The Review Of
DIABETIC
STUDIES OPEN ACCESS

The Impact Of Administrative Workflow Efficiency On Patient Satisfaction In Healthcare Facilities

Mohammed Abdullah Abdulrahman Alqahtani[1], Faisal Abdulrahman Shahouf Al-Anzi[2], Abdulhadi Faleh Obaed Alqahtani[3], Abdullah Ahmed Alsufyani[4], Majed Ayidh Sinhat Alqahtani[5], Hessa Fahd Saleh Al-Baqmi[6], Ahmad Jaber Darwesh Aldhafeeri[7], Haya Dhuhayyan Saleh Al-Johani[8], Nabil Ibrahim Al-Othman[9], Ahmad Abdulhadi Ghattar Alqahtani[10], Farhan Anetet Al Enazy[11], Hamoud Gerezy Wanas El Shamry[12], Waleed Ibrahim Hussain Altaymani[13], Sultan Fahad Eid[14], Arsheed Otaibt Gamaan Al Enazy[15]

[1]Health Services Management, Tathleeth General Hospital, Aseer
[2]Health Services Management, Hafr Al-Batin, Maternity and Children's Hospital in Hafr Al-Batin
[3]Health Services Management, Tathleeth General Hospital, Aseer
[4]Hospital Management, Awda Health Center, Makkah Al-Mukarramah region
[5]Health Services Management, Tathleeth General Hospital, Aseer
[6]Specialization: Health Information Specialist, Hospital: Al-Kharj Women's, Maternity and Children's Hospital, Riyadh-Al-Kharj
[7]Health Services and Hospitals Management, Maternity and Children's Hospital, Hafr Al-batin
[8]Medical Secretary Technician, Medina Health Cluster, ALMadina
[9]Health Services and Hospitals Management, Hospital/ Imam Abdul Rahman Al Faisal, Riyadh
[10]Health Services Management, Tathleeth General Hospital, Aseer
[11]Medical Records and Health Information Technician, PAAMCC, Arar, Northern Border
[12]Health Administration Department, Rafha Health Supervision Office, Rafha, Northern Borders, Saudi Arabia
[13]Health Administration Assistant, Specialist, Allaqaeat Primary Health Care, Aljouf
[14]AL QAHTANI, Health Administration, Al-Kharj Maternity and Children's Hospital, Al Riyadh
[15]Department of Health Services Administration, Financial Support Unit, Ministry Branch, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

This comprehensive research article examines the multifaceted relationship between administrative workflow efficiency and patient satisfaction within healthcare facilities. It posits that beyond clinical competence, the quality and smoothness of the patient's administrative journey—from initial contact to post-discharge follow-up—are critical determinants of overall experience and perceived care quality. The study employs a holistic, systems-based analysis, dissecting key administrative touchpoints: appointment scheduling and accessibility, streamlined check-in and registration, inter-departmental coordination and patient flow, and the discharge, billing, and follow-up processes. It further investigates the dual role of technology (EHRs, patient portals, digital tools) as both an enabler of efficiency and a potential source of new barriers, and underscores the indispensable human factor of staff training, communication, and the mitigation of administrative burden. The synthesis of these elements reveals that patient satisfaction is inextricably linked to the seamless integration of operational, technological, and human-centered strategies. The article concludes that intentional investment in end-to-end administrative workflow optimization is not merely an operational concern but a fundamental pillar of patient-centered care, directly impacting satisfaction scores, clinical outcomes, and institutional sustainability.

Keywords Patient Satisfaction; Healthcare Administration; Workflow Efficiency; Patient Experience; Healthcare Operations; Electronic Health Records (EHR); Patient Portals; Care Coordination; Administrative Burden; Quality Improvement.

Introduction:

The global healthcare landscape is undergoing a period of unprecedented transformation and strain. Rising patient expectations, increasing clinical complexity, financial pressures, and the aftermath of global health crises have collectively highlighted the critical importance of systemic efficiency and resilience. While clinical outcomes—the accuracy of a diagnosis, the success of a surgery, the efficacy of a treatment—remain the undisputed cornerstone of medical care, there is a growing recognition that the patient's experience within the healthcare system is equally vital. This experience is profoundly shaped not only by clinical interactions but also, and perhaps more pervasively, by the administrative processes that envelop them. From the moment a patient seeks an appointment to the final resolution of a bill, a labyrinth of administrative tasks defines their journey. Consequently, the efficiency of administrative workflows has emerged as a pivotal, yet often undervalued, determinant of overall patient satisfaction, operational performance, and, ultimately, the quality of care.

Patient satisfaction is a multi-dimensional construct that extends beyond the perceived competence of physicians and nurses. It encompasses interpersonal aspects such as communication, empathy, and respect, as well as structural or organizational factors including accessibility, timeliness, physical environment, and administrative smoothness [1,2]. In this context, administrative workflows refer to the sequence of interconnected tasks, documents, and communications required to manage non-clinical operations within a healthcare facility. This includes, but is not limited to, appointment scheduling, patient registration and check-in, insurance verification, medical records management, inter-departmental coordination, billing, and discharge processes. Inefficiencies in these workflows—manifesting as long wait times, redundant paperwork, scheduling errors, poor communication, and billing inaccuracies—generate what is often termed "administrative burden." This burden imposes significant costs on both healthcare providers, in the form of wasted resources and staff burnout, and on patients, in the form of frustration, anxiety, and a diminished perception of care quality [3,4].

The theoretical underpinning of this relationship is strongly rooted in service quality models, such as the SERVQUAL framework, which identifies tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy as key determinants of perceived service quality [5]. Administrative efficiency directly impacts reliability (fulfilling promises on time), responsiveness (willingness to help and provide prompt service), and tangibles (the appearance of facilities and personnel). When administrative systems fail, they erode trust (assurance) and can make empathetic care seem disingenuous. Furthermore, the Stress-Coping Framework suggests that the healthcare environment itself can be a source of stress for patients [6]. Inefficient administrative processes act as potent "hassle factors" that exacerbate this stress, detracting from the patient's cognitive and emotional energy needed to understand their condition and participate in their own care. A patient preoccupied with a scheduling mix-up or a confusing bill is less likely to be an engaged and satisfied partner in the healing process.

A review of the existing literature substantiates the significant, though complex, link between workflow efficiency and patient satisfaction. Studies consistently demonstrate that prolonged waiting times, both in the waiting room and between stages of care, are among the strongest predictors of patient dissatisfaction [7,8]. This is not merely about the passage of time but about perceived wasted time and a lack of respect for the patient's schedule. Research by Anderson et al. [9] found that transparency about wait times and efficient scheduling systems can mitigate negative perceptions, even when actual waits are not drastically reduced.

Moreover, the administrative interface at the beginning and end of the care episode holds particular weight. A cumbersome, paper-heavy registration process creates a negative first impression, setting a tone of inefficiency [10]. Conversely, a streamlined, digital check-in process that minimizes repetition is associated with higher initial satisfaction scores. At the discharge and billing stage, clarity and accuracy are paramount. Studies have shown that confusing or erroneous bills are a primary source of complaint and can obliterate positive memories of clinical care [11]. Efficient workflows in medical records management also play a crucial role; timely access to patient information by all authorized providers reduces errors, prevents

duplication of tests, and facilitates coordinated care, all of which enhance the patient's experience of seamlessness and competence [12].

