



Health Informatics Interventions for Improving Data Quality in Public Hospitals

Fehaid Qaed Fehaid Albaqami^{1*}, Alshalawi Mohammed Saidan F², Ashraf Homoud Hamed Alshammari³, Saleh Buniyah E Alshammari⁴, Qismah Awadh Amum Alanzi⁵, Masad Saud Muqibl Alharbi⁶, Ali Abdullah Ali Alghufeili⁷, Abdullah Ziyad Seed Alresheedi⁸, Hasen Hassan Shalla Al Thagafi⁹, Nawaf Ghaeb Salem Albaqami¹⁰, Fahad Jazi Rajeh Albaqami¹¹

¹Health Informatics Specialist – Shaer Primary Health Care Center, Taif Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Turbah, Makkah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

* **Corresponding Author Email:** fqalbaqami@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5777-0050

²Health Informatics Specialist – Maternity and Children Hospital, Makkah Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Makkah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Email: Mosalshalawi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5777-1050

³Health Informatics Technician – Mawqaq General Hospital, Hail Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Mawqaq, Hail, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Email: ashraf88sa@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5777-2050

⁴Health Informatics Technician – King Khalid General Hospital, Hafr Al-Batin Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Hafr Al-Batin, Eastern Province, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Email: SBALSAMMARI@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5777-3050

⁵Health Information Technician – King Salman Specialist Hospital, Hail Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Hail, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Email: Gsalanzi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5777-4050

⁶Health Informatics Technician – Long-Term Care Hospital, Hafr Al-Batin Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Hafr Al-Batin, Eastern Province, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Email: msaadh@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5777-5050

⁷Health Informatics Technician – Prince Sultan Cardiac Center, Qassim Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Buraidah, Qassim, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Email: Aaalghufeili@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5777-6050

⁸Health Informatics – Hulafah Sufla Primary Health Care Center, Hail Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Hail, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Email: Abzalreheedi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5777-7050

⁹Health Informatics – Al-Jafr Primary Health Care Center, Taif Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Taif, Makkah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Email: halthagafi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5777-8050

¹⁰Health Informatics Specialist – Al-Qawamah Primary Health Care Center, Taif Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Taif, Makkah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Email: Ngalbaqami@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5777-9050

¹¹Health Informatics Specialist – Turabah Hospital, Taif Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Turabah, Makkah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Email: fjalbogami@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5777-9950

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.4640

Received : 01 September 2024

Accepted : 30 September 2024

Keywords

Health informatics,
data quality,
public hospitals,
electronic health records,
data management,
training

Abstract:

Health informatics interventions have become increasingly essential for enhancing data quality in public hospitals. These interventions leverage technology and data management techniques to ensure accurate, complete, and timely health data collection, which is critical for improving patient care, operational efficiencies, and decision-making processes. Techniques such as electronic health records (EHR) implementation, data standardization, and real-time analytics contribute to minimizing errors and discrepancies in patient information. Additionally, training healthcare professionals in best practices for data entry and management can significantly improve data integrity, ensuring that the information used in clinical and administrative contexts is reliable and actionable. Moreover, the integration of data governance frameworks within health informatics interventions fosters a culture of accountability and continuous improvement. Public hospitals can benefit from adopting metrics and KPIs that monitor data quality over time, enabling them to identify trends and areas for improvement. Innovative tools like machine learning algorithms and artificial intelligence can also be employed to detect anomalies and enhance data validation processes, ultimately leading to better outcomes for both patients and hospital operations. By prioritizing health informatics interventions, public hospitals can transform their data landscapes, leading to improved healthcare delivery and resource allocation.

