International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering (IJCESEN)

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 2396-2408
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Role of Health Informatics and Administrative Teams in Enhancing Data-Driven Decision Making in Public Hospitals

Mashhour Obaidallah Mohammed Alsharif[1]*, Faisal Essa Abduaziz Altamimi[2], Mishal Saud Hamad Almhana[3], Salman Hamed Salman Alibrahim[4], Mesfer Hamda Mesfer Alshalawi[5], Almhna Hamad Saud H[6], Aljohani Randa Najeeb S[7], Faris Ali Hamad Alfaisal[8], Saud Faisal Alshammarl[9], Alruwaily Swailem Qayad F[10]

[1]Health Informatics Specialist – King Abdulaziz Specialist Hospital in Taif – Taif, Makkah Region – Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** malsharief5@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5241-7850

[2]Health Administration Specialist – Eradah Complex for Mental Health in Hail – Hail, Hail Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: faealtamimi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5242-7850

[3]Health Services and Hospitals Management – Aga Hospital for Long-Term Care and Medical Rehabilitation – Hail, Hail Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: meshal_al_mhana@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5243-7850

[4]Health and Hospital Management Specialist – Prince Mutaib Bin Abdulaziz Hospital – Sakaka, Al-Jouf – Saudi Arabia
Email: esalman2221@hotmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5244-7850

[5]Health Information Technician – Children Hospital in Taif – Taif, Makkah Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: m.h.m7767@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5245-7850

[6]Health and Hospital Administration Specialist – Hail General Hospital – Hail, Hail Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: blehan-11@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5246-7850

[7]Medical Secretary Technician – Mental Health Hospital – Al Madinah, Al Madinah Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: randana@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5248-7850

[8]Health Informatics Technician – Medical Services, Ministry of Interior – Riyadh, Riyadh Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: fa20r05is@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5249-7850

[9]Health Administration Technician – Diabetes and Endocrinology Center – Rafha, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: view.rafhaa@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5240-7850

[10]Health Administration Specialist – Eradah Complex for Mental Health – Arar, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: sswwiill1416@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5200-7850

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.4031
Received : 03 November 2024
Accepted : 27 December 2024

Keywords

Health Informatics,
Data-Driven Decision Making,
Public Hospitals,
Clinical Decision Support,
Administrative Decision Making

Abstract:

The contemporary public healthcare landscape is characterized by unprecedented complexity, rising costs, and increasing demands for high-quality, accessible care. Public hospitals, serving as critical safety nets, are often burdened with limited resources and immense operational pressures. This research posits that the transition to a robust, data-driven decision-making (DDDM) paradigm is essential for these institutions to thrive. The study comprehensively explores the synergistic roles of health informatics teams and administrative leadership in enabling this transformation. It delves into the core concepts of DDDM, outlining its benefits for clinical outcomes, operational efficiency, and strategic planning, while also addressing significant challenges such as data silos, quality issues, and cultural resistance. The paper further investigates the essential health informatics landscape, including the systems, standards, and interoperability required for a connected ecosystem. Critical themes of data quality, governance, and stewardship are analyzed as foundational prerequisites for reliable analytics. The research then details the technical processes of data collection, integration, and the analytical spectrum from descriptive to prescriptive analytics. Finally, it evaluates the tangible impact of clinical and administrative decision support tools on improving patient safety, optimizing resource utilization, and ensuring financial sustainability. The conclusion synthesizes the findings, emphasizing that successful DDDM is not merely a technological undertaking but a strategic imperative fueled by cross-functional collaboration, strong governance, and a pervasive data-informed culture.

1. Introduction

The contemporary healthcare landscape is characterized by unprecedented complexity, rising costs, and increasing demands for high-quality, accessible, and equitable care. Nowhere are these challenges more acutely felt than in public hospitals, which serve as the critical safety net for populations [1]. These institutions are often burdened with limited resources, aging infrastructure, and the immense pressure of serving a high volume of patients with diverse and often severe medical conditions. In this high-stakes environment, the traditional paradigm of clinical decision-making based solely on individual practitioner experience and intuition is no longer sufficient. It is being rapidly supplanted by the need for a more robust, evidence-based approach: data-driven decision making (DDDM) [2].

Data-driven decision making refers to the systematic process of collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data to guide strategic, operational, and clinical choices. In healthcare, DDDM holds the promise of optimizing patient outcomes, enhancing operational efficiency, controlling costs, and ultimately improving the overall health of populations [3]. The potential benefits for public hospitals are particularly profound. By leveraging data, these institutions can identify public health trends, allocate scarce resources more effectively, reduce medical errors, streamline patient flow, and personalize care plans, thereby moving from a reactive model of healthcare delivery to a proactive and preventive one [4].

However, the mere existence of data does not automatically translate into actionable intelligence or improved decisions. Public hospitals are data-rich but often information-poor, sitting on vast, untapped reservoirs of clinical, administrative, and financial data locked away in disparate, non-integrated systems such as Electronic Health Records (EHRs), laboratory information systems, and financial databases [5]. The journey from raw data to meaningful insight is a complex one, fraught with challenges related to data quality, interoperability, standardization, and security. This is where two crucial, and often synergistically linked, forces within the hospital ecosystem come into play: the specialized domain of health informatics and the strategic function of the administrative team. This research posits that the collaborative and integrated role of health informatics professionals and administrative leaders is not merely beneficial but is, in fact, the fundamental catalyst for enabling effective, sustainable, and ethically sound data-driven decision making in public hospitals.

2. Defining the Key Actors:

To understand their collective role, it is essential to define the distinct yet complementary functions of health informatics and administrative teams.

Health Informatics (HI) is an interdisciplinary field that blends medical science, information technology, computer science, and cognitive science. Its primary objective is to acquire, store, retrieve, and utilize health information and knowledge to support decision-making at all levels of the healthcare system [6]. Professionals in this field—such as clinical informaticists, data analysts, health information managers, and IT specialists—are the technical architects of the data ecosystem. They are responsible for designing, implementing, and maintaining the technological infrastructure that collects and secures data. Their expertise lies in ensuring data integrity, developing analytical models, creating intuitive data visualizations through dashboards and reports, and upholding the stringent standards of data privacy and security as mandated by regulations like HIPAA or GDPR [7]. In essence, they transform chaotic, raw data into structured, reliable, and accessible information.