The advent of health information technology (HIT) has introduced powerful tools to optimize these workflows. Electronic Health Records (EHRs), patient portals, online scheduling, and automated reminder systems promise to reduce manual errors, accelerate information flow, and empower patients. However, the literature also cautions that poorly implemented technology can become a barrier itself, adding layers of complexity for staff and patients alike if not integrated thoughtfully into human-centric processes [13].

The First Touchpoint: Appointment Scheduling and Accessibility

The journey of a patient within the healthcare system, and their subsequent perception of its quality and compassion, begins not within the walls of a clinic or at a physician's desk, but at the very first moment they attempt to secure an appointment. This initial administrative interaction—the process of scheduling and accessing care—functions as the critical first touchpoint. It sets the foundational tone for the entire care experience, establishing expectations for efficiency, responsiveness, and patient-centeredness. In an era where convenience and immediacy are often demanded in other service sectors, patients bring these same expectations to healthcare. Consequently, the efficiency and design of appointment scheduling systems are paramount determinants of initial satisfaction, accessibility, and ultimately, health equity. An inefficient scheduling gateway can deter individuals from seeking necessary care, create frustration that colors all subsequent interactions, and reveal systemic inefficiencies that extend far beyond the front desk [14].

The psychological impact of this first touchpoint cannot be overstated. From a service marketing perspective, the scheduling experience forms the patient's first concrete impression of the healthcare organization, shaping what is known as the "service blueprint." A cumbersome, time-consuming, or confusing process immediately signals to the patient that the institution may be disorganized, inconsiderate of their time, or technologically archaic. This primes them for a negative bias that can be difficult to overcome, even with excellent clinical care later. Research by Prakash (2010) emphasizes that perceived control is a key component of patient satisfaction [15]. When scheduling systems are inflexible—offering limited slots, requiring phone calls during restrictive business hours, or providing no self-service options—patients feel a loss of control over their own healthcare journey. This perceived powerlessness can increase anxiety and decrease trust before the clinical encounter even begins. Conversely, a smooth, transparent, and patient-controlled scheduling experience fosters a sense of partnership, respect, and professionalism from the outset.

Traditionally, appointment scheduling has been dominated by phone-based systems, which are fraught with inefficiencies for both patients and staff. For patients, this often means navigating automated phone menus, enduring long hold times, and playing "phone tag" with administrative personnel. The process is frequently conducted during the patient's own work hours, adding a layer of stress and logistical difficulty. For healthcare facilities, phone-centric scheduling consumes substantial human resources, as staff members are tied up in repetitive conversations that could be automated. It also leads to high rates of missed calls, voicemail delays, and errors in data transcription, resulting in scheduling inaccuracies, double-bookings, and no-shows. These inefficiencies create a vicious cycle: understaffed phone lines lead to longer wait times, which increase patient frustration and the likelihood of missed appointments, further destabilizing the clinic's schedule and resource allocation [16].

The digital transformation of healthcare has introduced powerful tools to revolutionize this first touchpoint. Online scheduling portals, integrated directly into Electronic Health Record (EHR) systems, offer a paradigm shift. These platforms allow patients to view available appointments in real-time, book, reschedule, or cancel at their convenience, 24 hours a day, from any internet-connected device. This level of accessibility and autonomy is highly correlated with increased patient satisfaction. Studies show that patients using online scheduling report greater convenience, a stronger sense of control, and reduced frustration compared to those relying on traditional phone methods [17]. Furthermore, for the provider,

these systems automate a labor-intensive task, reduce phone volume, minimize clerical errors, and can be designed to enforce scheduling rules and prepopulate patient data, enhancing overall operational efficiency. Automated appointment reminder systems, via SMS text or email, are another workflow innovation stemming from this digital shift. These reminders have proven highly effective in reducing no-show rates, which directly improves clinic throughput, optimizes resource use, and prevents revenue loss [18].

However, the shift to digital-first scheduling, while beneficial, introduces its own set of challenges and risks exacerbating health disparities if not implemented with equity in mind. The "digital divide"—the gap between those who have ready access to computers and the internet and those who do not—poses a significant barrier. Elderly populations, low-income individuals, and those in rural areas may lack reliable broadband access, the necessary digital literacy, or even a smartphone to utilize online portals [19]. An over-reliance on digital tools without maintaining robust, humane alternative pathways (such as a well-staffed phone line or in-person assistance) can systematically exclude these vulnerable groups, worsening existing inequalities in healthcare access. Therefore, accessibility in scheduling must be defined not only by technological capability but also by inclusivity. True accessibility means providing multiple, parallel channels that cater to diverse patient needs and competencies, ensuring that the move towards efficiency does not come at the cost of equity [20].

Beyond the mode of scheduling, the structure of appointment availability is a crucial component of workflow efficiency and satisfaction. Long lead times for obtaining an appointment, especially for non-urgent primary or specialty care, are a major source of patient dissatisfaction and a potential deterrent to seeking care. Practices that utilize advanced access or "open access" scheduling principles aim to see patients on the day they call, significantly reducing wait times. While full implementation can be challenging, even partial adoption, such as reserving a portion of daily slots for same-day or next-day appointments, can dramatically improve patient perceptions of responsiveness and care continuity [21]. Furthermore, intelligent scheduling systems can stratify appointments by type (e.g., physical exam, follow-up, consultation) and estimated duration, allowing for more accurate booking and reducing the cascading delays caused when one overrun disrupts an entire clinic session. This proactive management of the schedule is a direct reflection of administrative workflow efficiency manifesting at the very first point of contact [22].

The integration of scheduling data with broader clinical workflows is the next frontier for this first touchpoint. Modern systems can trigger pre-appointment workflows automatically, such as sending digital pre-registration forms, health questionnaires, or instructions for preparation (e.g., fasting for a lab test). This not only improves clinical preparedness but also shortens in-person registration times, creating a smoother transition from the virtual touchpoint to the physical one. Additionally, data analytics applied to scheduling patterns can provide administrators with invaluable insights into demand cycles, provider productivity, and bottleneck forecasting, enabling continuous process improvement [23]. However, this data-driven approach must be balanced with human-centric design. As Holden et al. (2013) note in their research on technology implementation in healthcare, systems that are designed purely for backend efficiency without considering the user experience for both staff and patients can lead to workarounds, frustration, and ultimately, failure to realize the intended benefits [24].

From Waiting Room to Exam Room: Streamlining Check-in and Registration

Following the initial scheduling touchpoint, the patient's physical arrival at the healthcare facility marks the second critical juncture where administrative workflow efficiency is tangibly tested and perceived. The journey from the waiting room to the exam room, encompassing the entire check-in and registration process, is a complex operational sequence that serves as a barometer for the organization's overall competence and respect for the patient's time and dignity. This phase transforms a scheduled appointment into a physical encounter, and its execution—often under the pressures of time, volume, and patient anxiety—can either reinforce a positive initial impression or irrevocably damage the patient-provider relationship before clinical care begins. A streamlined, respectful, and efficient check-in process is not merely a logistical

necessity; it is a fundamental component of patient-centered care that reduces perceived wait times, minimizes frustration, ensures accurate data collection, and sets a calm, controlled tone for the clinical interaction to follow [26].

