B. Séroussi et al. (Eds.)

© 2022 European Federation for Medical Informatics (EFMI) and IOS Press.

This article is published online with Open Access by IOS Press and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0).

doi:10.3233/SHTI220451

Evaluating Unintended Consequences in Health Information Systems

Nurkhadija ROHANI^a and Maryati Mohd YUSOF^{b,1}
^aPharmaceutical Policy & Strategic Planning Division, Ministry of Health, MALAYSIA
^bFaculty of Info. Sc. and Technology, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, MALAYSIA

Abstract. The use of health information systems (HIS) and complex sociotechnical interactions can generate dangerous unintended consequences (UC). The evaluation of such interactions can provide an understanding of the root causes of UC. This paper reviews the interactions that lead to UC and its contributing factors.

Keywords: error, evaluation, framework, health information systems, patient safety, process, socio-technical, unintended consequences

1. Introduction

Health information systems (HIS) can improve healthcare quality [1,2]. However, HIS have various sociotechnical (social and technical) challenges limiting their potential and introducing new errors that may cause unintended consequences (UC). Healthcare providers can effectively understand their causes by recognising HIS-UC to mitigate them. This paper reviews HIS-UC factors and their complex interactions based on the Interactive Sociotechnical Analysis (ISTA) [3] and Human-Organization-Process-Technology-fit (HOPT-fit) frameworks [4].

2. Methods

We review the literature on UC issues arising from HIS implementation to determine the influencing factors. HIS problems are identified, classified, and summarised based on four ISTA interactions and mapped into HOPT factors in HIS.

3. Results

We identify 16 factors that influence UC in HIS from user perspectives and categorised them based on four selected ISTA interactions: (1) new HIS changes in the existing social system, (2) technical and physical infrastructures mediating HIS use, (3) the social system mediating HIS use and (4) the HIS-in-use changes in the social system. We also deduced the socio-technical dimensions for each UC (Table 1).

¹ Corresponding author; Maryati. Yusof@ukm.edu.my

Table 1. ISTA-UC-HOPT-fit framework interactions

X = need fit, Y = evaluation dimension involved, - = not applicable		HOPT Dimension				
Interactions	Factors Influencing UCa	Org-Structurea	Workflowa	System-Usea	Syst-Qualitya	Info Qualitya
ISTA·1:·New· HIS changes· in the existing· social system¤	1a HIS disrupts current workflow and practice	¤	Y¤	¤.	Y¤	- ¤
	1b HIS increases workload by changing current tasks and roles a	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤	ā
	1cHIS interferes with communication and information transfers	Y¤	Y¤	- ¤	Y¤	- ¤
	1d-HIS requires users to have sufficient knowledge and skills a	- ¤	- ¤	Y¤	Y¤	- ¤
ISTA·2:· Infrastructures· mediating· HIS use¤	2a - HIS ability to integrate with existing infrastructure	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤	ā
	2b - Ability to provide technical support for HIS use	Y¤	- ¤	- ¤	Y¤	- ¤
	2c - Availability of organisational infrastructure to support HIS use	Y¤	- ¤	Y¤	- ¤	- ¤
ISTA-3:- Social-system- mediating- HIS use	3a - Incompatible HIS interfaces with practice add cognitive load a	- ¤	- ¤	Y¤	Y¤	- ¤
	3b - HIS functions are not interpreted according to the process	- ¤	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤
	3c HIS functions are not well-adapted to communication and information transfers $\mbox{\ensuremath{\square}}$	- ¤	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤
	3d·-·Emergence·of·new·types·of·errors¤	a -	ā	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤
ISTA·4: HIS- in-use- changes in- social system¤	4a - Changes in current practice	Yα	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤
	4b - Changes in HIS information contenta	Y¤	- ¤	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤
	4c - Changes in communication and information transfers	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤
	4d·-·Overdependence·on·HIS¤	- ¤	- ¤	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤
	4e - Changes in users' awareness¤	- ¤	- ¤	Y¤	Y¤	Y¤
п	Total¤	8¤	8¤	13¤	15p	8 ¤

4. Discussion and conclusion

HIS use disrupts workflows (UC-1a), communication patterns and information transfers (UC-1c), confusing roles/responsibilities and unclear expectations (UC-1b) in the social system. HIS also transforms the physical and technical infrastructures (UC-2a) that require alignment with clinical workflows to support HIS use in the social system. However, multiple UCs can occur if the HIS functions (system quality) misaligned with the workflows (UC-3b) and communication and information transfers (UC-3c). HIS-UCs result from complex sociotechnical interactions that are difficult to understand. Therefore, evaluators can analyse them structurally to understand the interactions that can trigger HIS-UC for improvements and mitigation purposes.

Acknowledgement. Ministry of Higher Learning Malaysia (FRGS/1/2018/ICT04/UKM/02/5) sponsored the study.

References

- [1] Dyb K, Warth LL.Implementing eHealth technologies: the need for changed work practices to reduce medication errors, in, IOS Press, 2019, pp. 83-86.
- [2] Sittig DF, Wright A, Coiera E, et al. Current challenges in health information technology-related patient safety, Health Inform J 26 (2020), 181-189.
- [3] Harrison MI, Koppel R, Bar-Lev S. Unintended consequences of information technologies in health carean interactive sociotechnical analysis, JAMIA 14 (2007), 542-549.
- [4] Yusof MM. A socio-technical and lean approach towards a framework for health information systemsinduced error, in, IOS Press, 2019.