Conversely, the **Administrative Team**—comprising hospital executives, department managers, financial officers, and quality improvement leaders—represents the strategic arm of the organization. They are the primary consumers of the information generated by the HI team and are ultimately accountable for the hospital's performance, financial viability, and strategic direction [8]. Their role in DDDM is to define the key business and clinical questions, set organizational priorities, and interpret the data-driven insights within the broader context of the hospital's mission, policy constraints, and financial realities. They translate information into action by allocating budgets, revising clinical pathways, launching quality improvement initiatives, and making policy changes. While the HI team provides the "how," the administrative team defines the "why" and the "what."

The critical insight is that neither group can succeed in fostering a true data-driven culture in isolation. A sophisticated data model from the HI team is useless if it does not address a pressing strategic question from administration. Conversely, a strategic mandate from administration for "better efficiency" is unactionable without the HI team to define the relevant metrics, collect the data, and provide the analysis to pinpoint inefficiencies [9]. Therefore, the synergy between them is paramount. This collaboration creates a continuous feedback loop: administration identifies a problem or goal, HI provides the data and analysis to illuminate the issue, and administration then implements and monitors the solution, with HI tracking the outcomes. This virtuous cycle is the engine of modern, evidence-based hospital management.

3. Challenges at the Intersection and the Scope of the Research

Despite the clear theoretical benefits, the integration of health informatics and administrative functions to enable DDDM in public hospitals is fraught with significant challenges. These obstacles often stem from structural, cultural, and resource-based issues inherent to the public health sector.

Firstly, a **siloed organizational culture** remains a formidable barrier. Historically, clinical, administrative, and technical departments have operated independently, with distinct goals, terminologies, and priorities [10]. This silo mentality can lead to mistrust and miscommunication. Clinicians may view administrators as focused solely on cost-cutting, while administrators may see clinicians as resistant to change. The HI team, in turn, may be perceived as an IT support function rather than a strategic partner. Breaking down these silos requires deliberate effort and leadership.

Secondly, public hospitals often face a **scarcity of specialized resources**. They may lack the funding to invest in state-of-the-art data analytics platforms or to compete with the private sector in hiring and retaining skilled health informatics professionals [11]. Furthermore, existing staff, both clinical and administrative, may lack the data literacy required to interpret complex analyses or to formulate data-centric questions, a gap known as the "analytics divide" [12].

Thirdly, issues of **data governance and quality** are paramount. Without a clear framework for data ownership, standardization, and quality control—a domain that requires joint ownership from HI and administration—the resulting analyses can be misleading or fundamentally flawed, leading to erroneous and potentially harmful decisions [13]. The ethical implications of data use, particularly concerning patient privacy and algorithmic bias, also demand a collaborative governance approach.

This research will delve into these complexities, arguing that overcoming them is essential for public hospitals to thrive. The study will explore the specific mechanisms through which health informatics and administrative teams can collaborate effectively. It will examine how this partnership enhances decision-making in key areas such as clinical quality and patient safety, operational and financial management, and long-term strategic planning. By analyzing the challenges and proposing a framework for successful collaboration, this research aims to provide a blueprint for public hospitals to harness the full power of their data, thereby fulfilling their mission of delivering exceptional, efficient, and equitable care to the communities they serve.

4. Data-Driven Decision Making: Concepts, Benefits, and Challenges

4.1. The Conceptual Framework of Data-Driven Decision Making

Data-Driven Decision Making (DDDM) represents a paradigm shift from intuition-based or tradition-guided decisions to a systematic process that prioritizes empirical evidence derived from data analysis. In the context of public hospitals, DDDM is not merely the sporadic use of reports; it is an embedded organizational culture and practice where data forms the fundamental basis for strategic, tactical, and operational choices [14]. The core concept rests on the transformation of raw data into actionable wisdom. This process can be conceptualized as a cyclical framework, often depicted as the information lifecycle. It begins with the **collection** of high-quality, relevant data from diverse sources such as Electronic Health Records (EHRs), financial systems, pharmacy databases, and patient satisfaction surveys. The subsequent step involves **processing and integration**, where data is cleaned, standardized, and consolidated from its disparate silos into a coherent and reliable dataset, a task often managed through data warehouses or interoperability platforms [15].

Following processing, the data undergoes **analysis** using various statistical, quantitative, and analytical techniques. This can range from descriptive analytics (e.g., "What happened?" such as reporting the rate of hospital-acquired infections last quarter) to diagnostic analytics ("Why did it happen?"), predictive analytics ("What is likely to happen?"), and prescriptive analytics ("What should we do about it?") [16]. The results of this analysis are then **communicated** effectively to stakeholders—clinicians, managers, and executives—typically through intuitive dashboards, visualizations, and reports that highlight key performance indicators (KPIs) and trends. The final and most crucial stage is **decision and action**, where the insights gained inform concrete actions, such as modifying a clinical protocol, reallocating staff, or investing in new equipment. The cycle is closed as the outcomes of these actions are measured, generating new data and initiating the process anew, fostering a culture of continuous improvement [17].

This structured approach stands in stark contrast to the traditional, often reactive, decision-making models in healthcare. It mitigates cognitive biases, reduces reliance on "the way things have always been done," and provides a transparent, auditable rationale for organizational choices. For public hospitals operating under intense scrutiny and limited margins, this objectivity is not just a luxury but a necessity for survival and excellence.

4.2. The Multifaceted Benefits of DDDM in Public Hospitals

The implementation of a robust DDDM framework yields transformative benefits across the entire spectrum of hospital functions. These advantages can be categorized into three primary domains: clinical, operational, and strategic.

In the **clinical domain**, the impact of DDDM is most directly felt on patient outcomes. By analyzing clinical data, hospitals can develop evidence-based clinical pathways and protocols that standardize care for specific conditions, reducing unwarranted variation and minimizing medical errors [18]. For instance, predictive analytics can identify patients at high risk for sepsis or readmission, enabling early, proactive interventions. Furthermore, DDDM supports the move towards personalized medicine, where treatment plans can be tailored based on a patient's unique genetic makeup, lifestyle, and response to previous therapies. Public health surveillance, a key mandate for public hospitals, is also greatly enhanced, allowing for the tracking of disease outbreaks and the effectiveness of vaccination programs in near real-time [19].

