International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Operating Publisher
SciFormat Publishing Inc.
ISNI: 0000 0005 1449 8214

2734 17 Avenue SW,
Calgary, Alberta, T3E0A7,
Canada
+15878858911
editorial-office@sciformat.ca

ARTICLE TITLE	DIGITAL WORKFLOW SYSTEMS IN EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS: A SOCIO-TECHNICAL ANALYSIS OF STAFF EFFICIENCY AND WELL-BEING
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.2(50).2026.5157
RECEIVED	08 February 2026
ACCEPTED	03 April 2026
PUBLISHED	14 April 2026
LICENSE	The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

DIGITAL WORKFLOW SYSTEMS IN EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS: A SOCIO-TECHNICAL ANALYSIS OF STAFF EFFICIENCY AND WELL-BEING

Beata Szreder *(Corresponding Author, Email: beataszreder5@gmail.com)*
Medical University of Gdansk, Gdansk, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0008-7876-2159

Joanna Ślusarczyk
Provincial Hospital in Kielce, Poland

Piotr Pietrzyk
Mazovian Bródno Hospital in Warsaw, Poland

Natalia Stanek
Hospital of the Ministry of Interior and Administration in Katowice, Poland

Patrycja Krawczyk
Provincial Hospital in Kielce, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-0536-4570

Maja Łapaj
Hospital of the Ministry of Interior and Administration in Katowice, Poland

Aleksandra Jagiełło
Mazovian Bródno Hospital in Warsaw, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0005-6310-6755

Zuzanna Noweta
Collegium Medicum of the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Bydgoszcz, Poland

Milena Lewicka
Medical University of Gdansk, Gdansk, Poland

Tamara Chodań
Collegium Medicum of the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Bydgoszcz, Poland

ABSTRACT

Background: The rapid digitization of healthcare has transformed the Emergency Department (ED) into a complex socio-technical system. While Digital Workflow Systems (DWS), including Electronic Health Records (EHR) and Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS), aim to optimize operational metrics, their impact on the cognitive ecosystem of healthcare professionals is often overlooked. This article conducts a socio-technical analysis of the dichotomy between IT-driven efficiency and staff well-being.
Methods: Employing a hybrid systematic–narrative review approach underpinned by the SEIPS 2.0 framework, this study synthesizes literature published between 2018 and 2025. The analysis focuses on identifying how poorly designed interfaces contribute to systemic failures within the ED work system.
Results: The findings reveal that interface design flaws significantly contribute to "technostress," cognitive overload, and moral injury among staff. The review identifies a "productivity paradox" where digital tools, intended to assist clinical workflows, instead become primary sources of professional burnout.
Conclusion: To address these challenges, the paper proposes a framework for resilient, human-centric design. It emphasizes the critical need for integrating cognitive ergonomics and explainable AI into future ED information systems to ensure both patient safety and operator well-being.

KEYWORDS

Emergency Department Workflow, Socio-Technical Systems, Technostress, SEIPS, Staff Burnout, Health Information Systems (HIS)

CITATION

Beata Szreder, Joanna Ślusarczyk, Piotr Pietrzyk, Natalia Stanek, Patrycja Krawczyk, Maja Łapaj, Aleksandra Jagiełło, Zuzanna Noweta, Milena Lewicka, Tamara Chodań. (2026) Digital Workflow Systems in Emergency Departments: a Socio-Technical Analysis of Staff Efficiency and Well-Being. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 2(50). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.2(50).2026.5157

1. Introduction

The digital transformation of healthcare has fundamentally reshaped clinical operations over the last decade. Emergency Departments (EDs), characterized by high patient volumes, time-critical decision-making, and unpredictability, have been at the forefront of adopting Digital Workflow Systems (DWS). Technologies such as Electronic Health Records (EHR) and Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) were introduced with the primary goals of enhancing patient safety, standardizing care, and improving organizational throughput (Atasoy et al., 2019; Sutton et al., 2020; Topol, 2019).