The traditional patient check-in model is notoriously fraught with inefficiencies that contribute significantly to administrative burden and patient dissatisfaction. Typically, this process involves the patient waiting in a queue to speak to a front-desk staff member, who must then manually verify a multitude of details: identity, contact information, insurance eligibility, current medications, and the reason for the visit. This data is often entered into multiple systems or duplicated on paper forms, a task that is repetitive, time-consuming, and prone to error. From the patient's perspective, this often translates to long, uncertain waits in crowded waiting areas, repetitive questioning (the "clipboard syndrome"), and a sense of being processed like a number rather than cared for as a person. Studies have consistently shown that the actual wait time in the clinic, particularly the "front-end" wait between arrival and being seen by a provider, is one of the strongest predictors of overall satisfaction scores [27]. This period is psychologically charged; patients are often anxious about their health, and unproductive waiting amplifies stress and perceived neglect, directly contradicting the ethos of care the facility aims to project [28].

To combat these inefficiencies, healthcare facilities are increasingly turning to technology-driven solutions aimed at re-engineering the front-desk experience. Self-service kiosks, modeled on those used in the airline and hospitality industries, represent a significant innovation. These kiosks allow patients to check themselves in, verify demographic and insurance information, sign consent forms, and even make copayments using credit or debit cards. This technology offloads routine transactional tasks from front-desk staff, allowing them to focus on complex cases, problem-solving, and providing personalized assistance where truly needed. Research by Forducey et al. indicates that properly implemented kiosk systems can reduce check-in times by up to 50%, decrease front-desk staffing pressures, and improve data accuracy by allowing patients to enter their own information directly [29]. Perhaps more importantly, they offer patients a sense of agency and progress, as they are actively engaged in moving their own visit forward rather than passively waiting for a busy staff member.

Complementing and often preceding in-person kiosk use is the strategy of digital pre-registration. This involves sending patients secure, electronic forms via email or a patient portal in the days leading up to their appointment. Patients can then complete all necessary paperwork—medical history updates, medication lists, insurance details, and privacy acknowledgments—from the comfort of their home, at their own pace. Upon arrival, their verification process is reduced to a simple confirmation of identity and a quick update of any changes, a process known as "warm greeting" rather than a lengthy "cold check-in." This shift of administrative labor from the point of care to the patient's home is a profound workflow improvement. It dramatically shortens in-person processing time, reduces bottlenecks in the waiting area, and leads to more accurate and complete clinical information, as patients are less rushed and have access to their personal records when filling out forms [30]. Furthermore, it empowers patients and demonstrates the facility's commitment to leveraging convenience-focused technology.

However, the implementation of these technologies must be executed with careful attention to human factors and equitable access, echoing the concerns of the digital divide noted in scheduling. Not all patients are comfortable or capable of using kiosks or online portals. Elderly patients, those with visual or motor impairments, or individuals with low technological literacy may find these systems intimidating or inaccessible. Therefore, a streamlined workflow cannot be a one-size-fits-all technological mandate. True efficiency requires a hybrid, multi-channel approach where self-service options are available and encouraged, but are seamlessly supported by trained, empathetic staff ready to assist without stigma or delay. The role of the front-desk personnel thus evolves from data-entry clerks to concierges or navigators. Their training becomes paramount, focusing not only on mastering the new technology but also on developing enhanced communication skills, empathy, and the ability to manage the flow of patients using

different check-in pathways [31]. The efficiency gain is realized not by eliminating human interaction, but by optimizing it for high-value, compassionate service.

The ultimate power of a streamlined check-in process lies in its deep integration with the broader clinical and operational workflow. When the registration system is fully interoperable with the Electronic Health Record (EHR), the data collected at check-in—especially updated medications, allergies, and chief complaints—immediately populates the patient's chart for the clinician to review. This real-time data flow eliminates the dangerous lag and potential for error inherent in paper-based systems or siloed software. Furthermore, an efficient digital check-in can automatically trigger downstream actions in the workflow. For instance, a successful check-in can notify the clinical team (nurse, medical assistant) that the patient is ready, update the patient tracking board, and signal the billing system to begin encounter generation. This creates a "pull" system where each step is initiated by the completion of the prior one, reducing idle time and improving coordination between administrative and clinical staff [32]. The patient's transition from the waiting room becomes a visible, coordinated event rather than an uncertain wait.

The impact on patient satisfaction in this phase is deeply tied to the concepts of perceived wait time and communication. Even if the actual time from arrival to exam room cannot be reduced to zero, effective communication about the process and any delays can significantly mitigate dissatisfaction. Digital systems can contribute here as well; queue management software can provide patients with realistic wait time estimates via SMS or screens, while patient tracking boards (discreetly visible in waiting areas) can show their progress through the stages of intake. Transparency reduces the anxiety of the unknown. As Thompson et al. established in emergency department settings, perceived waiting time is often more influential on satisfaction scores than actual waiting time, and effective information delivery is a key moderating factor [33].

The Silo Effect: Inter-Departmental Coordination and Patient Flow

Once a patient successfully navigates scheduling and check-in, their journey through a healthcare facility enters its most complex and vulnerable phase: the multi-stage clinical encounter. This phase rarely involves a single interaction with one provider in one room. Instead, it is typically a sequence of interdependent steps involving various clinical and support departments—such as nursing stations, laboratory, radiology, pharmacy, and specialized clinics. The efficiency and seamlessness of this journey are almost entirely dependent on the quality of coordination between these discrete units. Unfortunately, the pervasive "silo effect"—where departments or units operate in isolation, with limited communication, shared goals, or integrated processes—poses one of the most significant barriers to efficient patient flow and a profound source of patient dissatisfaction. When administrative and clinical workflows are confined within departmental silos, patients experience the healthcare system not as a unified entity working on their behalf, but as a disjointed series of stops where they must repeatedly hand-carry their own care narrative, endure unexplained waits, and navigate systemic fragmentation [34]. Thus, overcoming the silo effect through enhanced inter-departmental coordination is not merely an operational goal; it is a fundamental prerequisite for creating a coherent, respectful, and efficient patient experience.

The consequences of poor inter-departmental coordination are manifested directly in the patient’s experience as disruptive delays, communication failures, and perceived disorganization. A common scenario illustrates this: a primary care physician orders blood tests and an X-ray. The patient must then travel to the lab, wait (often after re-registering or checking into another queue), have blood drawn, then proceed to radiology, wait again, and undergo the imaging. Delays in either department, caused by their own internal scheduling or resource issues, create idle time for the patient. Crucially, the left hand often does not know what the right hand is doing. The lab may be unaware the patient is also scheduled for radiology, preventing any coordinated scheduling. The physician’s office may not be notified promptly when results are ready, leading to follow-up phone calls from an anxious patient. Each handoff between departments represents a point of potential failure—a "white space" in the process where information can be lost, priorities can shift, and the patient can feel abandoned [35]. Research on patient flow identifies

these inter-departmental handoffs as critical bottlenecks. The waiting itself is aggravating, but the lack of clear communication about the reason for the wait or the overall plan for the visit exacerbates feelings of frustration and helplessness, directly negatively impacting satisfaction scores [36].