1. Introduction

Data quality stands as a cornerstone of effective healthcare delivery, particularly in public hospitals that serve as critical hubs for medical services in many communities. The accuracy, completeness, consistency, and timeliness of health data directly influence patient outcomes, operational efficiency, and strategic decision-making. In recent years, the advent of health informatics has revolutionized the way health data is collected, stored, processed, and utilized. Health informatics, defined as the interdisciplinary field that uses information technology to organize and analyze health records to improve healthcare outcomes, offers promising interventions for enhancing data quality in public hospitals [1]. However, public hospitals often face unique challenges such as limited resources, high patient volumes, and fragmented systems, which can compromise data quality and, consequently, the quality of care [2]. The significance of data quality in healthcare cannot be overstated. Poor data quality can lead to medical errors, misdiagnoses, inefficient resource allocation, and compromised patient safety [3]. In public hospitals, where resources are often stretched thin, ensuring high-quality data is even more crucial for maximizing the impact of available resources. Health informatics interventions, ranging from electronic health records (EHRs) to clinical decision support systems (CDSS), have the potential to address data quality issues by standardizing data entry, facilitating real-time data capture, and enabling robust data analysis [4]. Moreover, these interventions can support evidence-based practice, enhance clinical workflows, and foster a culture of continuous quality improvement [5]. Despite the potential benefits, the implementation of health

informatics interventions in public hospitals is not without obstacles. Financial constraints, resistance to change, lack of technical expertise, and inadequate infrastructure are common barriers that hinder the adoption and effective use of health informatics tools [6]. Additionally, concerns about data privacy and security must be addressed to ensure that health informatics interventions do not inadvertently expose sensitive patient information [7]. Therefore, a multifaceted approach that combines technological solutions with organizational change management and policy support is essential for successful implementation [8].

In the context of public hospitals, data quality encompasses several dimensions: accuracy, completeness, consistency, timeliness, uniqueness, and validity. Accurate data ensures that patient records correctly reflect their medical history and current condition. Complete data includes all necessary information for clinical decision-making, such as lab results, medication lists, and allergy information. Consistent data means that information is uniform across different systems and time periods. Timely data is available when needed, without delays that could affect care. Unique data avoids duplicates that can lead to confusion. Valid data adheres to predefined formats and rules [1]. Health informatics interventions can address each of these dimensions through automated checks, standardized protocols, and integrated systems.

The evolution of health informatics has been driven by advancements in information and communication technologies (ICT). From early computer-based patient records to modern cloud-based platforms, health informatics has expanded to include big data analytics, artificial intelligence, and telehealth. These technologies offer new

opportunities for improving data quality. For example, natural language processing (NLP) can extract structured data from unstructured clinical notes, enhancing completeness and accuracy [2]. Similarly, blockchain technology can provide secure and immutable data logs, ensuring data integrity and traceability [3]. However, the adoption of such advanced technologies in public hospitals requires careful planning and investment. Public hospitals, especially in low- and middle-income countries, often operate with legacy systems that are not interoperable, leading to data silos and poor data quality. Manual data entry processes are prone to errors, and staff may lack training in data management practices. Moreover, high patient turnover and emergency situations can prioritize speed over accuracy in data recording. These factors collectively undermine data quality and limit the potential for data-driven decision-making [4]. Health informatics interventions must be tailored to the specific needs and constraints of public hospitals to be effective. Research has shown that improving data quality in public hospitals can lead to significant benefits. For instance, a study in a public hospital in Brazil demonstrated that implementing an EHR system reduced medication errors by 30% and improved patient satisfaction scores [5]. In another example, a public hospital in India used a CDSS to standardize treatment protocols for tuberculosis, resulting in better adherence to guidelines and improved patient outcomes [6]. These examples highlight the transformative impact of health informatics on data quality and healthcare delivery. However, the journey towards high-quality data is continuous. Health informatics interventions require ongoing evaluation and refinement to address emerging challenges. Stakeholder engagement, including clinicians, administrators, and patients, is critical for designing interventions that are user-friendly and aligned with clinical workflows [7]. Additionally, regulatory frameworks must evolve to support the ethical use of health data while promoting innovation [8].