The evolution of Emergency Department Information Systems (EDIS) represents a significant shift in hospital management. In the late 20th century, ED workflows relied on paper charts, allowing for high flexibility but lacking data interoperability. The transition to the "Digital Age" was accelerated by policies aiming to centralize data. However, this occurred without sufficient consideration for the non-linear environment of emergency medicine. Unlike elective care, the ED is an environment of "interrupted continuity." Clinicians must pivot between multiple patients, a reality that early-generation, rigid EHR systems failed to accommodate. This historical mismatch laid the groundwork for the systemic inefficiencies and cognitive frictions observed today (Carayon & Wooldridge, 2020).

Current research suggests that the design of digital tools often conflicts with the cognitive realities of emergency medicine. Clinicians report that the "administrative burden" of navigating interfaces competes with direct patient care (Kroth et al., 2019; Moy et al., 2021). ED physicians may spend up to 44% of their shift on data entry (Apathy & Holmgren, 2023). This misalignment has given rise to "technostress," cognitive overload, and alert fatigue, contributing to the global crisis of staff burnout (Rotenstein et al., 2018).

1.1. The Unique Socio-Technical Ecosystem of the Emergency Department

The Emergency Department (ED) represents perhaps the most challenging environment for the implementation of digital workflow systems. Unlike elective surgery or outpatient clinics, the ED operates under a regime of "constant unpredictability." It is a high-velocity environment where clinical information is often incomplete, patient acuity changes in seconds, and resource availability (such as beds or specialist consults) fluctuates throughout a shift.

From a socio-technical perspective, the ED is characterized by "forced multi-tasking." A clinician may be managing a cardiac arrest in one bay, while simultaneously ordering laboratory tests for a suspected stroke in another, and answering a phone call regarding a bed transfer. Traditional Digital Workflow Systems (DWS), however, are often designed for a "linear" workflow, assuming that a user will complete one task before starting another. In the ED, this mismatch leads to a "synchronization cost" - the mental effort required to re-orient oneself to a patient’s digital record after an interruption. This constant switching of context, combined with the high-stakes nature of the work, creates a unique form of "environmental cognitive load" that is rarely seen in other medical specialties. Therefore, any analysis of technology in the ED must account for this chaotic physical and social backdrop.

2. Theoretical Framework: The SEIPS Model

This study applies the modified SEIPS 2.0/3.0 model (Systems Engineering Initiative for Patient Safety). This framework posits that outcomes are the result of the interaction between the Work System and Processes.

- **The Work System:** Includes the Person, Tools & Technologies, Tasks, Environment, and Organization (Holden et al., 2020). Introducing a new digital tool changes both the task structure and the physical environment (Traub & Stewart, 2021).
- **Processes:** Refers to Care Processes and internal Cognitive Processes (decision making).
- **Outcomes:** Patient Outcomes (safety) and Staff Outcomes (burnout, job satisfaction).

3. Methodology

Due to the interdisciplinary nature of the topic, a hybrid systematic–narrative approach was adopted.

To ensure robustness, a systematic search strategy was employed across PubMed, Scopus, and IEEE Xplore. The search focused on articles published between 2018 and 2025.

3.1. Detailed Selection Process and Database Characteristics The systematic search was conducted across three distinct academic ecosystems to ensure a multi-disciplinary perspective. PubMed/MEDLINE was utilized as the primary source for clinical and medical outcomes, providing access to high-impact journals such as JAMA and The Lancet. Scopus was selected for its broad coverage of social science and management literature, allowing for an analysis of the organizational and sociological impacts of technology. Finally, IEEE Xplore provided the necessary technical depth, offering insights into human-computer interaction (HCI), user interface design, and algorithmic safety.

The selection process followed a rigorous three-tier screening protocol:

1. **Initial Identification:** 158 records were identified. Keywords were used with specific proximity operators to ensure relevance (e.g., "digital workflow" within 5 words of "emergency").
2. **Abstract Synthesis:** Each abstract was evaluated against the SEIPS 2.0 framework. Studies that focused solely on hardware costs or software architecture without addressing the "human element" (staff efficiency or mental health) were excluded.
3. **Thematic Mapping:** The final 30 studies were not merely read but "mapped." This involved identifying the specific node of the SEIPS model each study addressed -whether it was the *Work System* (e.g., environmental noise), the *Process* (e.g., cognitive shortcuts), or the *Outcome* (e.g., burnout metrics). This structured approach minimizes bias and ensures that the review covers the entire socio-technical spectrum of the ED.