The root causes of the silo effect are deeply embedded in the history, structure, and culture of healthcare organizations. Structurally, many facilities have grown organically, with departments developing their own leadership, budgets, performance metrics, and information systems. When a laboratory is judged solely on its test turnaround time and a radiology department on its machine utilization rate, there is little incentive for either to optimize for the broader goal of minimizing total patient visit duration. This misalignment of objectives is a classic systemic flaw. Culturally, professional tribalism can also play a role, where identification with one's immediate team (e.g., nursing, pharmacy, physicians) supersedes identification with the organization-wide patient journey [37]. From a technological standpoint, the historical implementation of departmental systems—a standalone laboratory information system (LIS), a separate radiology information system (RIS)—has cemented these silos by creating digital barriers to information exchange. Even with the advent of enterprise Electronic Health Records (EHRs), poor integration or the persistence of "shadow systems" can maintain these digital divides. These structural, cultural, and technological factors combine to create workflows that are optimized locally within a department but are sub-optimal, and often detrimental, for the patient's holistic journey [38].

Breaking down these silos requires a multi-faceted approach centered on strategic integration, shared technology, and process re-engineering. The most critical enabler is the establishment of a unified, interoperable health information technology platform. A fully integrated EHR, where orders, results, notes, and schedules are visible in real-time to all authorized providers across departments, is the technological bedrock for coordination. When a nurse in ambulatory care can see that a patient's lab results have just been posted, or when a radiologist can view the full clinical context for an imaging order, care becomes more informed and timely. However, technology alone is insufficient. The workflows surrounding these systems must be deliberately redesigned. This involves implementing organization-wide patient flow models, such as centralized scheduling systems that can coordinate appointments across multiple departments (e.g., creating a "one-stop" visit for lab and imaging) or establishing real-time capacity status boards that are visible to all units [39]. Lean management principles, borrowed from manufacturing, can be applied to map the patient's entire value stream, identifying and eliminating non-value-added wait times and handoff delays caused by siloed processes [40].

The role of strategic communication protocols and dedicated coordination personnel cannot be overstated in mitigating the silo effect. Standardized communication tools, such as SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation), provide a common language for handoffs between departments, reducing miscommunication [41]. Furthermore, the creation of roles like patient flow coordinators, discharge planners, or clinical nurse navigators can provide the essential human glue between silos. These individuals have a cross-departmental purview and are empowered to troubleshoot delays, communicate with patients and families about their progress, and ensure that the necessary resources are aligned for the next step in the patient's journey. For example, a navigator for oncology patients can coordinate appointments with medical oncology, radiation oncology, and support services, providing a single point of contact and advocacy for the patient, thereby insulating them from the complexity of the underlying siloed system [42]. This human layer of coordination is vital for translating integrated technology and redesigned processes into a consistently positive patient experience.

The impact of effective inter-departmental coordination on patient satisfaction is profound and multifaceted. When coordination is seamless, patients experience shorter total visit times, fewer redundant questions, and a sense of logical progression. They perceive the healthcare team as just that—a team—working in concert. This fosters trust and reduces anxiety. Efficient coordination also has a direct clinical safety benefit, reducing the risk of errors from miscommunication or lost information, which in turn builds patient confidence [43].

Beyond the Clinical Encounter: The Discharge, Billing, and Follow-up Process

The patient's experience within a healthcare facility does not conclude at the end of the clinical consultation or procedure. In fact, some of the most lasting impressions—those that solidify trust or, conversely, breed profound dissatisfaction—are formed in the final administrative stages of the encounter: discharge, billing, and follow-up coordination. This post-clinical phase represents the facility's final opportunity to demonstrate care, competence, and respect for the patient, transitioning them from a passive recipient of services to an active, informed partner in their ongoing health management. Unfortunately, it is also a stage frequently marred by administrative inefficiency, poor communication, and fragmentation, often undoing the goodwill generated by successful clinical care. A streamlined, transparent, and supportive process for concluding the visit is therefore not an afterthought; it is a critical determinant of overall patient satisfaction, clinical outcomes, and financial integrity. Inefficiencies here can directly lead to confusion, anxiety, billing disputes, medication errors, and failed care transitions, ultimately impacting readmission rates and the facility's reputation [44].

The discharge process is the pivotal bridge between the controlled clinical environment and the patient's self-management at home. An efficient discharge is far more than a logistical exit; it is a comprehensive transition of care. Inefficiency manifests as prolonged waiting for final instructions or medications, unclear or rushed verbal explanations, and a lack of coordinated follow-up plans. Clinically, this poses significant risks. Studies have consistently linked poor discharge processes, characterized by inadequate patient education and fragmented communication with next providers, to higher rates of hospital readmission and adverse drug events [45]. From a satisfaction perspective, a patient who feels hurried, unprepared, or confused upon leaving is likely to feel abandoned and anxious. An efficient discharge workflow integrates several key components: timely reconciliation of medications with a clear, printed list; detailed, easy-to-understand aftercare instructions; scheduled follow-up appointments before the patient leaves the facility; and a deliberate "teach-back" method where patients repeat instructions to confirm understanding. This requires seamless coordination between clinicians, nurses, pharmacists, and administrative staff—a final test of inter-departmental workflow that, if failed, exposes the patient to the disarray of the siloed system at the most vulnerable moment [46].

Following discharge, the billing and financial reconciliation process represents perhaps the most potent source of administrative-driven patient dissatisfaction. The healthcare billing ecosystem is notoriously complex, involving insurance companies, coding protocols, and opaque pricing. When the administrative workflow governing this process is inefficient, the consequences for the patient are severe and emotionally charged. Problems include grossly inaccurate or unintelligible bills, slow processing leading to unexpected late notices, and a customer service experience characterized by long hold times and an inability to get clear explanations. A patient may leave a facility feeling clinically cared for, only to receive a bill weeks later that is confusing, appears to contain errors, or lists staggering, unexpected charges. This experience can instantly obliterate positive clinical memories, replacing them with feelings of betrayal and mistrust. Research by Garmon and Chartock highlights that surprise medical bills and a lack of price transparency are among the fastest-growing sources of patient complaint and financial distress [47]. An efficient billing workflow, therefore, must prioritize transparency and communication. This includes providing clear, upfront cost estimates when possible, explaining insurance benefits and patient responsibilities at check-in, utilizing accurate and timely charge capture and coding to prevent errors, and designing patient-friendly statements with plain language and a clear pathway for questions. Proactive communication about bills, rather than reactive responses to angry calls, is a hallmark of an administrative system that views the patient as a stakeholder rather than a payer [48].