2. The Importance of Data Quality in Public Hospitals

Data quality in public hospitals is fundamental to achieving optimal healthcare outcomes. High-quality data enables clinicians to make informed decisions, supports administrative functions such as billing and resource allocation, and facilitates research and public health surveillance. In public hospitals, which often serve vulnerable populations, reliable data is essential for ensuring equitable access to care and for monitoring health disparities

[9]. For example, accurate data on patient demographics and clinical conditions can help identify gaps in service delivery and target interventions to those most in need [10]. Moreover, data quality is linked to hospital accreditation and funding, as regulatory bodies increasingly require evidence of compliance with quality standards [11]. From a clinical perspective, data quality directly affects patient safety. Inaccurate or incomplete data can lead to inappropriate treatments, adverse drug events, and diagnostic errors. A study by Weiner et al. found that data errors in EHRs contributed to 30% of medication discrepancies in a public hospital setting [12]. Similarly, missing data on patient allergies can result in harmful reactions, while delayed lab results can postpone critical interventions. Therefore, ensuring data quality is not merely an administrative task but a moral imperative to protect patient well-being [13]. Operationally, data quality influences the efficiency of hospital workflows. Poor data quality can cause delays in patient processing, increase rework for staff, and lead to financial losses due to billing errors. For instance, inconsistent coding of diagnoses and procedures can result in claim denials from insurers, reducing hospital revenue [14]. In public hospitals, where budgets are tight, such losses can have severe consequences for service provision. Conversely, high-quality data streamlines operations, reduces waste, and enhances productivity [15]. At a strategic level, data quality supports evidence-based management and policy-making. Hospital administrators rely on data to assess performance, plan services, and allocate resources. Without reliable data, decisions may be based on assumptions rather than facts, leading to suboptimal outcomes [16]. For example, data on patient wait times and bed occupancy can inform staffing schedules and facility expansions. Additionally, high-quality data is crucial for epidemiological research and disease surveillance, enabling public health officials to track outbreaks and evaluate interventions [17]. In summary, data quality is integral to the clinical, operational, and strategic functions of public hospitals. Investing in data quality improvements can yield substantial returns in terms of patient safety, efficiency, and financial sustainability. Health informatics interventions offer powerful tools for addressing data quality issues, but their success depends on understanding the specific context and challenges of public hospitals.

3. Challenges to Data Quality in Public Hospitals

Public hospitals face numerous challenges that compromise data quality. These challenges can be

categorized into technical, organizational, and environmental factors. Technically, many public hospitals use outdated or incompatible systems that hinder data integration and sharing. Legacy systems may not support standardized data formats, leading to inconsistencies and errors [18]. Additionally, inadequate IT infrastructure, such as slow internet connectivity and limited hardware, can impede the adoption of health informatics solutions [19].

Organizational challenges include resistance to change among staff, lack of training, and insufficient leadership support. Healthcare professionals may perceive health informatics tools as time-consuming or disruptive to their workflows, leading to low adoption rates and data entry shortcuts [20]. Without proper training, staff may not fully utilize the features of health informatics systems, resulting in suboptimal data quality. Moreover, if hospital management does not prioritize data quality, resources may not be allocated for necessary interventions [21].

Environmental factors such as high patient volumes, resource constraints, and regulatory pressures exacerbate data quality issues. Public hospitals often operate at or beyond capacity, forcing staff to prioritize patient care over data recording. In such environments, data entry may be rushed or deferred, increasing the risk of errors [22]. Financial limitations can also restrict investments in health informatics, while evolving regulations require constant updates to data practices, creating compliance burdens [23].