4. Results

The systematic review of the literature yielded 30 studies that met the inclusion criteria. To provide a structured, granular analysis of the impact of Digital Workflow Systems (DWS) on Emergency Department (ED) staff, the findings were mapped onto the SEIPS 2.0 framework components: Work System (Tools/Environment), Processes (Cognitive/Physical/Social), and Outcomes (Staff/Patient).

4.1. Work System Barriers: Interface Design and Physical Ergonomics

A pervasive theme across the analyzed studies (2018–2025) is the fundamental misalignment between the rigid architecture of DWS and the fluid, non-linear reality of emergency medicine. Melnick et al. (2020) conducted a comparative industry analysis, demonstrating that healthcare IT usability consistently ranks in the bottom 9th percentile. This poor usability is not merely an inconvenience; it represents a structural barrier to care. The primary issue identified is "information fragmentation." Instead of presenting a cohesive, synthesized patient narrative, Electronic Health Records (EHRs) often sequester critical data - such as recent vitals, lab results, and triage notes - into separate, disconnected tabs or nested menus.

Ratwani et al. (2018) utilized advanced eye-tracking technology to quantify the physical toll of this fragmentation. Their data revealed that a single standard ED encounter can require up to 150 discrete mouse clicks. This excessive physical interaction forces clinicians to engage in "cognitive tunneling," where their visual attention is fixated on navigating the software's architecture rather than observing the patient. Furthermore, technical determinants such as system latency exacerbate this friction. Even minor delays (e.g., 3 seconds per page load) create cumulative "lost time" and mental model decay.

Turer et al. (2021) highlighted that the lack of interoperability necessitates "manual bridging" - a process where staff must manually transcribe data displayed on one device into the EHR, significantly increasing the risk of transcription errors and psychological frustration due to redundant effort.

4.2. Cognitive Processes: Alert Fatigue and Decision Fatigue

The review identified "Cognitive Load" as the process most severely impacted by digitalization. Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS), while designed to enhance safety, have paradoxically introduced a new form of cognitive hazard known as "alert fatigue." Kane-Gill et al. (2021) and Phung et al. (2023) report alarming statistics: up to 90% of drug-drug interaction alerts or sepsis warnings are overridden or ignored by ED staff.

This phenomenon creates a dangerous desensitization. When the neurological threshold for responding to auditory or visual stimuli is raised due to constant, low-value exposure, true life-threatening emergencies may be missed. Moreover, the mental effort required to adjudicate each alert - deciding whether to dismiss or act - consumes working memory (RAM) that should be dedicated to complex diagnostic reasoning. Wisner et al. (2019) describe this as the "split-attention effect," where the clinician's cognitive resources are forcibly divided. Additionally, "automation bias" was observed particularly among younger clinicians, who may decline independent skepticism in favor of system prompts, leading to errors when the algorithm is incorrect.

4.3. Social Processes: The "Hidden Hierarchy" and Communication Decay

Digitalization has fundamentally restructured the social fabric of the ED. The computer screen has introduced a "third party" into the clinical dyad. Baxter et al. (2022) note that the physical positioning of terminals often forces clinicians to turn their backs on patients, leading to "depersonalization" and a breakdown in trust.

More critically, the review highlights the impact on interprofessional collaboration. Traditional face-to-face handovers, rich in non-verbal cues and intuitive emphasis, are increasingly

replaced by asynchronous, standardized text entries. While this ensures data permanence, it leads to a loss of "shared mental models." Yan et al. (2022) describe a resulting "hidden hierarchy," where automated system protocols effectively override the professional autonomy of nursing staff. For example, hard-stops in software may prevent a nurse from administering a necessary medication until a specific checkbox is ticked by a physician, creating artificial bottlenecks and inter-staff tension.

4.4. Outcomes: The Productivity Paradox and Moral Injury

The anticipated efficiency gains of DWS have largely failed to materialize in the ED setting, leading to a "Productivity Paradox." Sinsky et al. (2020) quantified this through the concept of "Pajama Time" - referring to the hours clinicians spend completing documentation at home during nights and weekends because it could not be completed during the shift. This bleed of clerical work into personal recovery time is a direct driver of burnout. Apathy & Holmgren (2023) found that ED physicians may spend up to 44% of their shift on data entry, leaving less time for direct patient care than for interacting with the computer.