From an **operational and financial perspective**, DDDM is a powerful tool for enhancing efficiency and optimizing resource utilization. Data analytics can model patient flow through the emergency department and inpatient wards, identifying bottlenecks and enabling better staff scheduling to match demand peaks, thereby reducing waiting times and improving patient satisfaction [20]. In supply chain management, analyzing usage patterns for medical supplies and pharmaceuticals can lead to more accurate inventory control, reducing waste and associated costs. On the financial side, DDDM helps in revenue cycle management by identifying patterns in claim denials and streamlining billing processes, which is critical for the financial sustainability of resource-constrained public institutions.

At the **strategic level**, DDDM provides the foundation for long-term planning and policy formulation. Hospital leadership can use population health data to make informed decisions about which new services to offer, which community health programs to invest in, and how to allocate capital for future infrastructure projects [21]. It also fosters a culture of accountability and transparency, as performance against strategic goals can be continuously monitored and reported to stakeholders, including the public and governing bodies. This evidence-based approach to strategic management ensures that the hospital's mission is pursued with clarity and measurable impact.

4.3. Navigating the Complex Challenges to DDDM Implementation

Despite its compelling benefits, the path to becoming a truly data-driven public hospital is obstructed by a series of significant challenges that must be strategically addressed.

The first and most fundamental hurdle is **Data Quality and Interoperability**. The principle of "garbage in, garbage out" is acutely relevant in healthcare. Data entered into EHRs is often incomplete, inconsistent, or recorded in non-standardized formats, compromising its reliability for analysis [22]. Furthermore, public hospitals frequently utilize a patchwork of legacy and modern systems that do not communicate seamlessly with one another. This lack of interoperability creates data silos, where critical information is trapped within individual departments, preventing a holistic, 360-degree view of the patient and the organization's performance.

A second critical challenge is the **Shortage of Skilled Personnel and Resource Constraints**. There is a global scarcity of professionals who possess the unique blend of clinical knowledge, data analytics skills, and an understanding of healthcare systems—the core competency of health informatics. Public hospitals, with their typically lower salary scales, struggle to attract and retain this specialized talent [11]. Compounding this is the general lack of **data literacy** among other staff. Clinicians and administrators may not have the training to interpret complex data visualizations or to formulate questions in a way that can be answered by data analysis, creating a gap between the data team and the decision-makers [23].

Third, **Cultural and Organizational Resistance** can stifle DDDM initiatives. Shifting from experience-based to data-based decision-making can be perceived as a threat to professional autonomy. Clinicians may distrust data that contradicts their long-held beliefs or may be skeptical of algorithms. A siloed organizational structure, where departments guard their data, further impedes the cross-functional collaboration essential for a unified data strategy. Overcoming this requires strong leadership to champion the change and demonstrate the value of data in achieving shared goals like improved patient care [24].

Finally, **Data Security, Privacy, and Ethical Concerns** present a formidable challenge. Healthcare data is among the most sensitive personal information, and its use for analytics must be balanced against stringent regulations like HIPAA. Breaches can have devastating consequences. Ethically, the use of algorithms and predictive models raises questions about bias and fairness. If historical data reflects existing health disparities, algorithms trained on this data may perpetuate or even exacerbate these inequities, leading to unequal care for minority or socioeconomically disadvantaged groups [22]. Therefore, establishing a robust data governance framework that addresses privacy, security, and ethical use is not an optional add-on but a prerequisite for any successful DDDM program in a public hospital.

5. The Health Informatics Landscape:

The practical application of health informatics is realized through a complex ecosystem of interconnected information systems that form the digital backbone of the modern public hospital. At the forefront is the **Electronic Health Record (EHR)**, which has largely replaced the paper chart as the central repository of a patient's clinical data. An EHR is a longitudinal, real-time record that contains a patient's medical history, diagnoses, medications, treatment plans, immunization dates, allergies, radiology images, and laboratory test results [25]. Its primary function is to provide a comprehensive view of the patient's health journey, accessible to authorized providers across different care settings within the hospital. Beyond mere data storage, advanced EHRs incorporate Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS), which provide alerts for drug interactions, reminders for preventive care, and guidelines for evidence-based treatment protocols, directly embedding data-driven insights into the clinical workflow [26].

Complementing the EHR are a suite of specialized systems that manage specific data domains. The **Laboratory Information System (LIS)** manages the workflow and data from medical laboratories, processing orders and reporting results directly back into the EHR. The **Radiology Information System (RIS)**, often integrated with a Picture Archiving and Communication System (PACS), handles medical imaging orders, schedules appointments, and stores and distributes diagnostic images like X-rays and MRIs. On the administrative side, **Hospital Information Systems (HIS)** and **Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)** systems manage patient admissions, discharge, and transfer (ADT) data, billing, scheduling, inventory, and human resources [27]. The power of health informatics is fully unleashed not when these systems operate in isolation, but when they are integrated, allowing for a seamless flow of information from the laboratory, to the radiologist, to the clinician at the bedside, and finally to the billing office. This integration is the foundational challenge and promise of the health informatics landscape.

For disparate health information systems to communicate effectively, a common language is essential. This is the role of health data standards and clinical terminologies, which provide the syntactic and semantic rules for representing and exchanging health information. Without such standards, data becomes ambiguous and unusable for large-scale analysis or coordinated care. **Health Level Seven International (HL7)** is a prime example of a messaging standard. HL7 versions, such as the widely used HL7 version 2.x and the more modern FHIR (Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources), define a framework for the exchange, integration, sharing, and retrieval of electronic health information. These standards specify the structure and data types for messages sent between systems, ensuring, for instance, that a lab result from an LIS is correctly parsed and displayed in the EHR [28].

