstein J. Meaningful use care coordination criteria: Perceived barriers and
505 benefits among primary care providers. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics*
506 *Association* □: *JAMIA*. 2016;23(e1): e146. <https://doi.org/10.1093/JAMIA/OCV147>.
- 507 15. O'Malley AS, Grossman JM, Cohen GR, Kemper NM, Pham HH. Are electronic medical records
508 helpful for care coordination? Experiences of physician practices. *Journal of General Internal*
509 *Medicine*. 2010;25(3): 177–185. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-009-1195-2>.
- 510 16. Rathert C, Porter TH, Mittler JN, Fleig-Palmer M. Seven years after Meaningful Use: Physicians'
511 and nurses' experiences with electronic health records. *Health Care Management Review*.
512 2019;44(1): 30–40. <https://doi.org/10.1097/HMR.000000000000168>.
- 513 17. Robertson A, Cresswell K, Takian A, Petrakaki D, Crowe S, Cornford T, et al. Implementation
514 and adoption of nationwide electronic health records in secondary care in England: Qualitative
515 analysis of interim results from a prospective national evaluation. *BMJ (Online)*. 2010;341(7778):
516 872. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.c4564>.
- 517 18. Sheikh A, Cornford T, Barber N, Avery A, Takian A, Lichtner V, et al. Implementation and
518 adoption of nationwide electronic health records in secondary care in England: Final qualitative
519 results from prospective national evaluation in 'early adopter' hospitals. *BMJ (Online)*.
520 2011;343(7829). <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d6054>.
- 521 19. Cifuentes M, Davis M, Fernald D, Gunn R, Dickinson P, Cohen DJ. Electronic Health Record
522 Challenges, Workarounds, and Solutions Observed in Practices Integrating Behavioral Health and
523 Primary Care. *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine* □: *JABFM*.
524 2015;28(Supplement 1): S63–S72. <https://doi.org/10.3122/jabfm.2015.S1.150133>.
- 525 20. The Harris Poll. How Doctors Feel About Electronic Health Records National Physician Poll by
526 The Harris Poll. *Stanford Medicine*. 2019; 1–33.
527 <https://med.stanford.edu/content/dam/sm/ehr/documents/EHR-Poll-Presentation.pdf>
- 528 21. Davis Z, Khansa L. Evaluating the epic electronic medical record system: A dichotomy in
529 perspectives and solution recommendations. *Health Policy and Technology*. 2016;5(1): 65–73.
530 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hlpt.2015.10.004>.
- 531 22. Clarke JM, Warren LR, Arora S, Barahona M, Darzi AW. Guiding interoperable electronic health
532 records through patient-sharing networks. *npj Digital Medicine*. 2018;1(1): 1–6.
533 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-018-0072-y>.
- 534 23. Walker DM, Tarver WL, Jonnalagadda P, Ranbom L, Ford EW, Rahrurkar S. Perspectives on
535 Challenges and Opportunities for Interoperability: Findings From Key Informant Interviews With
536 Stakeholders in Ohio. *JMIR Med Inform 2023;11:e43848*
537 <https://medinform.jmir.org/2023/1/e43848>. 2023;11(1): e43848. <https://doi.org/10.2196/43848>.
- 538 24. McGinn CA, Grenier S, Duplantie J, Shaw N, Sicotte C, Mathieu L, et al. Comparison of user
539 groups' perspectives of barriers and facilitators to implementing electronic health records: A
540 systematic review. *BMC Medicine*. 2011;9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7015-9-46>.
- 541 25. McGinn CA, Gagnon MP, Shaw N, Sicotte C, Mathieu L, Leduc Y, et al. Users perspectives of

- 542 key factors to implementing electronic health records in Canada: A Delphi study. *BMC Medical*
543 *Informatics and Decision Making*. 2012;12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6947-12-105>.
- 544 26. Graham TAD, Ballermann M, Lang E, Bullard MJ, Parsons D, Mercur G, et al. Emergency
545 physician use of the Alberta netcare portal, a province-wide interoperable electronic health record:
546 Multi-method observational study. *JMIR Medical Informatics*. 2018;20(9): e10184.
547 <https://doi.org/10.2196/10184>.