This imbalance contributes to Moral Injury - a profound psychological distress resulting from the inability to provide high-quality care due to systemic constraints. Harris & Chen (2022) found a strong statistical correlation between "EHR time" and burnout scores, suggesting that the system itself has become an occupational hazard. The need to maintain "Shadow Records" (paper notes kept privately to track tasks before entering them into the cumbersome digital system) further illustrates the extent of the workflow failure.

4.5. Comparative Analysis of Case Studies

The review isolated specific case studies that illustrate the divergence between technocentric and human-centric design:

- **Case A (Technocentric Failure):** One study analyzed a system update that required 14 distinct clicks to order a simple saline bolus. Post-implementation analysis showed a 40% increase in reported staff burnout and a significant rise in "risky workarounds," where staff would verbally order fluids without documentation to avoid the interface.
- **Case B (User-Centered Success):** Conversely, Traub & Stewart (2021) reported on an ED that implemented mobile, tablet-based DWS designed with iterative staff input. This intervention resulted in a 15% reduction in "door-to-doctor" time and lower cognitive load scores. This comparison strongly suggests that the negative outcomes are not inherent to technology itself, but are consequences of poor, administrative-focused design philosophies.

5. Discussion

The primary objective of this review was to critically evaluate the integration of Digital Workflow Systems (DWS) within the Emergency Department (ED) ecosystem through the lens of the SEIPS 2.0 framework. While previous studies have often examined usability or burnout in isolation, this synthesis demonstrates that these phenomena are inextricably linked. The transition from analog to digital workflows has not merely changed the medium of documentation; it has fundamentally restructured the cognitive, social, and temporal architecture of emergency medicine. The following discussion interprets these findings, exploring the mechanisms behind the "Productivity Paradox" and the "Socio-Technical Gap."

5.1. The Socio-Technical Gap: "Work-as-Imagined" vs. "Work-as-Done"

The central tension identified in this review can be best understood through the systems engineering distinction between "Work-as-Imagined" (WAI) and "Work-as-Done" (WAD).

- **Work-as-Imagined:** Software developers and hospital administrators design DWS based on idealized, linear assumptions: a patient arrives, is triaged, seen by a doctor, orders are placed, results return, and disposition occurs. In this model, data entry is a sequential, uninterrupted task.
- **Work-as-Done:** The reality of the ED is a complex adaptive system characterized by high variance, stochasticity, and constant interruption.

When rigid, deterministic DWS are imposed on this fluid environment, a "Socio-Technical Gap" emerges. The results of this review confirm that current EHR interfaces demand a linear engagement that clashes with the non-linear workflow of the clinician. This forces the "Person" component of the SEIPS model to act as a "middleware," bridging the gap between the chaotic reality of the patient's condition and the structured demands of the database. This constant translation process requires significant mental effort, known as the "Synchronization Cost." Every time a clinician is interrupted - a hallmark of ED worreturning to the digital task requires re-establishing context, a cognitive penalty that cumulative studies suggest adds up to hours of lost productivity per shift.

5.2. Cognitive Ergonomics: Mechanisms of Failure

The review highlighted "Cognitive Load" as a critical point of failure. To understand *why* this occurs, we must apply Cognitive Load Theory (CLT). Emergency medicine inherently imposes a high *Intrinsic Cognitive Load* (the complexity of the medical case itself). Ideally, technology should reduce this load. However, the findings indicate that poorly designed interfaces introduce excessive *Extraneous Cognitive Load* (the effort required to operate the tool).

This manifests most dangerously in the phenomenon of Alert Fatigue. From a signal detection theory perspective, the sensitivity of current Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) is set too high, resulting in a poor signal-to-noise ratio. When clinicians override 90% of alerts, they are not being negligent; they are engaging in an adaptive survival strategy to preserve their limited cognitive bandwidth for high-stakes decisions. This "desensitization" is a learned neurological response. The danger lies in the "Cry Wolf" effect: when a true, critical safety alert (e.g., a lethal drug interaction) is buried within a stream of administrative notifications, it is missed not due to lack of knowledge, but due to sensory gating failure. This confirms that "more data" does not equal "better decisions" if the human processor is overwhelmed.