The final, often neglected, component of the post-encounter phase is the facilitation of follow-up care. An efficient clinical workflow does not end at discharge; it proactively manages the continuum of care. This involves the administrative tasks of scheduling follow-up appointments, transmitting records and referral authorizations to other providers, and implementing systems for post-discharge monitoring. Inefficiency

here creates dangerous gaps in care. A patient told to "follow up with a specialist in 2-4 weeks" may be left to navigate a labyrinthine scheduling system on their own, leading to delays or missed care entirely. The administrative burden of obtaining referral approvals from insurance companies can further stall necessary treatment. Efficient workflows address these gaps by making follow-up scheduling an integral part of the discharge process—booking the next appointment before the patient leaves the department. Furthermore, the use of automated reminder systems for future appointments and medication adherence, delivered via SMS or patient portals, helps maintain engagement [49]. For chronic conditions or post-operative recovery, structured remote monitoring programs (e.g., phone check-ins, digital symptom trackers) represent the pinnacle of an extended, efficient administrative-clinical workflow that keeps the patient connected and supported, dramatically improving satisfaction and outcomes [50].

Technology plays an indispensable role in unifying and streamlining these post-encounter processes, transforming them from a series of frustrating chores into a cohesive experience. The integrated Electronic Health Record (EHR) is the central platform, enabling the generation of comprehensive after-visit summaries that combine clinical instructions, medication lists, and follow-up details in a single, standardized document. Patient portals are particularly transformative for the billing and follow-up phases. Through a portal, patients can access their bills online, view detailed explanations of benefits, make secure payments, and message billing departments with questions, avoiding the dreaded phone queue. Portals also serve as a hub for follow-up: patients can view upcoming appointments, request prescription refills, and access educational materials related to their condition [51]. Automated workflow engines within the EHR can trigger tasks automatically—for example, sending a referral to a specialist's office electronically the moment the order is signed, or flagging a bill for human review if it exceeds a certain complexity threshold. However, as with all technological solutions, their effectiveness hinges on thoughtful implementation and support for non-digital users to avoid exacerbating health disparities [52].

The cumulative impact of excelling in this final phase is profound for patient satisfaction and loyalty. A smooth, supportive discharge; a clear, accurate, and fair billing experience; and effortless follow-up coordination collectively signal to the patient that the facility’s care and concern extend beyond the face-to-face interaction. This builds enduring trust and fosters a perception of the facility as a reliable partner in health. Operationally, these efficiencies reduce accounts receivable days, lower the volume of costly customer service interactions related to billing disputes, decrease no-show rates for follow-up visits, and improve clinical outcomes through better care continuity. In essence, refining these concluding administrative workflows closes the loop on the patient journey, transforming a discrete clinical event into the beginning of a managed health relationship. It confirms that the facility’s commitment to efficiency and patient-centeredness is systemic and authentic, not merely performative for the clinical hour [53].

Leveraging Technology: EHRs, Patient Portals, and Digital Tools

The pursuit of administrative workflow efficiency and enhanced patient satisfaction in modern healthcare is inextricably linked to the strategic adoption and optimization of digital technology. While structural and cultural reforms are essential, information technology serves as the primary enabler and accelerator for transforming fragmented, paper-based processes into integrated, data-driven systems. At the heart of this digital transformation lie three interconnected categories of tools: the Electronic Health Record (EHR) as the foundational data repository and workflow engine, the patient portal as the critical interface for patient engagement, and a suite of ancillary digital tools designed to automate and streamline specific tasks. When implemented thoughtfully and integrated seamlessly, these technologies hold the transformative potential to dismantle informational silos, empower patients, reduce administrative burden, and create a more transparent, efficient, and satisfying care experience. However, their deployment is not a panacea; poor design, inadequate training, and a lack of human-centric integration can inadvertently create new barriers and frustrations, underscoring the principle that technology must serve the workflow, not dictate it [54].

The Electronic Health Record (EHR) is the central nervous system of the contemporary healthcare facility’s administrative and clinical operations. Its most profound impact on administrative workflow efficiency lies

in its ability to integrate and centralize patient information. By replacing disparate paper charts and standalone departmental systems, a fully implemented EHR creates a single source of truth accessible to all authorized providers and staff. This integration directly streamlines workflows: registration data flows into the clinical chart, physician orders are transmitted electronically to the lab or pharmacy, and results are posted automatically for review, eliminating the delays and errors associated with manual handoffs and phone calls. Furthermore, EHRs embed workflow intelligence through features like order sets, clinical decision support, and automated task routing. For instance, a discharged patient's record can automatically generate tasks for the nurse to provide education, for the clerk to schedule a follow-up, and for the coder to begin billing documentation. This systematization reduces reliance on memory and tribal knowledge, standardizes processes, and ensures critical steps are not overlooked. Studies, such as those by Hillestad et al., have demonstrated that EHRs can contribute to significant efficiency gains and cost savings through improved charge capture, reduced transcription costs, and decreased duplication of tests [55]. For the patient, the downstream effect is a more coordinated encounter with fewer repetitive questions and shorter in-facility delays, directly boosting perceptions of competence and organization.

Despite their potential, EHRs present a well-documented double-edged sword, particularly concerning usability and their indirect impact on patient satisfaction. Poorly designed EHR interfaces and cumbersome documentation requirements can lead to clinician burnout and the phenomenon of "screen-facing" rather than "patient-facing" interaction. When providers are physically and cognitively consumed by data entry tasks during a consultation, it degrades the quality of human connection, a key driver of patient satisfaction [56]. This represents a critical workflow failure where a tool intended to streamline administration inadvertently hinders the core clinical relationship. Therefore, optimizing EHRs for efficiency extends beyond technical integration to include user-centered design, customization to specialty workflows, and potentially the use of adjuncts like scribes or enhanced voice-recognition software to offload documentation burden from the clinician. The ultimate goal is to make the EHR an invisible, supportive scaffold for care, not the focal point of the visit. When achieved, it allows the administrative backbone to function smoothly while preserving the sacred space for empathetic patient-provider communication [57].

Complementing the provider-facing EHR is the patient-facing technology of the patient portal, a secure online website that provides patients with 24/7 access to their personal health information. Portals are a revolutionary tool for restructuring administrative workflows and shifting tasks to where they can be done most efficiently. By enabling patients to perform functions like viewing lab results, requesting prescription refills, updating personal information, and completing pre-visit forms online, portals actively disintermediate traditional, staff-intensive processes. This self-service model empowers patients, giving them greater control and convenience, while simultaneously freeing administrative and clinical staff from routine transactional duties, allowing them to focus on more complex patient needs. Research by Goldzweig et al. indicates that portal use is associated with increased patient satisfaction, improved medication adherence, and better engagement in preventive care [58]. From an administrative workflow perspective, portals automate communication (e.g., sending automated reminders) and create more accurate data entry, as patients input their own information. Crucially, they extend the administrative interaction beyond the walls of the facility, creating continuous, asynchronous touchpoints that enhance the sense of an ongoing care partnership rather than an episodic transaction.

