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Presentation Overview

• Background
• Methods
• Results
• Implications
• Limitations
• Future Research
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Definition of CDSS

• “any electronic system designed to aid directly in clinical decisionmaking, in which characteristics of individual patients are used to generate patient-specific assessments or recommendations that are then presented to clinicians for consideration.”

Definition of KMS

- a tool that selectively provides information relevant to the characteristics or circumstances of a clinical situation but which requires human interpretation for direct application to a specific patient.

- Examples:
  - Information retrieval tool
  - Knowledge resource
## Continuum of Decision Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of decision support interventions</th>
<th>Classic clinical decision support</th>
<th>Information retrieval tool</th>
<th>Knowledge resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Preventive care reminder</td>
<td>Infobutton</td>
<td>Epocrates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals & Scope

- Goals: to summarize the available evidence related to CDSSs and KMSs, highlight the limitations of the evidence, and identify areas for future research.

- **KQ 1**: What evidence-based study designs have been used to determine the clinical effectiveness of electronic knowledge management and CDSSs?

- **KQ 2**: What contextual factors/features influence the effectiveness or success of electronic knowledge management and CDSSs?
Scope (Cont)

- **KQ 3**: What is the impact of introducing electronic knowledge management and CDSSs?
  - 3a. Changes in the organization of health care delivery
  - 3b. Changes in the workload and efficiency for the user
  - 3c. Changes in health care process measures and clinical outcomes
Scope (cont)

• **KQ 4**: What generalizable knowledge can be integrated into electronic knowledge management and CDSSs to improve health care quality?
  
  – 4a. Knowledge from published evidence about electronic knowledge management and CDSSs to improve health care quality based on different types of measures (health care process, relationship-centered, clinical, economic)
  
  – 4b. How a clinician’s expertise/proficiency/informatics competency using the electronic knowledge management and CDSS affects patient outcomes (one type of measure)
Data Sources

• Peer-reviewed literature databases
  – Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL®)
  – Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews
  – MEDLINE® accessed via PubMed®
  – PsycINFO®
  – Web of Science®

• Manual searching of reference lists
Inclusion Criteria

- Electronic CDSS or KMS
- Healthcare provider interaction with system
- Comparator
- Measurable outcomes of interest
- Study design: KQ1: all; KQ2-4: RCTs
- English language
Exclusion Criteria

- System not used in real clinical setting
- Closed loop systems (no provider)
- Mandatory compliance with recommendations
- Sample size <50
15,176 citations identified by literature search:
- MEDLINE: 12,746
- CINAHL + PsycINFO: 1126
- Web of Science: 1277
- Manual searching: 27

1407 articles passed abstract screening

13,769 abstracts excluded

1084 articles excluded

Study design other than RCT: 163

323 articles passed full-text screening and were abstracted for KQ 1

160 articles were abstracted for KQs 2–4 (represents 148 unique studies)
## Outcome Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>Length of stay, morbidity, mortality, health-related quality of life, adverse events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care process</td>
<td>Adoption/implementation of CDSS/KMS-recommended preventive care/clinical study/treatment, patient adherence to CDSS/KMS recommendation, impact on user knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care provider workload, efficiency, and organization</td>
<td>Number of patients seen/unit time, clinician workload, efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship-centered</td>
<td>Patient satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Cost, cost-effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care provider use and implementation</td>
<td>User acceptance, satisfaction, and use and implementation of CDSS/KMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## System Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General System Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with charting or order entry system to support workflow integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinician-System Interaction Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic provision of decision support as part of clinician workflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need for additional clinician data entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request documentation of the reason for not following CDSS recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of decision support at time and location of decisionmaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations executed by noting agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## System Features (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication Content Features</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of a recommendation, not just an assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of action rather than inaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification of decision support via provision of reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification of decision support via provision of research evidence*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auxiliary Features</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local user involvement in development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of decision support results to patients as well as providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDSS accompanied by periodic performance feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDSS accompanied by conventional education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KQ1: Study Designs for CDSS