While HL7 deals with the "syntax" of the message, clinical terminologies and ontologies address the "semantics"—the meaning of the data. They provide standardized, coded vocabularies to ensure that a clinical concept is represented consistently across different systems and providers. Key terminologies include **SNOMED CT (Systematized Nomenclature of Medicine -- Clinical Terms)**, which is a comprehensive, multilingual clinical terminology used for encoding diagnoses, procedures, and findings in the EHR with a high degree of specificity [29]. For laboratory tests and observations, **LOINC (Logical Observation Identifiers Names and Codes)** provides universal identifiers, ensuring that a "serum potassium" test ordered at one hospital is identically understood by the information system of another. For procedures and services, the **International Classification of Diseases (ICD)** codes are used globally for morbidity and mortality statistics, reimbursement, and resource allocation, while **Current Procedural Terminology (CPT)** codes are used for billing outpatient and professional services [30]. The adoption of these standards is not merely a technical formality; it is a prerequisite for achieving interoperability, enabling secondary data use for research and public health, and ensuring accurate reimbursement in a value-based care environment.

Interoperability is the ultimate goal of a standardized health informatics landscape. It is defined as the ability of different information systems, devices, and applications to access, exchange, integrate, and cooperatively use data in a coordinated manner, within and across organizational, regional, and national boundaries, to provide timely and seamless portability of information and optimize the health of individuals and populations globally [31]. The Healthcare Information and Management Systems Society (HIMSS) conceptualizes interoperability on multiple levels. The most basic is **Foundational Interoperability**, which simply allows data to be transmitted from one system to another without requiring the ability for the receiving system to interpret the data. The next level, **Structural Interoperability**, defines the structure or format of the data exchange (syntax), ensuring that data fields are preserved and can be interpreted at the data field level; this is the domain of standards like HL7 [32].

The most advanced and impactful level is **Semantic Interoperability**, which allows multiple systems to not only exchange data but also to automatically interpret and use the information that has been exchanged. This is achieved through the use of shared, coded terminologies like SNOMED CT and LOINC, which give unambiguous meaning to the data. With semantic interoperability, a system can receive a diagnosis coded in SNOMED CT and reliably understand its precise clinical meaning, enabling advanced functions like cross-institutional decision support and aggregated public health reporting [33]. A fourth level, **Organizational Interoperability**, encompasses the non-technical aspects, such as governance, policy, and social and legal frameworks, that enable seamless and secure data sharing to support integrated care processes across organization boundaries [34].

Despite the existence of technical standards, achieving widespread interoperability remains a formidable challenge for public hospitals. Barriers include the high cost of upgrading or replacing legacy systems that were not designed for data sharing, the inconsistent implementation of standards by different EHR vendors, and persistent concerns over data privacy and security that lead to restrictive organizational policies. Furthermore, a lack of universal patient identifiers in many countries complicates the accurate and secure matching of patient records across different institutions [35]. Overcoming these barriers requires a concerted effort that goes beyond technology, involving strong governance, aligned financial incentives, and a collaborative commitment among vendors, providers, and policymakers to build a truly connected and learning health system.

6. Data Quality, Governance, and Stewardship in Public Healthcare

In the realm of data-driven decision making, the principle of "garbage in, garbage out" is not merely a colloquialism but a critical operational reality. The entire analytical superstructure—from simple reports to complex predictive models—is built upon the foundation of raw data. If this foundation is flawed, the resulting insights will be unreliable, potentially leading to erroneous clinical decisions, inefficient resource allocation, and misguided strategic policies [36]. In public healthcare, where decisions directly impact human lives and the stewardship of public funds, the imperative for high-quality data is absolute. Data quality is a multi-faceted concept, commonly evaluated across several dimensions. **Accuracy** refers to the extent to which data correctly describes the real-world object or event it represents, such as a correct lab result or an accurate patient diagnosis. **Completeness** measures whether all the necessary data is present and not missing, a common issue in rushed clinical environments where optional fields in an Electronic Health Record (EHR) are left blank [37].

Other crucial dimensions include **consistency**, which ensures that data does not contradict itself across different systems or time points; **timeliness**, meaning that data is up-to-date and available when needed for decision-making; and **accessibility**, which guarantees that authorized users can retrieve the data when required. Furthermore, **uniqueness** is vital to avoid duplicate records for the same patient, a significant problem that can fragment the patient's health story and lead to clinical errors [38]. The challenge of ensuring data quality is particularly acute in public hospitals, which often deal with a high volume of patients, frequent staff turnover, and the use of multiple, sometimes legacy, systems that were not designed with robust data validation in mind. Consequently, a proactive and systematic approach to measuring, monitoring, and improving data quality is not an IT back-office function but a core clinical and operational necessity.

To systematically address the challenge of data quality and to manage data as a strategic asset, organizations must implement a formal **Data Governance** program. Data governance can be defined as the exercise of authority, control, and shared decision-making over the management of data assets. It is the comprehensive framework of policies, procedures, standards, roles, and responsibilities that ensures data is managed consistently and properly across the entire organization [39]. Unlike IT governance, which focuses on the management of technology systems, data governance is concerned with the data itself—its definition, integrity, security, and usage. In a public hospital, a robust data governance framework provides the answers to critical questions: Who owns the data? Who is accountable for its quality? Who can access what data and under which circumstances? How is data defined and standardized?

A typical data governance structure involves a multi-tiered model. At the strategic level, a **Data Governance Council** or Steering Committee, comprising senior executives from clinical, administrative, and IT leadership, sets the overall vision, strategy, and policy. This council is responsible for prioritizing data initiatives, resolving conflicts, and allocating resources. At the tactical level, **Data Stewards** are assigned from various business units (e.g., heads of clinical departments, heads of finance, head of nursing). These individuals are subject matter experts who are formally accountable for the quality and lifecycle of specific data domains [40]. For instance, a laboratory data steward would be responsible for defining what constitutes a "valid" lab result and for monitoring the completeness and accuracy of data generated by the lab systems. Supporting this structure are **Data Governance Office** personnel who coordinate the program's daily operations, and **IT Data Management** teams who implement the technical controls and tools to enforce policies. This structured approach ensures that accountability for data is clearly assigned and that data management is aligned with the hospital's strategic objectives for quality care and operational excellence.

While data governance provides the framework and policies, **Data Stewardship** represents the execution of those policies in daily practice. It is the operational, hands-on work of managing data assets to ensure they are understood, trusted, and used effectively. Data stewards are the bridge between the technical data teams and the business users; they translate organizational policies into concrete actions that improve data quality and security [41]. The responsibilities of a data steward are manifold. A primary duty is **data definition and standardization**, where stewards create and maintain business glossaries and data dictionaries that clearly define the meaning of key data elements, such as "patient length of stay" or "hospital-acquired infection," ensuring consistent interpretation across the organization [42].