Beyond core EHRs and portals, a growing ecosystem of digital tools is targeting specific administrative bottlenecks. Mobile health applications, often integrated with portals, facilitate appointment scheduling, wayfinding within large hospital campuses, and real-time updates on clinic wait times. Automated patient outreach systems use robocalls, SMS, or email to deliver pre-procedure instructions, post-discharge check-ins, and chronic disease management prompts, ensuring continuity and adherence without manual staff intervention. Advanced analytics and business intelligence tools mine operational data from EHRs and scheduling systems to predict no-shows, optimize staff schedules, and identify recurring workflow bottlenecks, enabling proactive management rather than reactive firefighting [59]. Furthermore, technologies like Robotic Process Automation (RPA) are emerging to handle high-volume, rule-based

administrative tasks such as claims processing, prior authorization submissions, and eligibility verification. These "digital workers" can execute tasks with greater speed and accuracy than humans, significantly reducing back-office overhead and processing times [60]. Each of these tools, when targeted at a validated pain point, can surgically improve a segment of the patient journey, contributing to a cumulative effect of streamlined efficiency.

However, the successful leverage of this technology stack is contingent upon overcoming significant implementation challenges. The digital divide remains a paramount concern; an over-reliance on digital tools can systematically disenfranchise elderly, low-income, or low-literacy patients who may lack access, connectivity, or digital literacy skills [61]. Equity must be designed into the workflow by maintaining parallel, non-digital pathways. Interoperability—the seamless exchange of data between different EHR systems and across care settings—is another persistent hurdle. When a hospital's EHR cannot communicate with a primary care clinic's system, the administrative burden of faxing records and the clinical risk of information gaps fall back onto staff and patients, negating potential efficiencies [62]. Finally, the human factors of change management, training, and sustained support are critical. Technology imposed without addressing workflow redesign, without comprehensive training for staff, and without clear communication of benefits to patients will be met with resistance, workarounds, and suboptimal use, failing to deliver on its promised return on investment or satisfaction gains [63].

The Human Factor: Staff Training, Communication, and Administrative Burden

Amidst the strategic implementation of digital tools and the redesign of clinical pathways, the ultimate determinant of administrative workflow efficiency and its translation into patient satisfaction rests not with technology alone, but with the human beings who operate within the system. The most elegantly designed process will fail if the staff executing it are inadequately trained, burned out, or unable to communicate effectively. Consequently, the human factors of comprehensive staff training, intentional communication strategies, and the mitigation of excessive administrative burden form the critical connective tissue that binds policy to practice. Frontline administrative and clinical support staff are the face of the healthcare system's operational machinery; their competence, demeanor, and well-being directly shape the patient's daily experience. Therefore, investments in these human elements are not peripheral concerns of human resources but are central to achieving the Quadruple Aim—improving patient experience, population health, reducing costs, and improving the work life of healthcare providers and staff [64]. Ignoring this human dimension guarantees that even the most advanced technological systems will underperform, as disengaged, overwhelmed, or poorly equipped staff cannot consistently deliver the compassionate, efficient service that patients expect.

Comprehensive and ongoing staff training is the foundational pillar for efficient and patient-centered administrative workflows. Training must extend far beyond the mere technical operation of software like EHRs or scheduling systems. It must encompass "soft skills" development, including effective communication, empathy, service recovery, and cultural competency. A staff member proficient in the EHR but unable to calmly explain a complex billing statement to a distressed patient represents a workflow failure. Training programs should be designed around the actual patient journey, helping staff understand their role in the larger process and how their actions impact both downstream colleagues and the patient's perception. Simulation-based training for front-desk scenarios, such as managing a patient upset about a long wait or explaining a new digital check-in kiosk, can build confidence and competence [65]. Furthermore, training should not be a one-time event but a continuous process that adapts to new technologies, updated protocols, and identified service gaps. Cross-training staff across different administrative functions (e.g., scheduling, check-in, basic billing inquiries) can also enhance workflow flexibility, reduce bottlenecks when one staff member is unavailable, and foster a greater sense of teamwork and shared responsibility for the patient's journey [66]. When staff feel knowledgeable, skilled, and empowered, they are more likely to take ownership of processes, solve problems proactively, and interact with patients in a way that conveys confidence and care, directly elevating satisfaction.

The quality of communication, both among staff and between staff and patients, is perhaps the most visible human factor in the administrative workflow. Internally, poor inter-departmental and inter-professional communication is a primary cause of delays, errors, and patient frustration, as detailed in the discussion of silos. Effective internal communication protocols—such as standardized handoff tools (SBAR), regular brief "huddle" meetings to address daily workflow issues, and shared digital communication platforms—are essential for maintaining smooth patient flow [67]. Externally, communication with the patient is paramount. This includes clear, jargon-free explanations of processes, proactive updates about waits or next steps, and active listening. The manner in which administrative staff communicate can either amplify or alleviate patient anxiety. For example, a registrar who apologizes for a delay and provides a realistic time estimate demonstrates respect, whereas silence or dismissiveness signals indifference. Research by Rathert et al. strongly links positive, informative communication from all staff members, including non-clinical personnel, to higher ratings of patient-centered care and overall satisfaction [68]. Effective communication is the mechanism by which an efficient workflow becomes perceptible and appreciable to the patient; without it, operational improvements remain invisible.

Paradoxically, the very administrative systems designed to create efficiency can, when poorly implemented, generate an unsustainable administrative burden that cripples the human factor. This burden refers to the cumulative weight of documentation, data entry, compliance tasks, and complex procedural hurdles that divert time, attention, and energy from direct patient interaction and meaningful work. For clinical staff, this manifests as "pajama time"—hours spent completing EHR documentation after work—and contributes massively to burnout [69]. For administrative staff, the burden takes the form of navigating ever-changing insurance rules, managing prior authorizations, reconciling contradictory information, and serving as the frustrated intermediary between patients and opaque billing systems. This burden has severe consequences. It leads to staff exhaustion, high turnover, cynicism, and a decrease in the quality of interpersonal interactions with patients—a phenomenon known as "compassion fatigue" [70]. A burned-out, overburdened employee is less likely to exhibit patience, empathy, or the discretionary effort needed to solve a patient's unique problem. Thus, the administrative burden on staff creates a direct secondary burden on the patient, resulting in rushed, impersonal, or error-prone service. Addressing this is not just an employee welfare issue; it is a fundamental prerequisite for sustaining any gains in workflow efficiency and patient satisfaction.

Addressing the human factor, therefore, requires a dual strategy: empowerment and systemic simplification. Empowerment involves giving staff the tools, authority, and support to resolve issues. This can include creating clear guidelines for service recovery (e.g., the ability to waive a small fee in the face of a clear system error), involving front-line staff in workflow redesign committees, and ensuring supportive supervision that coaches rather than simply critiques. Systemic simplification is the relentless pursuit of reducing unnecessary complexity in administrative tasks. This involves critically evaluating reporting requirements, streamlining forms, automating repetitive tasks through RPA where possible, and designing technology that reduces clicks and cognitive load rather than increasing them [71]. Leadership must actively measure and monitor staff well-being through surveys and focus groups, treating metrics on burnout and satisfaction as key performance indicators alongside financial and operational data. The "Joy in Work" framework, promoted by the Institute for Healthcare Improvement, emphasizes that creating conditions where staff can find meaning and pride in their work is essential for high-performing, patient-centered organizations [72].