• 311 studies were reviewed
  – 148 RCTs (47.5%),
  – 121 quasi-experimental (38.9%)
  – 42 observational studies (13.5%)
• Clinical outcomes: 19.6% of RCTs, 35.5% of quasi-experimental, 40.5% of observational studies
• Health care process measures: 86.5% of RCTs, 75.2% of quasi-experimental, 69% of observational studies
KQ2: System Features

- Previously identified factors/features*
  - Automatic provision of decision support as part of clinician workflow
  - Provision of decision support at time and location of decisionmaking
  - Provision of a recommendation, not just an assessment

KQ2: System Features (cont)

• Newly identified factors/features
  – Integration with charting/order entry system
  – No need for additional data entry
  – Promotion of action rather than inaction
  – Justification of decision support via provision of research evidence
  – Local user involvement in the development process
  – Provision of decision support results to patients as well as providers
KQ3: Impact of CDSS/KMS

- Changes in the organization of health care delivery (3a)
  - Insufficient evidence

- Changes in the workload and efficiency for the user (3b)
  - Insufficient evidence
KQ3: Impact of CDSS/KMS

• Changes in healthcare process measures (3c)
  – Recommended preventive care service ordered/completed (n=43, 20 good quality)
    • Odds ratio: 1.42 (95% CI 1.27 to 1.58), n= 25
  – Recommended clinical study ordered/ completed (n=29, 16 good quality)
    • Odds ratio:1.72 (95% CI 1.47 to 2.00), n=20
  – Recommended treatment ordered/ prescribed (n=67, 35 good quality)
    • Odds ratio: 1.57 (95% CI 1.35 to 1.82), n=46
KQ3: Impact of CDSS/KMS

• Changes in clinical outcomes (3c)
  – Length of stay (n=6, 6 good quality)
    • Relative risk: 0.96 (95% CI 0.88 to 1.05), n= 5,
  – Morbidity (n=22, 13 good quality)
    • Relative risk: 0.88 (95% CI 0.80 to 0.96), n=16
  – Mortality (n=7, 6 good quality)
    • Odds ratio: 0.79 (95% CI 0.54 to 1.15), n=6
KQ3: Impact of CDSS/KMS

• Changes in economic outcomes (3c)
  – Cost (n=22, 10 good quality)
    • Trend toward lower costs and greater cost savings
  – Cost-effectiveness (n=6, 1 good quality)
    • Insufficient
KQ4: Generalizable Knowledge

• Structured care protocols (61 studies, 41.2%)

• Clinical practice guidelines that focused on a single or limited set of medical conditions (42 studies, 28.4%)
CDSS Features/Factors

• Nine CDSS features/factors associated with effective impact
• General system features, clinician-system interaction features, communication content features, and auxiliary features
• Factors/features were present across the breadth of CDSS implementations in diverse venues using both locally and commercially developed systems
CDSS/KMS Outcomes

- Strong evidence that CDSSs/KMSs favorably impacted health care processes, including facilitating preventive care services, ordering clinical studies, and prescribing treatments
- Effect spanned diverse venues and systems
- Effect now been observed at community sites and with use of commercially developed systems
Gaps in the Evidence

- Effects of clinical decision support on clinical and economic outcomes remains limited
- Limited evidence showing an impact of clinical decision support on clinical workload and efficiency
- Most of the published RCTs on CDSSs focused on a single or limited set of conditions
- Most studies concentrated on decision support delivered to physicians
- Only 3 RCTs on KMSs
Limitations

• Publication bias
  – No consistent bias for most endpoints
  – Strong bias detected around CDSS promoting adherence to ordering a clinical study

• Heterogeneous literature: systems, populations, settings, outcomes

• Unable to isolate impact of individual features/factors

• Variable level of system detail in manuscripts

• Focused on RCTs
Future Directions

- CDSSs that simultaneously address a breadth of comorbid conditions
- Approaches to delivering CDSS/KMS content
- Methods for integrating CDSS/KMS into workflow
- CDSS/KMS for non-physician users
Future Studies

