Review Article

IT Medical Team
https://www.itmedicalteam.pl/

Translational Biomedicine
2172-0479

2023
Vol. 14 No. 3: 113

Setup difficulties Implementing Policies for Translational Research in Electronic Health Records

Dick Steen*

Department of Translational Research, Australia

Corresponding author: Dick Steen

ssteen_d22@gmail.com

Department of Translational Research, Australia

Citation: Steen D (2023) Setup difficulties Implementing Policies for Translational Research in Electronic Health Records. Transl Biomed, Vol. 14 No. 3: 113.

Abstract

EMRs, or electronic medical records, are frequently mentioned as an important new tool for integrating clinical trial capabilities into routine clinical practice. Nonetheless, consolidating clinical exploration and clinical consideration exercises into one brought together electronic data framework requires incorporating a significant group of administrative necessities and institutional strategies. In order for the EMR configuration to simultaneously meet all requirements, divergent interpretations of internal policies and external regulations must be reconciled. Additionally, attempts to implement potential policies in the EMR system revealed a number of commercial system limitations and inconsistencies. Until the commercial vendor provides the missing functionality, the authors describe a set of compromises that will be implemented at The Children's Hospital. Similar configuration and policy issues will need to be resolved at each facility of an EMR-implementing institution. Before incorporating translational research capabilities into an operational EMR, the authors present a list of questions that must be answered categorically in order to highlight these configuration difficulties.

Received: 01-May-2023, Manuscript No. Iptb-23-13608; **Editor assigned:** 03-May-2023, Pre-QC No. Iptb-23-13608 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 16-May-2023, QC No. Iptb-23-13608; **Revised:** 20-May-2023, Manuscript No. Iptb-23-13608 (R); **Published:** 27-May-2023, DOI: 10.36648/2172- 0479.14.03.288

Introduction

New remedial medicines and gadgets should go through a progression of continuously more rigid planned preliminaries to acquire administrative endorsement. Alternative care strategies are frequently compared in post approval prospective trials [1]. However, there is a lot of evidence to suggest that the method used to organize and carry out these crucial clinical trials is not meeting the requirements of patients, clinical investigators, sponsors of the studies, or regulatory agencies.3,4 Only 7% of eligible patients enrol in clinical trials, and only 3% of eligible patients enrol in cancer studies [2]. 86% of clinical preliminaries neglect to finish enlistment on time7; 85% to 95% of the additional days required to complete a trial are caused by investigators failing to recruit subjects on time.8 Low recruitment rates not only prolong study completion times, but they also cause Due to the fact that the majority of studies do not include women, minorities, children, or other vulnerable populations, they also pose a threat to the generalizability of the research. Only 3% of all board-certified physicians participate in FDA-approved trials, the number of first-time clinical investigators decreased by 11% between 2001 and 2003, and half of all principal investigators never conduct another FDA-regulated clinical trial despite a significant increase in the number of new trials initiated annually. Demonstrates examples of how clinical trials could be made more efficient by utilizing electronic medical records (EMRs) [3]. Additionally, electronic medical records (EMRs) have the potential to support both clinical care and clinical research simultaneously, streamlining and integrating clinical trial and care systems, as pioneers of EMRs acknowledged. The government's expectation that the utilization of health care information technologies will significantly expand the nation's capacity for clinical research is mentioned in the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Roadmap, the NIH National Center for Research Resources (NCRR) strategic plan for 2004–2008, and the Department of Health and Human Services Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology strategic framework in the United States [4]. Information technology has also been mentioned in a lot of private sector reports as a way to expand public access to cutting-edge and experimental treatment options that are only available through clinical trials.