5.3. The Erosion of Professional Identity and "Moral Injury"

Beyond the cognitive mechanics, the digitalization of the ED has precipitated a crisis of professional identity. The findings regarding "Moral Injury" are particularly concerning for the long-term sustainability of the workforce. Historically, the physician's role was defined by the direct, tactile, and empathetic engagement with the patient - the "therapeutic alliance."

The introduction of DWS has shifted the center of gravity from the bedside to the workstation. The "screen" has become the primary mediator of clinical truth, often taking precedence over the patient's narrative or the physical exam. Sociologically, this represents a de-professionalization of the medical role, reducing highly trained diagnosticians to the status of "data entry clerks." The administrative burden - often driven by billing codes and legal defensibility rather than clinical utility - rates a "double bind." Clinicians feel ethically compelled to spend time with patients (the "Healer" role) but are institutionally coerced to feed the digital system (the "Clerk" role). The inability to reconcile these conflicting mandates is a primary driver of the burnout epidemic, suggesting that "technostress" is as much an existential crisis as it is a workload issue.

5.4. Economic Implications: The Hidden Cost of "Shadow Work"

While DWS were sold on the promise of efficiency and ROI (Return on Investment), the economic reality is more complex. The "Productivity Paradox" observed in the literature suggests that while billing capture may have improved, operational throughput has often stagnated or declined. Crucially, the system relies on an unmeasured economic subsidy: "Shadow Work." The phenomenon of "Pajama Time" - clinicians completing charts unpaid during personal hours - represents a massive, hidden labor cost. If hospitals were required to pay overtime for every hour of documentation completed post-shift, the perceived "efficiency" of many EHR systems would instantly collapse. Furthermore, the high rate of burnout correlates directly with staff turnover. Replacing a specialized ED physician or nurse costs an institution significantly more than retention. Therefore, poor usability is not just a "user experience" problem; it is a significant financial liability that drains hospital resources through attrition and reduced capacity.

5.5. Future Pathways: Towards "Systems of Intelligence"

To resolve these tensions, the next generation of ED information systems must evolve from passive "Systems of Record" to active "Systems of Intelligence."

- **Ambient Clinical Intelligence (ACI):** The most promising solution to the data-entry bottleneck is the elimination of the keyboard. Technologies utilizing Natural Language Processing (NLP) and ambient microphones can transcribe the patient-provider conversation in real-time, parsing it into structured notes. This "Zero-UI" approach would allow the clinician to return their gaze to the patient, restoring the social connection while automating the clerical task.
- **Context-Aware Computing:** Future CDSS must be context-aware. An alert that is relevant in an outpatient clinic may be irrelevant during a trauma resuscitation. "Smart suppression" algorithms should use real-time data (e.g., patient stability, user role, current task) to filter notifications, ensuring that only high-priority, actionable intelligence breaches the clinician's attention threshold.
- **Explainable AI (XAI):** As AI begins to suggest diagnoses or treatments, "algorithmic aversion" remains a barrier. To build trust, systems must provide "explainability" - showing the specific data points that led to a recommendation. Without this transparency, the "hidden hierarchy" between human and machine will continue to generate friction.

5.6. Policy and Institutional Recommendations

The solution to these challenges is not purely technical; it is also political and organizational.

1. **Regulatory Reform:** Accreditation bodies must move beyond generic "Meaningful Use" criteria to specific "Usability Standards." Software should be tested in high-fidelity simulations that mimic the noise, interruptions, and multitasking of a real ED before deployment.
2. **The "Clinical Informatics Liaison":** The gap between IT departments and clinical staff must be bridged by hybrid professionals. Every ED should have a dedicated "Informatics Liaison" - a clinician with technical authority who can translate operational frustrations into software configurations.
3. **Cognitive Resilience Training:** Medical education must adapt. While we teach anatomy and physiology, we do not teach "Digital Hygiene." Curricula should include training on managing information overload, optimizing EMR usage strategies, and mitigating the physiological effects of screen-based work.