- Studies on clinical outcomes
- Studies on economic endpoints
- Studies on KMSs
Analytic Framework

Factors/features
General system features
- Integration with charting or order entry system to support workflow integration

Clinician-system interaction features
- Automatic provision of decision support as part of clinician workflow
- No need for additional clinician data entry
- Request documentation of the reason for not following CDSS/KMS recommendations
- Provision of decision support at time and location of decisionmaking
- Recommendations executed by noting agreement

Communication content features
- Provision of a recommendation, not just an assessment
- Promotion of action rather than inaction
- Justification of decision support via provision of reasoning
- Justification of decision support via provision of research evidence

Auxiliary features
- Local user involvement in development process
- Provision of decision support results to patients as well as providers
- CDSS/KMS accompanied by periodic performance feedback
- CDSS/KMS accompanied by conventional education

Population
System users
Organization

Comparators
CDSS/KMS vs no electronic CDSS/KMS
Basic CDSS/KMS vs advanced CDSS/KMS in CPOE
Basic CDSS/KMS vs advanced CDSS/KMS in a standalone system

Outcomes
Clinical
Health care process
Workload, efficiency, organization of health care delivery
Relationship-centered
Economic
Use and implementation
KQ2: System Features—Odds Ratios

- Previously identified factors/features
  - Automatic provision of decision support as part of clinician workflow
    - Odds ratio (OR): 1.45, 95% CI of 1.28 to 1.64 for adherence to preventive care (PC), n = 19
    - OR: 1.85, 95% CI of 1.52 to 2.25 for ordering of clinical studies (OS), n = 15
    - OR: 1.59 95% CI of 1.33 to 1.90 for prescribing or ordering of therapy (OT), n = 38
  - Provision of decision support at time and location of decisionmaking
    - OR: 1.35, 95% CI of 1.20 to 1.52 for PC, n = 22
    - OR: 1.78, 95% CI of 1.46 to 2.17 for OS, n = 15
    - OR: 1.75, 95% CI of 1.47 to 2.08 for PT, n = 37
  - Provision of a recommendation, not just an assessment
    - OR: 1.50, 95% CI of 1.30 to 1.74 for PC, n = 18
    - OR: 2.01, 95% CI of 1.63 to 2.48 for OS, n = 15
    - OR: 1.61, 95% CI of 1.34 to 1.93 for PT, n = 36
KQ2: System Features-OR (cont)

• Newly identified factors/features
  – Integration with charting/order entry system
    • OR: 1.47, 95% CI of 1.21 to 1.77 for PC, n = 13
    • OR: 1.56, 95% CI of 1.29 to 1.87 for OS, n = 9
    • OR: 1.67, 95% CI of 1.39 to 2.00 for PT, n = 36
  – No need for additional data entry
    • OR: 1.43, 95% CI of 1.22 to 1.69 for PC, n = 16
    • OR: 1.58, 95% CI of 1.31 to 1.89 for OS, n = 11
    • OR: 1.78, 95% CI of 1.44 to 2.19 for PT, n = 30
  – Promotion of action rather than inaction
    • OR: 1.28, 95% CI of 1.09 to 1.50 for PC, n = 15
    • OR: 1.52, 95% CI of 1.23 to 1.87 for OS, n = 9
    • OR: 1.71, 95% CI of 1.35 to 2.16 for PT, n = 22
KQ2: System Features-OR (cont)