Reviewing institutional research policies using clinical vignettes

By allowing or disabling users' access to specific functionalities, EMR systems have the potential to improve compliance with institutional policies if properly configured. However, when implemented in an EMR, long-standing institutional policies that appear acceptable on paper may result in workflows that are either impractical or unacceptable [5]. EMR systems' extensive logging and auditing capabilities may also increase the visibility of policy violations. As a result, careful alignment is required between the EMR configuration and institutional policies. All ambulatory clinics and inpatient settings at The Children's Hospital in Denver, Colorado, began using a comprehensive EMR in 2003. The rollout and design of the EMR will be finished. At that point, the electronic medical record (EMR) will store comprehensive clinical data from every patient encounter across the organization [6]. The integration of prospective clinical research and concurrent clinical care activities and requirements within an integrated EMR was a major goal of TCH from its inception. As a result, additional policy and regulatory requirements specific to prospective clinical research required that EMR capabilities be configured accordingly. We created a comprehensive clinical vignette that detailed all of the essential steps in a prospective clinical trial in order to keep policy discussions grounded in real-world issues. During routine ambulatory, inpatient, or emergency clinical care, the EMR stores all caregiver-generated clinical observations, notes, ancillary reports, and test results in this vignette. The institution wants to use the same electronic medical record (EMR) to find potential study subjects and record study-specific clinical observations and test results on patients enrolled in prospective observational and translational clinical trials that have been approved by the IRB [7]. We listed a number of competing interpretations for each question posed in response to the vignette that could be implemented in policy and possibly enforced by the EMR software. In light of the clinical vignette, policy issues were discussed, and it was discovered that there was a surprising wide range of opinions regarding which response best matched the existing research policies, practices, and regulations. The institution, investigators, study participants, sponsoring organizations, and regulatory agencies are all subject to significantly distinct responsibilities from one another [8].

Using user roles to implement institutional policies

An important technical approach to ensuring that an electronic medical record (EMR) system complies with regulations and policy restrictions is to define and implement user-based roles and permissions that have been carefully constructed [9]. Users who require access to the same subset of system features for their jobs are assigned distinct roles. User access to system functions and patient data is controlled by role-based security. EMR users can play a variety of roles in clinical care and clinical research, as shown. It may be simple to assign a specific role to each EMR user in settings where patients only receive treatment as part of a clinical trial or standard care. However, even within the same clinical encounter, users may play different roles for the same patient in the context of mixed care, where a clinical trial directs some aspects of a patient's treatment plan but not others.

References

1 Heiat A, Gross CP, Krumholz HM (2002) Representation of the elderly, women, and minorities in heart failure clinical trials. Arch Intern Med 162:1682–1688.

2 Embi PJ, Jain A, Clark J, Bizjack S, Hornung R et al. (2005) Effect of a clinical trial alert system on physician participation in trial recruitment. Arch Intern Med 165:2272–2277.

3 Mosis G, Vlug AE, Mosseveld M (2005) A technical infrastructure to conduct randomized database studies facilitated by a general practice research database. J Am Med Inform Assoc 12:602–607.

4 Getz K (2005) Informing and engaging stakeholders on the periphery of the clinical research enterprise. Res Pract 6:4–8.

5 Sung NS, Crowley WF, Genel M (2003) Central challenges facing the national clinical research enterprise. JAMA 289:1278–1287.

6 Cruz Rowe J, Elling ME, Hazlewood JG, Zakhary R (2002) A cure for clinical trials. McKinsey Q 2:134–141.

7 Vidaver RM, Lafleur B, Tong C, Bradshaw R, Marts SA (2000) Women subjects in NIH-funded clinical research literature: lack of progress in both representation and analysis by sex. J Womens Health Gend Based Med 9:495–504.

8 King C, Manire L, Strong RM, Goldstein L (1984) Data management systems in clinical research. In: Blum BI, editor. Information Systems for Patient Care Computers and Medicine. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag 404–415.

9 Ross Davies A (1992) Health care researchers' needs for computer-based patient records. In: Ball MJ, Collen MF, editors. Aspects of the Computer-Based Patient Record Computers in Health Care. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag 46–56.