- 548 27. Cifuentes M, Davis M, Fernald D, Gunn R, Dickinson P, Cohen DJ. Electronic Health Record
549 Challenges, Workarounds, and Solutions Observed in Practices Integrating Behavioral Health and
550 Primary Care. *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine* □: *JABFM*. 2015;28(July): S63–
551 S72. <https://doi.org/10.3122/jabfm.2015.S1.150133>.
- 552 28. Gheorghiu B, Hagens S. Measuring interoperable EHR adoption and maturity: A Canadian
553 example. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*. 2016;16(1): 1–7.
554 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-016-0247-x>.
- 555 29. *NHS Workforce Statistics - September 2020 - NHS Digital*. [https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/nhs-workforce-statistics/september-2020)
556 [information/publications/statistical/nhs-workforce-statistics/september-2020](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/nhs-workforce-statistics/september-2020) [Accessed 8th March
557 2021].
- 558 30. Baruch Y, Holtom BC. Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research. *Human*
559 *Relations*. 2008;61(8): 1139–1160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708094863>.
- 560 31. Cunningham CT, Quan H, Hemmelgarn B, Noseworthy T, Beck CA, Dixon E, et al. Exploring
561 physician specialist response rates to web-based surveys. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*.
562 2015;15(1): 32. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-015-0016-z>.
- 563 32. Bartlett JE, Kotrlik JWKJW, Higgins C. Organizational research: Determining appropriate sample
564 size in survey research appropriate sample size in survey research. *Information technology,*
565 *learning, and performance journal*. 2001;19(1): 43. <https://doi.org/info:doi/>.
- 566 33. Lwanga SK, Lemeshow S. *Sample size determination in health studies* □: *A practical manual*.
567 1991. [https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/40062/9241544058_\(p1-](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/40062/9241544058_(p1-p22).pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1)
568 [p22\).pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/40062/9241544058_(p1-p22).pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1)
- 569 34. *Qualtrics XM: The Leading Experience Management Software*. <https://www.qualtrics.com/>
570 [Accessed 7th June 2024].
- 571 35. *Qualtrics survey tool | Staff | Imperial College London*. [https://www.imperial.ac.uk/staff/tools-](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/staff/tools-and-reference/web-guide/tools/qualtrics/)
572 [and-reference/web-guide/tools/qualtrics/](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/staff/tools-and-reference/web-guide/tools/qualtrics/) [Accessed 7th June 2024].
- 573 36. Stewart BA, Fernandes S, Rodriguez-Huertas E, Landzberg M. A preliminary look at duplicate
574 testing associated with lack of electronic health record interoperability for transferred patients.
575 *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2010;17(3): 341–344.
576 <https://doi.org/10.1136/jamia.2009.001750>.
- 577 37. Meyer R, Lovis C. Interoperability in hospital information systems: A return-on-investment study
578 comparing CPOE with and without laboratory integration. *Studies in Health Technology and*
579 *Informatics*. 2011;169: 320–324. <https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-60750-806-9-320>.

- 580 38. NHS England. *NHS England* » *National Cost Collection for the NHS*. NHS England.
581 <https://doi.org/10.22024/UniKent/01.02.100519>. [Accessed 26th June 2023].
- 582 39. Curtis LA, Burns A. Unit Costs of Health & Social Care 2022 - Kent Academic Repository.
583 *University of Kent*. 2022; <https://doi.org/10.22024/UniKent/01.02.100519>.
- 584 40. *Interoperability Toolkit - NHS Digital*. <https://digital.nhs.uk/services/interoperability-toolkit>
585 [Accessed 9th June 2023].
- 586 41. Chada B V. *Implementing electronic health records in the NHS: Key considerations*. *British*
587 *Journal of Health Care Management*. 2022. p. 72–77. <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjhc.2021.0048>.
- 588 42. Zhang J, Sood H, Harrison OT, Horner B, Sharma N, Budhdeo S. Interoperability in NHS
589 hospitals must be improved: the Care Quality Commission should be a key actor in this process.
590 *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*. 2020;113(3): 101–104.
591 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0141076819894664>.
- 592 43. Turbow S, Hollberg JR, Ali MK. Electronic Health Record Interoperability: How Did We Get
593 Here and How Do We Move Forward? *JAMA Health Forum*. 2021;2(3): e210253.
594 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamahealthforum.2021.0253>.
- 595
596