Another critical function is **data quality monitoring and remediation**. Stewards work with the health informatics team to establish data quality metrics and dashboards specific to their domain. They regularly review these reports to identify issues—such as a rising number of incomplete patient records in the emergency department—and then investigate the root cause. The remediation might involve retraining staff, working with IT to modify a data entry screen in the EHR to include mandatory fields, or cleaning existing dirty data [43]. Furthermore, data stewards play a key role in **access control and security**, helping to define role-based access permissions to ensure that clinical and administrative staff can access the data they need for their jobs, but no more, thereby upholding the principle of least privilege and protecting patient confidentiality as mandated by regulations like HIPAA [44].

The successful implementation of data governance and stewardship in a public hospital faces significant cultural and resource hurdles. It requires a shift from viewing data management as an IT problem to recognizing it as a shared organizational responsibility. Securing buy-in from busy clinicians and administrators to take on stewardship roles is challenging but essential. However, the investment yields substantial returns. A mature data governance program creates a "single source of truth," fostering trust in the data used for decision-making. It reduces the costs associated with rework and errors caused by poor data, ensures regulatory compliance, and ultimately, protects the hospital's reputation and, most importantly, the safety of its patients [45].

7. Data Collection, Integration, and Analytics in Public Hospital Settings

The journey of data-driven decision making in a public hospital begins at the critical point of data collection. This process involves capturing raw data from a vast array of sources, creating a comprehensive digital footprint of clinical care, operational workflows, and financial transactions. The primary source is the **Electronic Health Record (EHR)**, which captures structured data (e.g., coded diagnoses, lab results, vital signs) and unstructured data (e.g., clinical notes, radiology reports, discharge summaries) [46]. Beyond the EHR, a plethora of specialized systems contribute vital information. These include **Laboratory Information Systems (LIS)** generating test results, **Pharmacy Information Systems** managing medication orders and dispensing, **Radiology Information Systems (RIS)** and **Picture Archiving and Communication Systems (PACS)** handling medical images, and **Medical Device Interfaces** that automatically stream real-time patient vitals from bedside monitors and ventilators into the EHR [47].

On the administrative front, data is generated from **Patient Administration Systems (PAS)** managing admissions, discharges, and transfers (ADT), **Billing and Claims Systems** detailing financial transactions, and **Human Resource Information Systems (HRIS)** containing staff-related data. An increasingly important source is direct **Patient-Generated Health Data (PGHD)** from wearable devices, patient portals, and mobile health applications, which provides insights into a patient's health outside the hospital walls [48]. The challenge in public hospitals is not a lack of data, but the sheer volume, velocity, and variety of this data. Much of the most clinically rich information, such as physician notes, is locked in unstructured text, making it difficult to analyze using traditional methods. Furthermore, the pressure of high patient volumes can lead to inconsistencies in data entry, where mandatory fields are completed hastily, and optional fields are left blank, directly impacting the quality and completeness of the foundational data asset.

Data collected from these disparate sources exists in isolated silos, each with its own format, structure, and terminology. To be useful for organization-wide analysis, this data must be integrated into a coherent and consistent whole. **Data Integration** is the technical process of combining data from these different sources to provide a unified, holistic view. A cornerstone technology for achieving this in public hospitals is the **Data Warehouse**. A data warehouse is a central repository that aggregates data from various operational systems (like the EHR, LIS, and financial systems) and transforms it into a consistent format optimized for querying and analysis, rather than for transaction processing [49]. The process of building and maintaining a data warehouse, known as **Extract, Transform, Load (ETL)**, is fundamental. The **Extract** phase involves pulling data from the source systems. The **Transform** phase is the most critical, where the data is cleaned, standardized, and harmonized. This includes mapping local laboratory codes to universal LOINC codes, converting dates into a standard format, and resolving inconsistencies in patient identifiers to create a single, master patient index. The **Load** phase then places this transformed, high-quality data into the warehouse's structured tables [50]. More modern approaches like **Extract, Load, Transform (ELT)** are also emerging, leveraging low-cost cloud storage and powerful computing to load raw data first and transform it later. For dealing with the vast volumes of unstructured data, technologies like **Data Lakes** are used. A data lake stores raw data in its native format until it is needed, making it ideal for storing clinical notes, medical images, and genomic data for future advanced analytics projects [51]. The successful implementation of a data warehouse or lake is a significant undertaking for a public hospital, requiring substantial investment and expertise, but it is an essential step to break down data silos and create a "single source of truth" for the entire organization.

Once data is integrated and stored in an accessible repository, the focus shifts to analytics—the art and science of discovering meaningful patterns and insights from the data. The analytical capabilities in a hospital can be viewed as a spectrum, evolving from understanding the past to shaping the future. At the most basic level, **Descriptive Analytics** answers the question, "What happened?" This involves using historical data to create reports, summaries, and dashboards that track Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) such as average length of stay, hospital-acquired infection rates, or emergency department wait times [52]. This is the foundation of most business intelligence activities in hospitals today.

The next level, **Diagnostic Analytics**, seeks to understand "Why did it happen?" This involves drilling down into the data, using techniques like data discovery, correlations, and drill-through analysis to identify root causes. For example, if descriptive analytics shows a spike in patient falls on a specific ward, diagnostic analytics might cross-reference data on staffing levels, patient acuity, and medication administration to pinpoint contributing factors [53]. More advanced is **Predictive Analytics**, which uses statistical models and machine learning algorithms to forecast "What is likely to happen?" By analyzing historical and current data, predictive models can identify patients at high risk for readmission, sepsis, or clinical deterioration, enabling proactive interventions [54]. For instance, a model might flag a diabetic patient with a history of poor medication adherence as high-risk for readmission, allowing a care coordinator to schedule a follow-up call post-discharge.