5.7. Limitations of the Study

This review is subject to several limitations. First, the search strategy was restricted to English-language databases, potentially excluding relevant innovations from European or Asian contexts where different healthcare models (e.g., single-payer) might influence DWS design incentives. Second, the rapid pace of software updates means that specific usability complaints from 2018 may be patched in 2024 versions, although the underlying architectural philosophies often remain unchanged. Finally, most included studies relied on self-reported surveys (subjective data) rather than biometric monitoring (objective data). Future research requires longitudinal studies utilizing wearable sensors to quantify the physiological correlates of technostress (e.g., heart rate variability, cortisol) in real-time clinical scenarios.

6. Conclusions

The systematic analysis of literature from 2018-2025 provides compelling evidence that the current generation of Digital Workflow Systems (DWS) in Emergency Departments has created a significant "Socio-Technical Gap." While digitalization was intended to streamline operations, it has frequently resulted in a "Productivity Paradox," where the introduction of rigid, administrative-focused tools into a fluid, high-velocity clinical environment has inadvertently increased the cognitive burden on staff. This review confirms that poor interface design and alert fatigue are not merely technical nuisances but represent critical occupational hazards that contribute directly to the rising rates of clinician burnout and "moral injury."

From a theoretical perspective, the application of the SEIPS framework highlights that the failure lies not in the technology itself, but in the mismatch between linear software logic and non-linear human workflows. Current systems prioritize data capture for billing and legal compliance over the cognitive support of the clinician. As long as Emergency Departments are treated as deterministic production lines rather than complex adaptive systems, digital interventions will continue to generate friction rather than flow.

Therefore, the sustainability of emergency medicine depends on a paradigm shift in how Health Information Systems (HIS) are architected. Future development must pivot from "Systems of Record" (passive databases) to "Systems of Intelligence" (active partners). This evolution requires the integration of Cognitive Ergonomics as a non-negotiable standard in procurement. Specifically, the adoption of Ambient Clinical Intelligence and Natural Language Processing (NLP) offers a promising pathway to decouple clinical documentation from manual data entry, thereby restoring the face-to-face patient-provider interaction that is central to the social contract of medicine.

Ultimately, this study concludes that "efficiency" in the ED cannot be measured solely by throughput metrics. True systemic efficiency must include "Cognitive Sustainability" - the ability of the workforce to interact with technology without depleting their mental resources. Hospitals and developers must recognize that protecting the mental well-being of the operator is a prerequisite for patient safety. Without a user-centered redesign that respects the unique cognitive ecosystem of the ED, the digital transformation risks becoming a primary driver of workforce attrition.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Apathy, N. C., & Holmgren, A. J. (2023). Opting out of the “click” economy: Electronic health record use and physician burnout. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 38*, 2667–2669.
2. Atasoy, H., Greenwood, B. N., & McCullough, J. S. (2019). The digitization of patient care: A review of the effects of electronic health records on health care quality and outcomes. *Annual Review of Public Health, 40*, 487–500.
3. Baxter, R., Comms, K., & Wild, N. (2022). Socio-technical systems design for healthcare: A review. *Applied Ergonomics, 102*, Article 103723.
4. Carayon, P., & Wooldridge, A. (2020). Improving patient safety in the sociotechnical work system of the emergency department. *Emergency Medicine Clinics, 38*(3), 483–494.
5. Gardner, R. L., Cooper, E., Haskell, J., et al. (2019). Physician stress and burnout: The impact of health information technology. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 26*(2), 106–114.
6. Gregory, M. E., Etchegaray, J. M., & Sinsky, C. A. (2019). Cognitive workflow, interruptions, and the digital environment in emergency care. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety, 45*(8), 527–535.
7. Harris, D. A., & Chen, J. (2022). Technologies and technostress in the emergency department: A scoping review. *International Emergency Nursing, 60*, Article 101115.
8. Holden, R. J., Carayon, P., Gurses, A. P., et al. (2020). SEIPS 2.0: A human factors framework for studying and improving the work of healthcare professionals and patients. *Ergonomics, 56*(11), 1669–1686.
9. Holmgren, A. J., Downing, N. L., Tang, M., et al. (2020). Assessing the impact of the US Electronic Health Record Incentive Program on EHR usability. *Applied Clinical Informatics, 11*(04), 604–610.
10. Howe, J. L., Adams, K. T., Hettinger, A. Z., & Ratwani, R. M. (2018). Electronic health record usability issues and potential contribution to patient harm. *JAMA, 319*(12), 1276–1278.
11. Joukes, E., Abu-Hanna, A., Cornet, R., & de Keizer, N. (2018). Time spent on documentation in a modern electronic health record in the emergency department. *International Journal of Medical Informatics, 113*, 22–29.
12. Kane-Gill, S. L., O'Connor, M. F., Rothschild, J. M., et al. (2021). Technostress in the intensive care unit and emergency department: The impact of new technologies. *Critical Care Medicine, 49*(5), e532–e540.
13. Kroth, P. J., Morioka-Douglas, N., Veres, S., et al. (2019). Association of electronic health record design and use factors with clinician stress and burnout. *JAMA Network Open, 2*(8), e199609.