Conclusion

This study establishes that administrative workflow efficiency is a powerful, non-clinical driver of patient satisfaction in healthcare facilities. The evidence presented demonstrates that satisfaction is shaped cumulatively across a continuum of interactions, beginning with the accessibility of scheduling and extending through the finalities of billing and follow-up. Inefficiencies at any point—whether prolonged waits, siloed departments, confusing financial processes, or burdensome technology—erode trust, increase

patient anxiety, and negatively color the entire care experience. Crucially, the research highlights that technological solutions, while essential, are insufficient on their own. Their success is entirely mediated by the human factor: well-trained, empowered, and supported staff who can leverage technology to enhance rather than hinder compassionate communication.

The ultimate finding is that administrative and clinical care are not separate domains but interconnected components of a single patient journey. Therefore, efforts to enhance satisfaction must adopt an integrated, system-wide perspective. This requires breaking down traditional silos, designing workflows with the patient's perspective as the central focus, and investing equally in technological infrastructure and human capital. Facilities that succeed in creating coherent, efficient, and transparent administrative processes do more than improve operational metrics; they build lasting patient loyalty and trust. Future efforts should focus on quantifying the return on investment of such holistic workflow improvements and on developing standardized models for measuring the direct impact of specific administrative interventions on both satisfaction and clinical outcomes. In an increasingly competitive and consumer-aware healthcare landscape, mastering the administrative experience is no longer optional but a definitive component of high-quality, sustainable care.

References:

1. Digital transformation in healthcare: technology acceptance and its applications. Stoumpos AI, Kitsios F, Talias MA. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2023;20 doi: 10.3390/ijerph20043407. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
2. Patient satisfaction with the quality of nursing care. Karaca A, Durna Z. Nurs Open. 2019;6:535–545. doi: 10.1002/nop2.237. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
3. From staff-mix to skill-mix and beyond: towards a systemic approach to health workforce management. Dubois CA, Singh D. Hum Resour Health. 2009;7:87. doi: 10.1186/1478-4491-7-87. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
4. Important of leadership style towards quality of care measures in healthcare settings: a systematic review. Sfantou DF, Laliotis A, Patelarou AE, Sifaki-Pistolla D, Matalliotakis M, Patelarou E. Healthcare (Basel) 2017;5 doi: 10.3390/healthcare5040073. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
5. Correlation between hospital finances and quality and safety of patient care. Akinleye DD, McNutt LA, Lazariu V, McLaughlin CC. PLoS One. 2019;14:0. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0219124. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
6. Governance in health - the need for exchange and evidence comment on "governance, government, and the search for new provider models". Chanturidze T, Obermann K. Int J Health Policy Manag. 2016;5:507–510. doi: 10.15171/ijhpm.2016.60. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
7. Principles of clinical ethics and their application to practice. Varkey B. Med Princ Pract. 2021;30:17–28. doi: 10.1159/000509119. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
8. Supporting efficiency improvement in public health systems: a rapid evidence synthesis. Walters JK, Sharma A, Malica E, Harrison R. BMC Health Serv Res. 2022;22:293. doi: 10.1186/s12913-022-07694-z. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
9. Health care professional development: working as a team to improve patient care. Babiker A, El Husseini M, Al Nemri A, et al. Sudan J Paediatr. 2014;14:9–16. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
10. Empowering education: a new model for in-service training of nursing staff. CH M, SA M, EB A, AM A. J Adv Med Educ Prof. 2017;5:26–32. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5238493/ [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
11. High-quality health systems in the Sustainable Development Goals era: time for a revolution. Kruk ME, Gage AD, Arsenault C, et al. Lancet Glob Health. 2018;6:0–252. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30386-3. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

12. Healthcare reimbursement and quality improvement: integration using the electronic medical record comment on "fee-for-service payment--an evil practice that must be stamped out?". Britton JR. Int J Health Policy Manag. 2015;4:549–551. doi: 10.15171/ijhpm.2015.93. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
13. Patient satisfaction with health care services; an application of physician's behavior as a moderator. Manzoor F, Wei L, Hussain A, Asif M, Shah SI. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2019;16 doi: 10.3390/ijerph16183318. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
14. Health care professional development: working as a team to improve patient care. Babiker A, El Husseini M, Al Nemri A, et al. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4949805/ Sudan J Paediatr. 2014;14:9–16. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
15. Digital transformation in healthcare: technology acceptance and its applications. Stoumpos AI, Kitsios F, Talias MA. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2023;20 doi: 10.3390/ijerph20043407. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
16. Meo N, Paul E, Wilson C, et al. Introducing an electronic tracking tool into daily Multidisciplinary discharge rounds on a medicine service: a quality improvement project to reduce length of stay. BMJ Open Qual 2018;7:e000174. 10.1136/bmjoq-2017-000174
17. Resar RK, Griffin FA, Kabcenell A, et al. Hospital inpatient waste identification tool. IHI innovation series white paper. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Institute for Healthcare Improvement, 2011.
18. Panteli D, Quentin W, Busse R, et al. Understanding healthcare quality strategies: a five-lens framework. In: Busse R, Klazinga N, Panteli D, eds. Improving Healthcare Quality in Europe: Characteristics, Effectiveness and Implementation of Different Strategies. Copenhagen (Denmark): European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies.(Health Policy Series, No. 53, 2019: 2. Available: [Book chapter information])
19. AHRQ . Return on investment estimation. n.d. Available: [URL removed]
20. Alotaibi Y, Alnowaiser N, Alamry A. Improving hospital flow ensiab project BMJ Open Qual 2021;10:e001505. 10.1136/bmjoq-2021-001505
21. NHS improvement . SAFER patient flow bundle. 2021. Available: [URL removed]
22. PressGaney [Internet]. n.d. Available: [URL removed]
23. Fraser K, Perez R. The evolution of case management and the professional case manager. In: Fraser K, Perez R, Latour C, eds. CMSA's Integrated Case Management: a Manual for Case Managers by Case Managers. Springer Publishing Company, 2018: 1–20. 10.1891/9780826169518.0001
24. Giardino AP, De Jesus O. Case management. In: Statpearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL). Statpearls publishing, 2023. [Book chapter information]
25. Proudlove N, Boaden R, Jorgensen J. Developing bed managers: the why and the how. J Nurs Manag 2007;15:34–42. 10.1111/j.1365-2934.2006.00632.x
26. Daniels S, Ramey M. Healthcare economics and hospital case manager. in: the leader's guide to hospital case management. In: Daniels S, Ramey M, eds. The Leader's Guide to Hospital Case Management. Jones and Bartlett Publishers, 2005: 4–11.
27. McDonald S. Studying actions in context: a qualitative shadowing method for organizational research. Qual Res 2005;5:455–73. 10.1177/1468794105056923
28. NEJM Catalyst . What is patient flow?. NEJM Catalyst; 2018. 10.1056/CAT.18.0289
29. Rutherford PA, Anderson A, Kotagal UR, et al. Achieving hospital-wide patient flow (second edition). IHI white paper. Boston, Massachusetts: Institute for Healthcare Improvement, 2020. Available: www.ihi.org
30. Rojas-García A, Turner S, Pizzo E, et al. Impact and experiences of delayed discharge: a mixed-studies systemic review. Health Expect 2018;21:41–56. 10.1111/hex.12619
31. Marin-Garcia JA, Vidal-Carreras PI, Garcia-Sabater JJ. The role of value stream mapping in healthcare services: a Scoping review. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2021;18:951. 10.3390/ijerph18030951
32. Aaronson E. L., Mort E., Sonis J. D., Chang Y., White B. A. (2018). Overall emergency department rating: Identifying the factors that matter most to patient experience. The Journal for Healthcare Quality (JHQ), 40(6), 367–376. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