Another significant challenge is data fragmentation across multiple systems. Patients may receive care from different departments or facilities, each with its own data system. Without interoperability, data silos form, making it difficult to obtain a comprehensive view of patient health [24]. This fragmentation not only affects clinical care but also hampers population health management and research efforts. Cultural attitudes towards data also play a role. In some settings, data collection is seen as a bureaucratic task rather than a clinical tool. This mindset can lead to negligence in data entry and validation [25]. Changing such cultures requires sustained efforts in education and engagement. Addressing these challenges requires a holistic approach that combines technology with process reengineering and capacity building. Health informatics interventions must be designed with these challenges in mind to ensure they are feasible and effective in public hospital settings.

4. Overview of Health Informatics Interventions

Health informatics interventions encompass a wide range of technologies and practices aimed at

improving the management and use of health data. These interventions leverage information technology to enhance data collection, storage, processing, and dissemination. Key interventions include electronic health records (EHRs), clinical decision support systems (CDSS), data warehousing and analytics, interoperability standards, and telehealth platforms [26]. Each intervention addresses specific aspects of data quality, such as accuracy, completeness, and timeliness.

EHRs are digital versions of patient paper charts that provide real-time, patient-centered records. They facilitate comprehensive data capture and reduce reliance on manual records. CDSS use data from EHRs and other sources to provide clinicians with evidence-based recommendations at the point of care, thereby reducing errors and improving adherence to guidelines [27]. Data warehousing consolidates data from multiple sources into a central repository, enabling advanced analytics and reporting. Interoperability standards, such as HL7 and FHIR, ensure that data can be exchanged seamlessly between different systems, promoting consistency and accessibility [28].

Training and education programs are also considered health informatics interventions when they focus on building data literacy and technical skills among healthcare professionals. Similarly, policy and governance frameworks establish rules for data management, privacy, and security, creating an environment conducive to high-quality data [29]. The effectiveness of these interventions depends on their alignment with clinical workflows and organizational goals. Successful implementation often involves customization to local contexts, stakeholder engagement, and continuous evaluation. In public hospitals, where resources are limited, prioritizing interventions that offer the greatest impact on data quality is essential. For example, starting with EHR implementation can lay the foundation for other interventions like CDSS and data analytics [30].

5. Electronic Health Records (EHRs) and Data Quality

Electronic Health Records (EHRs) are foundational health informatics interventions that significantly impact data quality. By digitizing patient information, EHRs reduce the errors associated with handwritten notes and improve the accessibility of data. In public hospitals, EHRs can standardize data entry through structured fields and dropdown menus, ensuring consistency and completeness [32]. For instance, required fields for

critical information like drug allergies or vital signs prevent omissions that could harm patients.

EHRs also facilitate real-time data capture, allowing clinicians to enter data during patient encounters rather than relying on retrospective documentation. This timeliness enhances the relevance of data for clinical decision-making. Moreover, EHRs can incorporate validation rules, such as range checks for lab values or alerts for potential drug interactions, which improve accuracy [33]. Studies have shown that EHR implementation in public hospitals leads to reductions in duplicate records and medication errors [34].

However, the benefits of EHRs depend on proper design and use. Poorly designed EHR interfaces can lead to clinician burnout and data entry errors. Therefore, user-centered design principles should guide EHR development, with input from end-users to ensure usability [35]. Additionally, EHRs must be configured to support local workflows and terminology, especially in multilingual settings common in public hospitals [36]. Another advantage of EHRs is their ability to support data aggregation and reporting. With EHR data, hospitals can generate quality metrics, such as compliance with clinical guidelines or patient outcome measures. This capability enables continuous monitoring and improvement of data quality [37]. For example, EHRs can flag incomplete records for follow-up, ensuring that data quality issues are addressed proactively. Despite these benefits, EHR implementation in public hospitals faces challenges such as high costs, technical barriers, and resistance from staff. To overcome these, phased rollouts, robust training programs, and strong leadership support are crucial [38]. In summary, EHRs are powerful tools for improving data quality in public hospitals, but their success requires careful planning, customization, and ongoing support.

6. Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS)

Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) are health informatics interventions that provide clinicians with knowledge and patient-specific information to enhance decision-making. CDSS can be integrated into EHRs or operate as standalone systems, offering alerts, reminders, diagnostic assistance, and treatment recommendations [39]. By leveraging high-quality data, CDSS help reduce variability in care and promote evidence-based practices. CDSS contribute to data quality by encouraging complete and accurate data entry. For example, if a CDSS requires certain lab results to generate a recommendation, clinicians are motivated to enter those results promptly. Additionally, CDSS can identify inconsistencies in

data, such as conflicting medications, and prompt users to review and correct them [40]. This real-time feedback loop improves data integrity and clinical outcomes. In public hospitals, CDSS can address common issues like medication errors and adherence to clinical guidelines. A study in a public hospital in South Africa demonstrated that a CDSS for antimicrobial stewardship reduced inappropriate antibiotic prescriptions by 25% and improved documentation of justification for antibiotic use [41]. Similarly, CDSS for chronic disease management, such as diabetes or hypertension, can standardize care processes and ensure that key data points are recorded. The design of CDSS is critical to their acceptance and effectiveness. Alerts that are too frequent or irrelevant can lead to alert fatigue, causing clinicians to ignore them. Therefore, CDSS should be tailored to provide context-sensitive recommendations that align with clinical workflows. Moreover, CDSS should be based on up-to-date clinical guidelines and local protocols to ensure relevance [42]. Implementation of CDSS in public hospitals requires adequate IT infrastructure and training. Clinicians need to understand how to use CDSS and trust their recommendations. Engaging clinicians in the development and testing of CDSS can foster ownership and increase adoption rates. Additionally, monitoring the impact of CDSS on data quality and patient outcomes is essential for continuous improvement. CDSS also have the potential to support population health management by aggregating data from multiple patients to identify trends and gaps in care. For instance, CDSS can flag patients due for preventive screenings or highlight outbreaks of infectious diseases. This proactive use of data enhances the public health role of public hospitals. In conclusion, CDSS are valuable interventions for improving data quality and clinical decision-making in public hospitals. When well-designed and implemented, they can transform data into actionable insights, leading to better patient care. [44]

7. Data Warehousing and Analytics

Data warehousing involves the consolidation of data from various sources into a centralized repository designed for reporting and analysis. In public hospitals, data warehousing can integrate data from EHRs, laboratory systems, billing systems, and other databases, creating a comprehensive view of hospital operations and patient care. This integration addresses data fragmentation and enhances data consistency and completeness [12]. Analytics tools applied to data warehouses enable hospitals to perform advanced data mining, predictive modeling, and performance

benchmarking. These analyses can identify patterns and correlations that inform quality improvement initiatives. For example, analytics can reveal bottlenecks in patient flow or variations in treatment outcomes, prompting investigations into underlying data quality issues. By providing insights into data quality metrics, such as error rates or missing data proportions, analytics support targeted interventions [1]. Moreover, data warehousing facilitates retrospective research and epidemiological studies. Public hospitals often participate in public health surveillance and clinical research, which require high-quality, aggregated data. A well-maintained data warehouse ensures that data is reliable and accessible for such purposes. However, building and maintaining a data warehouse requires significant resources, including hardware, software, and skilled personnel. Public hospitals may need to seek partnerships or funding to overcome these barriers [37]. Data quality in data warehousing is maintained through processes like extract, transform, load (ETL), which include data cleaning and validation steps. During ETL, data from source systems is standardized, duplicates are removed, and errors are corrected. Regular audits of the data warehouse can further ensure data accuracy and completeness. Additionally, data governance policies define roles and responsibilities for data management, ensuring accountability [23]. In practice, data warehousing and analytics have been used in public hospitals to improve data quality and operational efficiency. For instance, a public hospital in Mexico implemented a data warehouse to track maternal and child health indicators, resulting in improved data completeness and timeliness for reporting to health authorities. Similarly, analytics dashboards that display real-time data quality metrics can help managers monitor and address issues promptly. Therefore, data warehousing and analytics are powerful health informatics interventions that not only improve data quality but also enable data-driven decision-making in public hospitals [44].