• Newly identified factors/features
  – Justification of decision support via provision of research evidence
    • OR: 1.60, 95% CI of 1.04 to 2.46 for PC, n = 5
    • OR: 2.93, 95% CI of 1.40 to 6.12 for OS, n = 5
    • OR: 1.59, 95% CI of 1.13 to 2.24 for PT, n = 15
  – Local user involvement in the development process
    • OR: 1.45, 95% CI of 1.23 to 1.73 for PC, n = 11
    • OR: 1.41, 95% CI of 1.18 to 1.70 for OS, n = 10
    • OR: 1.90, 95% CI of 1.38 to 2.61 for PT, n = 20
  – Provision of decision support results to patients as well as providers
    • OR: 1.18, 95% CI of 1.02 to 1.37 for PC, n = 5
    • OR: 1.41, 95% CI of 1.26 to 1.58 for OS, n = 5
    • OR: 1.97, 95% CI of 1.20 to 3.21 for PT, n = 5
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Objectives

• Evidence Report
  – Review the literature of MMIT
  – Synthesize evidence
  – Identify gaps
  – Make recommendations

• Webinar
  – Introduce the report
  – “shape” of the literature base
Content

• Medication management
• Health information technology
• No restrictions on
  – Settings
  – People involved
  – Conditions
  – Geography
  – Time
  – Study design
Medication Management Phases—Bell Model*

- Prescribing
- Order communication
- Dispensing
- Administering
- Monitoring
- Plus
  - Reconciliation
  - Education

MMIT Inclusion Criteria

The information technology

- Processed patient-specific information
- Sent clinical data to a decision maker
- Integrated with another IT system
Key Questions for MMIT

1. Effectiveness
2. Gaps in knowledge and evidence
3. Value proposition
4. System characteristics
5. Sustainability
6. 2-way electronic data interchange (EDI) for order communication
7. RCTs for CDSS
Literature Searches

Databases (n = 11)

- Health
- Technology
- Business
- Grey literature

40,582 → 428 articles

Growth in 2000s
Settings - Number of Studies

- Hospitals: 260
- Ambulatory care: 150
- Pharmacies: 60
- Long term care: 10
- Community, home: 5

Y-axis: Number of Studies
X-axis: 0 - 300
Patients and Caregivers-
Number of Studies

- Infants
- Children
- Adolescents
- Adults
- Middle age
- Geriatrics
MMIT-Number of Studies

- CDSS/reminders
- CPOE/POE
- e-Prescribing
- Bar coding administration
- e-Medication administration
- Handhelds, PDAs
- Pharmacy information systems
- EDI-order transmission
- Other
KQ1a Effectiveness
Process Changes

• Many studies
• Lots of RCTs
• Set in hospitals
• Many positive findings

......examples
KQ1a Effectiveness Process—Prescribing

174 studies

• Changes: 85 of 104 studies +
  – Better matches for antibiotics or doses

• Errors: 17 of 24 studies +
  – Potential drug interactions, wrong doses

• Compliance: 28 of 36 studies +
  – Reminders, guidelines, best practices

• Workflow: 1 of 2 studies +
KQ1a Effectiveness
Process—Administration

16 studies

• **Errors**: 8 of 13 studies +, 1 -
  – Timing of administration

• **Compliance**: 2 of 3 studies +
  – Guidelines

• **Time for administration tasks**: 3 of 4 +
  – Mostly time spend on recording

• **Workflow**: 1 of 1 study +
KQ1 Effectiveness
Clinical Endpoints

76 studies—all methods
• 54% show improvements

23 RCTs with primary clinical outcomes
• 43% show improvements

26 RCTs with secondary clinical outcomes
• 12% show improvements
KQ1 Effectiveness
Clinical Endpoints

76 studies—all methods

- Length of stay: 7 of 14 studies +, 1 -
- Quality of life: 1 of 5 studies +
- Adverse drug events: 8 of 12 studies +
- Disease events: 6 of 16 studies +
  - Blood clots, infections, depression
- Physiological measurements: 18 of 32 +
  - Blood pressure, glucose levels
KQ1 Effectiveness
Clinical Endpoints—Mortality

CPOE in US pediatric hospitals
3 cohort studies with historical controls

Han 2005  increase  OR 3.3 (CI 1.9 to 5.6)
Keene 2007  no difference  OR 0.7 (CI 0.3 to 1.6)
Longhurst 2010  decrease  1.01 vs 0.71 deaths/100 discharges per month