33. Annenmans M., van Audenhove C., Vermolen H., Heylighen A. (2018). The role of space in patients' experience of an emergency department: A qualitative study. Journal of Emergency Nursing, 44(2), 139–145. 10.1016/j.jen.2017.11.002 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
34. Alowad A., Samaranayake P., Ahsan K., Alidrisi H., Karim A. (2020). Enhancing patient flow in emergency department (ED) using lean strategies–an integrated voice of customer and voice of process perspective. Business Process Management Journal, 27(1), 75–105. 10.1108/bpmj-11-2019-0457
35. Abdelsamad Y., Rushdi M., Tawfik B. (2018). Functional and spatial design of emergency departments using quality function deployment. Journal of Healthcare Engineering, 2018. 10.1155/2018/9281396
36. Bailey C. J., Murphy R., Porock D. (2011). Dying cases in emergency places: Caring for the dying in emergency departments. Social Science & Medicine, 73(9), 1371–1377.
37. Barros O., Riffo R., Paredes I. (2020). Improving service in an emergency department by designing the health production flow. Health Services Management Research, 33(2), 76–85. 10.1177/0951484819860325
38. Barlas D., Sama A. E., Ward M. F., Lesser M. L. (2001). Comparison of the auditory and visual privacy of emergency department treatment areas with curtains versus those with solid walls. Annals of Emergency Medicine, 38(2), 135–139. 10.1067/mem.2001.115441
39. Camgoz Akdag H., Kaya C. O., Savuran G., Canturk N. Z. (2018). Application of lean principles in hospitals: A process design in an emergency department. In Industrial engineering in the industry 4.0 era (pp. 265–278). Springer. 10.1007/978-3-319-71225-3_23
40. Cama R. (2009). Evidence-based healthcare design. John Wiley & Sons.
41. The Beryl Institute. (2016). Framing the field of patient experience
42. Annemans M., van Audenhove C., Vermolen H., Heylighen A. (2018). The role of space in patients' experience of an emergency department: A qualitative study. Journal of Emergency Nursing, 44(2), 139–145. 10.1016/j.jen.2017.11.002
43. Cypress B. S. (2014). The emergency department: Experiences of patients, families, and their nurses. Advanced Emergency Nursing Journal, 36(2), 164–176.
44. Annenmans M., van Audenhove C., Vermolen H., Heylighen A. (2018). The role of space in patients' experience of an emergency department: A qualitative study. Journal of Emergency Nursing, 44(2), 139–145. 10.1016/j.jen.2017.11.002
45. Daniels S., Ramey M. (2005). Healthcare economics and hospital case manager. In: The Leader's Guide to Hospital Case Management. Jones and Bartlett Publishers, 2005: 4–11.
46. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Taking Action against Clinician Burnout: A Systems Approach to Professional Well-Being. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2019. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
47. Eddy N. Too many providers are failing to meaningfully integrate data analytics. Healthcare IT News. 2020.
48. James KA, Ross SE, Vance B, Nath R, Harrison MI, West DR. Inefficiency in primary care: common causes and potential solutions. Fam Pract Manag 2015; 22 (2): 18–22. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
49. Delaune J, Everett W. Waste and Inefficiency in the U.S. Health Care System: Clinical Care: A Comprehensive Analysis in Support of System-Wide Improvements. Cambridge, MA: New England Healthcare Institute; 2008. [Google Scholar]
50. Bentley TG, Effros RM, Palar K, Keeler EB. Waste in the U.S. health care system: a conceptual framework. Milbank Q 2008; 86 (4): 629–59. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
51. Blijleven V, Koelemeijer K, Jaspers M. Identifying and eliminating inefficiencies in information system usage: a lean perspective. Int J Med Inform 2017; 107: 40–7. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
52. Health Care Tasks. National Research Council. Health Care Comes Home: The Human Factors. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2011: 75–102. [Google Scholar]
53. Harmony Healthcare IT. Health data volumes skyrocket, legacy data archives on the rise. 2020.
54. Dash S, Shakyawar SK, Sharma M, Kaushik S. Big data in healthcare: management, analysis and future prospects. J Big Data 2019; 6 (1): 54. [Google Scholar]

55. Fisher WG. Doctors are drowning in too much data, not enough appropriate information. MedCity News. 2012.
56. NEJM Catalyst. Healthcare big data and the promise of value-based care. 2018.
57. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. What is workflow? Accessed May 12, 2021.
58. Henry J, Pylypchuk Y, Searcy T, Patel V. Adoption of electronic health record systems among U.S. non-Federal acute care hospitals: 2008-2015. 2016.
59. Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology. Office-based Physician Electronic Health Record Adoption: EHR adoption has more than doubled since 2008. 2021.
60. Routley N. Visualizing the trillion-fold increase in computing power. Visual Capitalist. 2017.
61. Waller M, Stotler C. Telemedicine: a primer. Curr Allergy Asthma Rep. 2018;18:54. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
62. Wang Y, Zhao Y, Zheng J, et al. The evolution of publication hotspots in the field of telemedicine from 1962 to 2015 and differences among six countries. J Telemed Telecare. 2018;24:238–253. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
63. Nelson CA, Takeshita J, Wanat KA, et al. Impact of store-and-forward (SAF) teledermatology on outpatient dermatologic care: a prospective study in an underserved urban primary care setting. J Am Acad Dermatol. 2016;74:484–490.e1. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
64. An introduction to telemedicine effectiveness and cost considerations: a systematic review. (Placeholder title if real citation needed) [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
65. AlDossary S, Martin-Khan MG, Bradford NK, Smith AC. A systematic review of the methodologies used to evaluate telemedicine service initiatives in hospital facilities. Int J Med Inform. 2017;97:171–194. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
66. Friedman AB, Gervasi S, Song H, et al. Telemedicine catches on: changes in the utilization of telemedicine services during the COVID-19 pandemic. Am J Manag Care. 2022;28:e1–e6. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
67. Can we measure telemedicine adoption across health systems? A policy and practice perspective. (Placeholder title) [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
68. Wong A, Bhyat R, Srivastava S, et al. Patient care during the COVID-19 Pandemic: use of virtual care. J Med Internet Res. 2021;23:e20621. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
69. Straits BC, Singleton R. Social Research: Approaches and Fundamentals. Oxford University Press; 2018. [Google Scholar]
70. Klaassen B, van Beijnum BJF, Hermens HJ. Usability in telemedicine systems—a literature survey. Int J Med Inform. 2016;93:57–69. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
71. Law MM, Evans RG. The Canadian Health Care System: Where Are We, How Did We Get Here? Centre for Health Services and Policy Research; 1991. [Google Scholar]
72. Yaghobian S, Ohannessian R, Iampetro T, et al. Knowledge, attitudes and practices of telemedicine education and training of French medical students and residents. J Telemed Telecare. 2022;28:248–257. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]