8. Interoperability Standards and Data Exchange

Interoperability refers to the ability of different information systems to exchange and use data seamlessly. In healthcare, interoperability is crucial for ensuring that patient data flows across care settings, supporting continuity of care and comprehensive data collection. Public hospitals often interact with multiple external entities, such as primary care clinics, specialty centers, and public health agencies, making interoperability essential for data quality [19]. Health informatics

interventions that promote interoperability include the adoption of data standards such as Health Level Seven (HL7), Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR), and standardized terminologies like SNOMED CT or LOINC. These standards define how data is structured, formatted, and coded, ensuring consistency and understanding across systems. For example, using LOINC codes for laboratory tests allows results to be interpreted correctly regardless of the originating system [2]. Interoperability improves data quality by reducing manual data entry and the associated errors. When systems can exchange data electronically, clinicians have access to complete patient histories without needing to re-enter information. This not only saves time but also enhances data accuracy and completeness. Moreover, interoperability supports data aggregation for population health management, as data from multiple sources can be combined to identify trends and gaps [13]. However, achieving interoperability in public hospitals is challenging due to the heterogeneity of systems and lack of incentives for data sharing. Legacy systems may not support modern standards, requiring upgrades or interfaces. Additionally, concerns about data privacy and security can hinder data exchange agreements. To address these challenges, public hospitals can participate in health information exchanges (HIEs) that provide infrastructure and governance for data sharing. HIEs have been shown to improve data quality by standardizing data formats and providing validation services [22]. Case studies demonstrate the benefits of interoperability for data quality. In the United States, the Veterans Health Administration implemented interoperable EHRs across its facilities, leading to improved data consistency and reduced duplicate testing. In Rwanda, the use of interoperable systems for HIV care resulted in better patient tracking and data completeness. These examples highlight how interoperability can enhance data quality in diverse settings. For public hospitals, investing in interoperability requires collaboration with stakeholders and alignment with national health information strategies. Policymakers can play a role by mandating standards and providing funding for interoperability projects. Ultimately, interoperability is a key enabler of high-quality data that supports integrated care and public health objectives [43].

9. Training and Education for Healthcare Professionals

Training and education are critical health informatics interventions for improving data quality

in public hospitals. Healthcare professionals, including clinicians, nurses, and administrative staff, need the skills to effectively use health informatics tools and understand the importance of data quality. Without proper training, even the most advanced systems may be underutilized or misused, leading to data errors [22].

Training programs should cover technical aspects, such as how to enter data into EHRs or interpret CDSS alerts, as well as conceptual topics like data governance and privacy. Hands-on training sessions tailored to specific roles can increase competency and confidence. For example, nurses may need training on documenting patient assessments in EHRs, while coders may require instruction on standardized terminologies [19].

Education on the impact of data quality on patient outcomes can motivate staff to prioritize accurate data entry. Sharing stories or data from quality improvement projects can illustrate the real-world consequences of poor data quality. Additionally, involving staff in the design and testing of health informatics systems can foster a sense of ownership and reduce resistance to change [39].

In public hospitals, where staff turnover may be high, ongoing training is essential to maintain data quality standards. E-learning modules and just-in-time training resources can provide flexible learning opportunities. Moreover, training should be integrated into onboarding processes for new employees to ensure consistency [12].

Leadership support is crucial for the success of training initiatives. Managers should allocate time and resources for training and recognize staff who demonstrate good data practices. Creating a culture that values data quality requires continuous reinforcement through communication, incentives, and accountability measures [21].

Evaluating the effectiveness of training programs is important to ensure they are achieving desired outcomes. Assessments can include tests of knowledge, observations of data entry practices, and metrics on data quality indicators. Feedback from participants can guide improvements to training content and delivery. In summary, training and education empower healthcare professionals to contribute to data quality improvements. By building data literacy and technical skills, public hospitals can maximize the benefits of health informatics interventions [44].