PubMed IDs: Han 16322178  Keene 17417119  Longhurst 20439590
KQ1 Effectiveness Economic/Cost Endpoints

5 full economic evaluations
26 cost analyses studies

• Lack cost data related to
  – Capital investment
  – Implementation

• Cost savings possible over time
KQ1 Effectiveness
Qualitative Studies

56 qualitative and mixed methods studies

- Similar themes across settings and users
- Expectations were unrealistic
- Strong emotions involved
- Important changes to process occurred
- New errors were introduced
- Technology affected working relationships
KQ1 Effectiveness
Unintended consequences

18 studies: Qualitative and Quantitative
Both positive and negative

- Errors
- Alert fatigue
- Changing roles
- Communication
- Workflow

  - Flexibility
  - Power of displays
  - Dependence
  - Workarounds
KQ7 RCTs of CDSS

• Well studied
• Focused on only RCTs (n = 77)
• Prescribing and monitoring phases
• Outcomes for the MMIT RCTs
  – 36 process changes: 67% positive
  – 16 clinical endpoints: 31% positive
KQ3 Value Proposition

• Financial
  – Cost reduction
  – Revenue enhancement
  – Productivity gain

• Clinical
  – Care process improvements
  – Improved patient outcomes

• Organizational
  – Stakeholder satisfaction improvements
  – Risk mitigation

...evidence leans towards a positive VP
KQ5 Sustainability

• What is sustainability?
  – Discussed in health IT literature
  – Poorly defined
  – No studies assessing sustainability

• Most relevant definition:
  “the ability of a health service to provide ongoing access to appropriate quality care in a cost-effective and health-effective manner”
  (Humphreys et al.)
KQ6 2-way EDI (order communication)

- Facilitators for EDI:
  - Incentives
  - Supportive regulatory environment
  - Messaging standards for EDI

- Barriers to EDI:
  - Effects on pharmacists and pharmacies
  - Regulatory and legal uncertainties
  - Low preexisting adoption rates of EMRs and EHRs
Call to Action—Research Focus

• Phases
  – Order communication, dispensing, and administering

• People
  – Pharmacists, nurses, and mental health
  – Patients and families

• Information technologies
  – that are used by and for these people
Call to Action—Research Expansion

• Studies with control groups
• Move beyond process measures
• Balance qualitative/quantitative studies
• Teams with broad input
  – Methodologists -- Statisticians
  – Clinicians -- Technology experts
• Complete work on the value proposition
• Sort out sustainability
Call to Action: Researchers

• Develop new research methods using our own data collection capabilities
• Better adherence to reporting standards (longer articles)
• Better use of terminologies and standard definitions
• Be serious about knowledge translation/translational research efforts
Call to Action: Implementers

• Manage expectations
• Look for and value unintended consequences
• Recognize systems change relations and communication patterns
• Updating needs are not addressed
  – systems themselves
  – knowledge base of our systems
US History of Medicine Collection NLM
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Background

• Health Information technologies may enable future transformations in Healthcare delivery quality, outcomes and costs. There is growing interest in electronic tools that are owned and operated primarily by patients and healthcare consumers.

• Consumer Health Informatics (CHI) is defined as any electronic tool, technology or electronic application that is designed to interact directly with consumers, with or without the presence of a healthcare professional, that provides or uses individualized (personal) information and provides the consumer with individualized assistance, to help the patient better manage their health or healthcare.

• The objectives of this report were to review the literature on the evidence of the health impact of currently developed CHI applications, to identify the gaps in the CHI literature, and to make recommendations for future CHI research.
Key Questions

1) What evidence exists that CHI applications impact:
   - Health care process outcomes (e.g., receiving appropriate treatment) among users?
   - Intermediate health outcomes (e.g. self management, health knowledge, and health behaviors) among users?
   - Relationship-centered outcomes (e.g. shared decision making or clinician-patient communication) among users?
   - Clinical outcomes (including quality of life) among users?
   - Economic outcomes (e.g., cost and access to care) among users?