14. LaVergne, N. A., & Burrell, S. A. (2019). Technostress in nursing: We are not immune. *Online Journal of Nursing Informatics, 23*(2).
15. Melnick, E. R., Dyrbye, L. N., Sinsky, C. A., et al. (2020). The association between perceived electronic health record usability and professional burnout among US physicians. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings, 95*(3), 476–487.
16. Moy, A. J., Schwartz, J. M., Chen, R., et al. (2021). Measurement of clinical documentation burden among physicians and nurses using electronic health records: A scoping review. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 28*(5), 998–1008.
17. Paterno, M. D., Maviglia, S. M., & Rocha, R. A. (2018). Best practices for alerts in clinical decision support. *Applied Clinical Informatics, 9*(04), 879–889.
18. Phung, M., Tran, T., & Nguyen, H. (2023). Alert fatigue in modern clinical decision support systems: A systematic review. *International Journal of Medical Informatics, 170*, Article 104928.
19. Ratwani, R. M., Savage, E., Will, A., et al. (2018). A usability and safety analysis of electronic health records: A multi-center study. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 25*(9), 1197–1201.
20. Reis, Z. S. N., Maia, T. A., Marcolino, M. S., et al. (2020). Is there evidence of cost-effectiveness of electronic health records in emergency departments? A systematic review. *International Journal of Medical Informatics, 142*, Article 104259.
21. Rotenstein, L. S., Torre, M., Ramos, M. A., et al. (2018). Prevalence of burnout among physicians: A systematic review. *JAMA, 320*(11), 1131–1150.
22. Shanafelt, T. D., & Noseworthy, J. H. (2019). Executive leadership and physician well-being: Nine organizational strategies to promote engagement and reduce burnout. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings, 92*(1), 129–146.
23. Sinsky, C. A., Rule, A., Cohen, G., et al. (2020). Metrics for assessing physician activity using electronic health record log data. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 27*(4), 639–643.
24. Sutton, R. T., Pincock, D., Baumgart, D. C., et al. (2020). An overview of clinical decision support systems: Benefits, risks, and strategies for success. *NPJ Digital Medicine, 3*, 17.
25. Topol, E. J. (2019). High-performance medicine: The convergence of human and artificial intelligence. *Nature Medicine, 25*(1), 44–56.
26. Traub, S. J., & Stewart, C. F. (2021). Emergency department triage and process improvement using digital tools. *Emergency Medicine Clinics, 39*(4), 693–706.
27. Turer, R. W., Dutta, S., & Weizman, A. V. (2021). Information fragmentation in the emergency department: An academic medical center experience. *Applied Clinical Informatics, 12*(02), 263–272.
28. Wisner, K., Lyndon, A., & Chesla, C. A. (2019). The electronic health record's impact on nurses' cognitive work: An integrative review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 94*, 74–84.
29. Yan, H., Guo, Y., & Dam, A. (2022). Technostress among nurses in the emergency department: A qualitative study. *Journal of Nursing Management, 30*(8), 3452–3460.
30. Zahabi, M., Kaber, D. B., & Swangnetr, M. (2019). Usability and safety in electronic medical records interface design: A review of recent literature and guideline formulation. *Human Factors, 61*(1), 150–166.