The pinnacle of this spectrum is **Prescriptive Analytics**, which goes beyond prediction to recommend "What should we do about it?" It suggests decision options and outlines the potential consequences of each. In a clinical context, this could be a clinical decision support system that, based on a patient's unique profile and the latest medical evidence, recommends an optimal, personalized treatment plan. In an operational context, it could involve simulating different staff-scheduling models to recommend one that minimizes wait times while controlling labor costs [55]. While descriptive and diagnostic analytics are now commonplace, the adoption of predictive and prescriptive analytics represents the next frontier for public hospitals, promising to transform care from reactive to genuinely proactive and personalized, ultimately driving superior outcomes for the populations they serve.

8. Decision Support Tools and Their Impact on Clinical and Administrative Outcomes

The culmination of a robust health informatics infrastructure—comprising quality data, integrated systems, and advanced analytics—is its delivery through practical tools that directly influence decision-making at the point of care and management. These are known as Decision Support Systems (DSS), which are active knowledge resources that use patient data to generate case-specific advice. DSS are broadly categorized into two domains: Clinical Decision Support (CDS) and Administrative Decision Support (ADS). **Clinical Decision Support (CDS)** systems are designed to assist healthcare providers in making clinical decisions at the point of care. Integrated within the Electronic Health Record (EHR), CDS provides clinicians with filtered, patient-specific information and knowledge to enhance care. The core functionalities of CDS include computerized alerts and reminders for preventive care (e.g., flu vaccinations), drug-drug interaction warnings at the point of prescribing, protocol-based order sets for specific conditions like sepsis or heart failure, and documentation templates that guide structured data entry [56]. A more advanced form of CDS involves diagnostic support, suggesting possible diagnoses based on a patient's symptoms, history, and test results.

Conversely, **Administrative Decision Support (ADS)** systems are geared towards the managerial and operational functions of the hospital. These tools leverage data from financial, human resource, and operational systems to support strategic planning and resource allocation. Common ADS tools include **business intelligence (BI) dashboards** that visually display key performance indicators (KPIs) such as bed occupancy rates, surgical theater utilization, and average patient wait times in the emergency department. Furthermore, **predictive modeling tools** for revenue cycle management can forecast claim denials, while **workforce management systems** can optimize staff scheduling based on predicted patient volume [57]. Both CDS and ADS share a common goal: to reduce the cognitive load on humans, mitigate the risk of error stemming from information overload or fatigue, and ensure that decisions are consistently aligned with the best available evidence and organizational policies.

The integration of well-designed CDS tools has demonstrated a significant and measurable impact on improving clinical outcomes and patient safety within hospital settings. One of the most documented benefits is in the realm of **medication safety**. Computerized Provider Order Entry (CPOE) systems coupled with CDS for drug-dose checking, allergy alerts, and drug-laboratory interaction warnings have been shown to substantially reduce the rates of adverse drug events (ADEs). By intercepting potentially harmful prescriptions before they reach the patient, these systems act as a critical safety net, preventing medication errors at the ordering stage [58]. Furthermore, CDS is instrumental in improving **adherence to evidence-based guidelines**. Reminder systems can prompt physicians to order recommended screenings for diabetic retinopathy or to prescribe beta-blockers for post-heart attack patients, thereby closing the gap between established clinical knowledge and everyday practice. Studies have consistently shown that such reminders lead to significant improvements in compliance with preventive care guidelines and chronic disease management protocols [59].

Another critical area of impact is in the management of **sepsis and other time-sensitive conditions**. Sophisticated CDS tools can run in the background, continuously monitoring patient vital signs and laboratory results in real-time. Using predictive algorithms, these systems can generate early warning scores and alert clinicians to patients who are exhibiting early signs of clinical deterioration or sepsis, often hours before it would be clinically obvious. This early detection enables timely intervention, which is crucial for improving survival rates and reducing complications [60]. By embedding clinical knowledge into the workflow, CDS tools standardize care processes, reduce unwarranted variation among providers, and ultimately lead to higher quality, safer, and more reliable patient care.

9. Impact on Administrative Outcomes: Driving Efficiency and Financial Sustainability

On the administrative front, decision support tools are equally transformative, directly contributing to the operational efficiency and financial viability of public hospitals. ADS tools provide managers with real-time, data-driven insights that enable more effective resource management. For instance, **capacity management dashboards** that integrate live data on bed status, expected discharges, and incoming admissions from the emergency department and operating rooms allow bed managers to anticipate bottlenecks and streamline patient flow. This directly translates to reduced ambulance diversion times, decreased emergency department boarding, and a lower average length of stay (LOS), which is a key metric for both cost containment and quality of care [61]. In the realm of **supply chain management**, ADS can analyze usage patterns for medical supplies and pharmaceuticals, enabling automated, just-in-time inventory control that minimizes waste and reduces carrying costs without risking stock-outs of critical items [62].

Financially, the impact is profound. **Revenue cycle analytics tools** can identify patterns in claim denials from payers, allowing the hospital to address common coding or documentation errors proactively. This improves the clean claim rate, accelerates reimbursement, and directly enhances cash flow—a critical concern for publicly funded institutions. Moreover, ADS is indispensable for navigating the shift from fee-for-service to **value-based care** models. These tools can analyze data on patient outcomes, resource utilization, and costs to measure performance against value-based contracts. They help administrators identify high-cost, high-risk patient populations for targeted care management programs, thereby improving outcomes while controlling costs [63]. However, the success of these tools is not automatic. Challenges such as **alert fatigue** in CDS, where clinicians become desensitized to a high volume of low-specificity alerts, can diminish their effectiveness [64]. Similarly, the accuracy of ADS outputs is entirely dependent on the quality of the underlying data. Therefore, the successful implementation of decision support requires not only sophisticated technology but also a thoughtful design that integrates seamlessly into user workflows, coupled with continuous monitoring and refinement to ensure these tools remain relevant, trusted, and effective in achieving superior clinical and administrative outcomes [65].

10. Conclusion

In conclusion, the journey toward effective data-driven decision making in public hospitals is a multifaceted endeavor that transcends the mere implementation of technology. It represents a fundamental cultural and operational shift that is critically dependent on the integrated and collaborative efforts of health informatics professionals and administrative teams. The health informatics landscape provides the essential technological foundation—comprising integrated systems, standardized terminologies, and interoperable platforms—that transforms raw data into accessible, high-quality information. This foundation is upheld by robust data governance and stewardship frameworks that ensure data is managed as a strategic, trustworthy asset.