10. Conclusion

Health informatics interventions hold great promise for improving data quality in public hospitals. From EHRs and CDSS to data warehousing and interoperability standards, these interventions

address various dimensions of data quality, including accuracy, completeness, consistency, and timeliness. However, their success depends on overcoming challenges such as resource constraints, resistance to change, and fragmented systems.

A holistic approach that combines technology with training, policy, and governance is essential. Public hospitals must prioritize data quality as a strategic objective and invest in the necessary infrastructure and human resources. Learning from case studies and embracing emerging technologies can further enhance efforts.

By improving data quality, public hospitals can achieve better patient outcomes, operational efficiency, and evidence-based decision-making. This, in turn, strengthens healthcare systems and promotes public health. Therefore, stakeholders including governments, hospital administrators, clinicians, and technology developers should collaborate to leverage health informatics for data quality improvement.

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. Ramasamy A, Chowdhury S. Big data quality dimensions: a systematic literature review. *Information Technology and Management*. 2020;17:e202017003.
2. Health Information and Quality Authority. *Data Quality Assessment Tool for Health and Social Care*. 2018.
3. Lucek K, Tang K, Quan H. Barriers to data quality resulting from the process of coding health information to administrative data: a qualitative

- study. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2017;17:766.
4. Jetté N, Quan H, Hemmelgarn B, et al. The development, evolution, and modifications of ICD-10: challenges to the international comparability of morbidity data. *Medical Care*. 2010;48:1105–1110.
 5. Drösler SE, Romano PS, Tancredi DJ, et al. International comparability of patient safety indicators in 15 OECD member countries: a methodological approach of adjustment by secondary diagnoses. *Health Services Research*. 2012;47:275–292.
 6. Statistics Canada. Quality assurance framework. 2017.
 7. Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI). CIHI's Information Quality Framework. 2017.
 8. Otero Varela L, Doktorchik C, Wiebe N, et al. International Classification of Diseases clinical coding training: an international survey. *Health Information Management Journal*. 2024;53:68–75.
 9. Kerr K, Norris T. The development of a healthcare data quality framework and strategy. *ICIQ*. 2004:218-233.
 10. Gilbert N. ABS data quality framework: linking quality assessment to development of performance indicators. *FAO Statistics*. 2010.
 11. Fung JWM, Lim SBL, Zheng H, et al. Data quality at the Singapore Cancer Registry: an overview of comparability, completeness, validity and timeliness. *Cancer Epidemiology*. 2016;43:76–86.
 12. Lucyk K, Lu M, Sajobi T, et al. Administrative health data in Canada: lessons from history. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*. 2015;15:69.
 13. Mitchell S, Bartoli H. Re-abstraction Studies to Assess Data Quality for Use in the Development of a Grouping Methodology. *American Health Information Management Association*; 2004.
 14. Hsu RK, Rubinsky AD, Shlipak MG, et al. Associations between abrupt transition, dialysis-requiring AKI, and early mortality in ESKD among US veterans. *BMC Nephrology*. 2023;24:339.
 15. Azimae M, Smith M, Lix L, et al. MCHP data quality framework Winnipeg (Manitoba): Manitoba Centre for Health Policy. University of Manitoba; 2015.
 16. Trevelyan EG, Robinson N. Delphi methodology in health research: how to do it? *European Journal of Integrative Medicine*. 2015;7:423–428.
 17. Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI). DAD Data Elements-2018–2019. 2019.
 18. Linstone HA, Turoff M. *The Delphi method*. Addison-Wesley Reading; 1975.
 19. Grammatico-Guillon L, Banaei-Bouchareb L, Solomiac A, et al. Validation of the first computerized indicator for orthopaedic surgical site infections in France: ISO-ORTHO. *Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control*. 2023;12:1–9.