2) What are the barriers that clinicians, developers, consumers and their families or caregivers encounter that limit utilization or implementation of CHI applications?

3) What knowledge or evidence exists to support estimates of cost, benefit, and net value with regard to CHI applications?

4) What critical information regarding the impact of CHI applications is needed to give consumers, their families, clinicians, and developers a clear understanding of the value proposition particular to them?
Methodology

• Search strategy
  – RCT’s Only (Key Question #1)
  – All study designs (Key Questions #2, #3, #4)

• Databases
  – MEDLINE®, EMBASE®, The Cochrane Library, Scopus, and CINAHL
  – Published reviews, Grey literature
  – Query of technical experts, advisors, and project investigators

• Exclusion Criteria
  – No health informatics application, Application does not apply to the consumer,
    General health information application (general Web site) and is not tailored to
    individual consumers, “Point of care” device (defined as requiring a clinician to use
    or obtain and is part of the regular provision of care), or No original data provided.
Methodology

• Quality assessment
  – Jadad Criteria
  – GRADE Working Group Criteria

• Double data review and Quality assessment

• Iterative feedback and review by TEP & External Advisors
Results for Process & Intermediate outcomes

• Significant (+) impact of CHI in at least one outcome
  – Process outcomes
    • 4 of 5 asthma studies
  – Intermediate outcomes
    • 100% of 3 breast cancer studies,
    • 89% of # diet/exercise/physical activity studies
    • 100% of XXX alcohol abuse studies,
    • #% of # smoking cessation studies,
    • 40% of # obesity studies,
    • 100% of # Diabetes studies,
    • 88% of # mental health studies,
    • 25% of # asthma/COPD studies
    • 50% of two menopause/HRT utilization studies.
    • 13 miscellaneous single studies
Results for Clinical outcomes

• Significant (+) impact of CHI in at least one outcome
  – Doctor-Patient relationship
    • 5 of 8 studies
  – Clinical outcomes
    • 1 of 3 breast cancer studies
    • 80% of 5 diet/exercise/physical activity studies
    • 100% of 7 mental health studies
    • 100% of 3 Diabetes studies
    • xx% of # miscellaneous single studies

• No evidence of consumer harm attributable to CHI

• Insufficient evidence to determine economic impact of CHI

• Several individual & system level utilization barriers found
Discussion

• Current literature is broad (studies on many topic areas) but at times thin (limited number of studies in each topic area)

• Emerging themes
  – CHI applications can significantly impact health outcomes
  – CHI applications may also be effective adjuvants to traditional healthcare
  – Effective CHI applications include 1) individual tailoring, 2) personalization and 3) behavioral feedback.
Discussion

• **Knowledge Gaps regarding CHI**
  – The role of CHI applications targeting children, adolescents, the elderly and caregivers.
  – The role of Web 2.0, social networking, “On Demand”, Television and health gaming technology in CHI applications.
  – Consumer knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, perceptions and practices regarding technology utilization, particularly among priority populations.
  – The effect of CHI applications on health outcomes among racial and ethnic minority populations, low literacy populations and the potential effect of these applications on healthcare disparities.
  – The impact of CHI content design (software) vs platform design (hardware) on consumer utilization and outcomes.

• **Research needs and opportunities**
  – Standardized interdisciplinary CHI nomenclature.
  – A CHI Design & evaluation registry.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>Length of stay, morbidity, mortality, health-related quality of life, adverse events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care process</td>
<td>Adoption/implementation of CDSS/KMS-recommended preventative care/clinical study/treatment, patient adherence to CDSS/KMS recommendation, impact on user knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care provider workload, efficiency, and organization</td>
<td>Number of patients seen/unit time, clinician workload, efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship-centered</td>
<td>Patient Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Cost, cost-effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care provider use and implementation</td>
<td>User acceptance, satisfaction, and use and implementation of CDSS/KMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>