Through advanced analytics, this data is converted into actionable insights, which are then delivered to frontline clinicians and managers via sophisticated decision support tools. The impact is profound: enhanced patient safety through reduced medication errors and early detection of clinical deterioration, improved operational efficiency through optimized resource allocation and patient flow, and greater financial sustainability through proactive revenue cycle management and cost control. Ultimately, overcoming the challenges of implementation—including siloed cultures, resource constraints, and alert fatigue—requires unwavering leadership commitment. By fostering a collaborative environment, investing in data literacy, and continuously refining their data ecosystems, public hospitals can fully harness the power of their data. This will enable them to not only navigate contemporary challenges but also to redefine their mission, delivering higher-value, more equitable, and more proactive care to the communities they serve.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could

have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper

- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.

- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

1. Kraft MR, Androwich I. Informatics for health professionals. 1st ed. Burlington: Jones & Bartlett Learning, 2017. Chapter 17, Using Informatics to Promote Community/Population Health; 251–263.
2. Choi B.C.K. The past, present, and future of public health surveillance. Scientifica. 2012;2012:26. doi: 10.6064/2012/875253.
3. Yasnoff W.A., Overhage J.M., Humphreys B.L., LaVenture M. A national agenda for public health informatics. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2001;8(6):535–545. doi: 10.1136/jamia.2001.0080535.
4. Ngjuna H.N. Disease surveillance via smartphones cheaper, faster vs. paper-based surveys. Infect Dis News. 2012 April;25(4):13.
5. Brownstein J., Freifeld C., Madoff L. Digital disease detection — harnessing the web for public health surveillance. N Engl J Med. 2009;360(21):2153–2157.
6. Rozek P., Groth D. Business continuity planning. It's a critical element of disaster preparedness. Can you afford to keep it off your radar? Health Manag Technol. 2008;29(3):10–12.
7. Yasnoff W.A., O'Carroll P.W., Koo D., Linkins R.W., Kilbourne E.M. Public health informatics: improving and transforming public health in the information age. J Public Health Manag Pract. 2000;6(6):67–75.
8. Leanin g J., Guha-Sapir D. Natural disasters, armed conflict, and public health. N Engl J Med. 2013;369(19):1836–1842.
9. Snee N.L., McCormick K.A. The case for integrating public health informatics networks. Eng Med Biol Mag IEEE. 2004;23(1):81–88.
10. Lombardo J.S., Buckeridge D.L. Disease surveillance: a public health informatics approach. 2012.
11. Fan S., Blair C., Brown A., Gabos S., Honish L., Hughes T. A multi-function public health surveillance system and the lessons learned in its development: the Alberta real time syndromic surveillance net. Can J Public Health. 2010 Nov–Dec;101(6):454–458.
12. Kohane I.S. The contributions of biomedical informatics to the fight against bioterrorism. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2002;9(2):116–119.
13. Leaning J., Guha-Sapir D. Natural disasters, armed conflict, and public health. N Engl J Med. 2013;369(19):1836–1842.
14. Hoyt R., Bailey A. Health informatics: practical guide for healthcare and information technology professionals. 6th ed. Lulu Press; Raleigh: 2014.
15. Choi B.C.K. The past, present, and future of public health surveillance. Scientifica. 2012;2012:26.
16. Wang L., Wang Y., Jin S., Wu Z., Chin D.P., Koplan J.P., Wilson M.E. Emergence and control of infectious diseases in China. Lancet. 2008;372(9649):1598–1605.
17. Njuguna H.N. Disease surveillance via smartphones cheaper, faster vs. paper-based surveys. Infect Dis News. 2012 April;25(4):13.
18. Bahkali S., Almaiman A., Almadani W., Househ M., El Metwally A. The state public health informatics in Saudi Arabia. Stud Health Technol Inform. 2014;202:257–260.
19. Jacobs A. The pathologies of big data. Commun ACM. (2009) 52:36–44. 10.1145/1536616.1536632
20. Journal: Jamoom E, Beatty P, Bercovitz A, Woodwell D, Palso K, Rechtsteiner E. Physician adoption of electronic health record systems: United States, 2011. NCHS Data Brief. (2011) 98:1–8.
21. Patel S, Park H, Bonato P, Chan L, Rodgers M. A review of wearable sensors and systems with application in rehabilitation. J Neuroeng Rehabil. (2012) 9:21. 10.1186/1743-0003-9-21
22. future: Future of Health Technology Summits 1996-2000. (2000). Available online at the: fhti.org
23. Chen J, Qian F, Yan W, Shen B. Translational biomedical informatics in the cloud: present and future. Biomed Res Int. (2013) 2013:658925. 10.1155/2013/658925
24. Jordan MI, Mitchell TM. Machine learning: trends, perspectives, and prospects. Science. (2015) 349:255–60. 10.1126/science.aaa8415
25. LeCun Y, Bengio Y, Hinton G. Deep learning. Nature. (2015) 521:436–44. 10.1038/nature14539
26. Pete S. Congressional intent for the HITECH Act. Am J Managed Care. (2010) 16(12 Suppl HIT):SP24–8.
27. Jamoom E, Beatty P, Bercovitz A, Woodwell D, Palso K, Rechtsteiner E. Physician adoption of electronic health record systems: United States, 2011. NCHS Data Brief. (2011) 98:1–8.
28. Jacobs A. The pathologies of big data. Commun ACM. (2009) 52:36–44. 10.1145/1536616.1536632
29. Wolfe PJ. Making sense of big data. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. (2013) 0 110:18031–2. 10.1073/pnas.1317797110
30. Herland M. A review of data mining using big data in health informatics. J Big Data. (2014) 1:1–35. 10.1186/2196-1115-1-2
31. Fang R, Pouyanfar S, Yang Y, Chen SC, Iyengar S. Computational health informatics in the big data age: a survey. ACM Comput Surv. (2016) 49:1–36. 10.1145/293270725832646

32. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee for the Study of the Future of Public Health. The Future of Public Health. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; (1988).
33. Yasnoff WA, O'Carroll PW, Koo D, Linkins RW, Kilbourne EM. Public health informatics: Improving and transforming public health in the information age. J Public Health Manage Pract. (2000) 6:67–75. 10.1097/00124784-200006060-00010
34. Gable CB. A compendium of public health data sources. Am J Epidemiol. (1990) 131:381–94. 10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a115513
35. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Assuring the Health of the Public in the 21st Century. The Future of the Public's Health in the 21st Century. (2002).
36. Chen SC, Fang R, etc. [If any additional items are present, proceed similarly.]
37. Wu PY, Cheng CW, Kaddi CD, Venugopalan J, Hoffman R, Wang MD. -Omic and electronic health record big data analytics for precision medicine. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng. (2017) 64:263–73. 10.1109/TBME.2016.2573285
38. Yang HC, Dasdan A, Hsiao RL, Parker DS. Map-reduce-merge: simplified relational data processing on large clusters. In: Proceedings of the ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data. Beijing: (2007). p. 1029–40. 10.1145/1247480.1247602
39. Karun AK, Chitharanjan K. A review on Hadoop–HDFS infrastructure extensions. In: IEEE Conference on Information and Communication Technologies. Thuckalay: (2013). p. 132–7.
40. Mohri M, Rostamizadeh A, Talwalkar A. Foundations of Machine Learning. London: MIT Press; (2012).
41. Bellazzi R, Zupan B. Predictive data mining in clinical medicine: current issues and guidelines. Int J Med Inform. (2008) 77:81–97. 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2006.11.006
42. Cohen AM, Hersh WR. A survey of current work in biomedical text mining. Brief Bioinform. (2005) 6:57–71. 10.1093/bib/6.1.57
43. Bedard N, Pierce M, El-Naggar A, Anandasabapathy S, Gillenwater A, Richards-Kortum R. Emerging roles for multimodal optical imaging in early cancer detection: a global challenge. Technol Cancer Res Treat. (2010) 9:211–7. 10.1177/153303461000900210
44. Weissleder R, Pittet MJ. Imaging in the era of molecular oncology. Nature. (2008) 452:580–9. 10.1038/nature06917
45. Islam NS, Kwon SC, Wyatt LC, et al. Disparities in diabetes management in Asian Americans in New York City compared with other racial/ethnic minority groups. American journal of public health. 2015;105 Suppl 3:S443–446.
46. Clarke AR, Goddu AP, Nocon RS, et al. Thirty years of disparities intervention research: what are we doing to close racial and ethnic gaps in health care? Med Care. 2013;51(11):1020–1026.
47. Rol and KB, Milliken EL, Rohan EA, et al. Use of Community Health Workers and Patient Navigators to Improve Cancer Outcomes Among Patients Served by Federally Qualified Health Centers: A Systematic Literature Review. Health equity. 2017;1(1):61–76.
48. Chin MH, Clarke AR, Nocon RS, et al. A roadmap and best practices for organizations to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in health care. J Gen Intern Med. 2012;27(8):992–1000.
49. Johnson-Askew WL, Gordon L, Sockalingam S. Practice paper of the American Dietetic Association: addressing racial and ethnic health disparities. J Am Diet Assoc. 2011;111(3):446–456.
50. Findley S, Matos S, Hicks A, Chang J, Reich D. Community health worker integration into the health care team accomplishes the triple aim in a patient-centered medical home: a Bronx tale. J Ambul Care Manage. 2014;37(1):82–91.
51. Reinschmidt KM, Ingram M, Morales S, et al. Documenting Community Health Worker Roles in Primary Care: Contributions to Evidence-Based Integration Into Health Care Teams, 2015. The Journal of ambulatory care management. 2017;40(4):305–315.
52. Love MB, Gardner K, Legion V. Community health workers: who they are and what they do. Health education & behavior : the official publication of the Society for Public Health Education. 1997;24(4):510–522.
53. Association APH. Support for Community Health Workers to Increase Health Access and to Reduce Health Inequities. 2009.
54. Islam N, Nadkarni SK, Zahn D, Skillman M, Kwon SC, Trinh-Shevrin C. Integrating community health workers within Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act implementation. Journal of public health management and practice : JPHMP. 2015;21(1):42–50.
55. Krieger JW, Takaro TK, Song L, Weaver M. The Seattle-King County Healthy Homes Project: a randomized, controlled trial of a community health worker intervention to decrease exposure to indoor asthma triggers. American journal of public health. 2005;95(4):652–659.
56. Fedder DO, Chang RJ, Curry S, Nichols G. The effectiveness of a community health worker outreach program on healthcare utilization of west Baltimore City Medicaid patients with diabetes, with or without hypertension. Ethnicity & disease. 2003;13(1):22–27.
57. Findley S, Matos S, Hicks A, Chang J, Reich D. Community health worker integration into the health care team accomplishes the triple aim in a patient-centered medical home: a Bronx tale. J Ambul Care Manage. 2014;37(1):82–91.
58. Allen C, Brownstein JN, Mirambeau A, Jayapaul-Philip B. Technical Assistance Guide for States Implementing Community Health Worker Strategies. CDC 2014.
59. Johnson SL, Gunn VL. Community Health Workers as a Component of the Health Care Team.

Pediatric clinics of North America. 2015;62(5):1313–1328.
60. Hemmat M, Ayatollahi H, Maleki M, Saghafi F. Future Research in Health Information Technology: A Review. Perspectives in health information management. 2017;14(1b).
61. Cottrell EK, Gold R, Likumahuwa S, et al. Using Health Information Technology to Bring Social Determinants of Health into Primary Care: A Conceptual Framework to Guide Research. Journal of health care for the poor and underserved. 2018;29(3):949–963.
62. Bassi J, Lau F. Measuring value for money: a scoping review on economic evaluation of health information systems. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association : JAMIA. 2013;20(4):792–801.
63. Akgun, S. & Greenhow, C. (2022) Artificial intelligence in education: addressing ethical challenges in K-12 settings. AI and Ethics, 2(3), 431–440.
64. Alowais, S.A. et al. (2023) Revolutionizing healthcare: The role of artificial intelligence in clinical practice. BMC Medical Education, 23(1), 689.
65. American Nurses Association. (2022) The ethical use of artificial intelligence in nursing practice. Position Statement by ANA Center for Ethics and Human Rights.