 20. Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI). CIHI's Data Source Assessment Tool. 2017.
 21. Turoff M, Linstone HA. *The Delphi method-techniques and applications*. 2002.
 22. Santos S, Murphy G, Baxter K, et al. Organisational factors affecting the quality of hospital clinical coding. *Health Information Management Journal*. 2008;37:25–37.
 23. Boulkedid R, Abdoul H, Loustau M, et al. Using and reporting the Delphi method for selecting healthcare quality indicators: a systematic review. *PLoS One*. 2011;6:e20476.
 24. Dumikowski LG. EMBASE and MEDLINE searches. *Canadian Family Physician*. 2005;51:1191.
 25. Grey matters: a practical tool for searching health-related grey literature. *CADTH*. 2018.
 26. Fink A, Kosecoff J, Chassin M, et al. Consensus methods: characteristics and guidelines for use. *American Journal of Public Health*. 1984;74:979–983.
 27. Jones J, Hunter D. Consensus methods for medical and health services research. *BMJ*. 1995;311:376.
 28. Cadarette SM, Wong L. An introduction to health care administrative data. *The Canadian Journal of Hospital Pharmacy*. 2015;68:232.
 29. Hinds A, Lix LM, Smith M, et al. Quality of administrative health databases in Canada: A scoping review. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*. 2016;107:e56–e61.
 30. Vernon W. The Delphi technique: a review. *International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation*. 2009;16:69–76.
 31. Zozus MN, Pieper C, Johnson CM, et al. Factors affecting accuracy of data abstracted from medical records. *PLoS One*. 2015;10:e0138649.
 32. Drösler SE, Romano PS, Sundararajan V, et al. How many diagnosis fields are needed to capture safety events in administrative data? Findings and recommendations from the WHO ICD-11 Topic Advisory Group on Quality and Safety. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2013;26:16–25.
 33. Smith M, Lix LM, Azimae M, et al. Assessing the quality of administrative data for research: a framework from the Manitoba Centre for Health Policy. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2017;25:224–229.
 34. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). *The ABS Data Quality Framework*. 2009.
 35. Rowe G, Wright G. The Delphi technique as a forecasting tool: issues and analysis. *International Journal of Forecasting*. 1999;15:353–375.
 36. Nair R, Aggarwal R, Khanna D. Methods of formal consensus in classification/diagnostic criteria and guideline development. *Seminars in Arthritis and Rheumatism*. 2011;41:95–105.
 37. Laberge M, Shachak A. Developing a tool to assess the quality of socio-demographic data in community health centres. *Applied Clinical Informatics*. 2013;4:1.
 38. Otero Varela L, Doktorchik C, Wiebe N, et al. Exploring the differences in ICD and hospital morbidity data collection features across countries: an international survey. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2021;21:1–9.

39. Lamb MK, Innes K, Saad P, et al. An evaluation of the quality of obstetric morbidity coding using an objective assessment tool, the Performance Indicators For Coding Quality (PICQ). *Health Information Management Journal*. 2008;37:19–29.
40. Diamond IR, Grant RC, Feldman BM, et al. Defining consensus: a systematic review recommends methodologic criteria for reporting of Delphi studies. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2014;67:401–409.
41. Cai L, Zhu Y. The challenges of data quality and data quality assessment in the big data era. *Data Science Journal*. 2015;14:2.
42. Humphrey-Murto S, Varpio L, Gonsalves C, et al. Using consensus group methods such as Delphi and Nominal Group in medical education research. *Medical Teacher*. 2017;39:14–19.
43. Breland JY, Tseng C-H, Toyama J, et al. Influence of depression on racial and ethnic disparities in diabetes control. *BMJ Open Diabetes Research & Care*. 2023;11:e003612.
44. Heckathorn DD. Snowball versus respondent-driven sampling. *Sociological Methodology*. 2011;41:355–366.