

Digital Maturity as a Predictor of Quality and Safety Outcomes in US Hospitals

Anne Snowdon, Abdulkadir Hussein, Melissa Danforth, Alexandra Wright, Reid Oakes

Submitted to: Journal of Medical Internet Research
on: January 12, 2024

Disclaimer: © The authors. All rights reserved. This is a privileged document currently under peer-review/community review. Authors have provided JMIR Publications with an exclusive license to publish this preprint on its website for review purposes only. While the final peer-reviewed paper may be licensed under a CC BY license on publication, at this stage authors and publisher expressly prohibit redistribution of this draft paper other than for review purposes.

Table of Contents

Original Manuscript..... 5

Supplementary Files..... 38

0..... 38

0..... 38

0..... 38

0..... 38

Digital Maturity as a Predictor of Quality and Safety Outcomes in US Hospitals

Anne Snowdon¹ PhD; Abdulkadir Hussein¹ PhD; Melissa Danforth²; Alexandra Wright¹ PhD; Reid Oakes³

¹University of Windsor Windsor CA

²Leapfrog Washington US

³HIMSS Chicago US

Corresponding Author:

Alexandra Wright PhD

University of Windsor

401 Sunset Ave

Wright

Windsor

CA

Abstract

Background: This study demonstrates that digital maturity contributes to strengthened quality and safety performance outcomes in US hospitals. Advanced digital maturity is associated with more digitally enabled work environments with automated flow of data across information systems to enable clinicians and leaders to track quality and safety outcomes. This research illustrates that advanced digitally enabled workforce is associated with a strong safety leadership and culture, stronger patient health and safety outcomes.

Objective: To examine the relationship between digital maturity and quality and safety outcomes in US hospitals.

This was a cross sectional observational study of 1026 US hospitals. Logistic, linear, and Tweedie regressions were used to explore the relationship between The Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades, individual leapfrog safety scores and digital maturity levels classified as highly advanced digital maturity (level 6 and 7 EMRAM maturity), and early-stage maturity levels (level 0 EMRAM maturity).

Hospitals that had completed an EMRAM assessment, were located in the USA, had complete data for their hospital characteristics in the CMS data, and had complete data for The Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades were included in this study. Hospitals included in the analysis were distributed across all 50 states.

Hospitals were divided into two groups to compare safety and quality outcomes; hospitals that are digitally advanced (EMRAM maturity levels 6 or 7) and hospitals with low digital maturity (EMRAM level 0). Data for The Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades report published in Spring 2019 were matched to the hospitals with completed EMRAM assessments in 2019. Hospital characteristics such as number of hospital beds were obtained from the CMS data base.

Main Outcome(s) and Measure(s): The main outcomes are hospital safety letter grades, and quality and safety scores on a continuous scale, published by The Leapfrog Group. Digital maturity level (EMRAM) was used as a predictor while controlling for hospital characteristics including teaching status, urban or rural location, hospital size measured by number of beds, whether the hospital was a referral center, and type of hospital ownership, as confounding variables.

Methods: The data sources were hospital safety letter grades, and quality and safety scores on a continuous scale, published by The Leapfrog Group. Digital maturity level (EMRAM) was used from 1026 US hospitals. This was a cross sectional observational study. Logistic, linear, and Tweedie regressions were used to explore the relationship between The Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades, individual leapfrog safety scores and digital maturity levels classified as highly advanced digital maturity (level 6 and 7 EMRAM maturity), and early-stage maturity levels (level 0 EMRAM maturity). EMRAM was a predictor while controlling for hospital characteristics including teaching status, urban or rural location, hospital size measured by number of beds, whether the hospital was a referral center, and type of hospital ownership, as confounding variables. Hospitals were divided into two groups to compare safety and quality outcomes; hospitals that are digitally advanced and hospitals with low digital maturity. Data for The Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades report published in Spring 2019 were matched to the hospitals with completed EMRAM assessments in 2019. Hospital characteristics such as number of hospital beds were obtained

from the CMS data base.

Results: Hospitals were distributed across the United States (all 50 states) with the final sample consisting of n=1026 hospitals. Results revealed that the odds of achieving a higher Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades is statistically significantly higher by 3.25 folds for hospitals with advanced digital maturity (EMRAM maturity of 6 or 7) (OR=3.25, 95% CI:2.33—4.55). Similarly, hospitals with advanced digital maturity had statistically significantly reduced infection rates, reduced adverse events, and improved surgical safety outcomes.

Conclusions: Study findings suggest a significant difference in quality and safety outcomes among hospitals with advanced digital maturity, compared to hospitals with low levels of digital maturity.

(JMIR Preprints 12/01/2024:56316)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.56316>

Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?

✓ **Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).**

Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.

No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.

2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?

✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**

Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in a JMIR journal, my full manuscript will be made available to all users.

Original Manuscript

Title: Digital Maturity as a Predictor of Quality and Safety Outcomes in US Hospitals**Word Count: 3066****Corresponding Author:**

Dr. Anne Snowdon, RN, PhD, FAAN
Professor, Strategy and Entrepreneurship
Odette School of Business
University of Windsor
401 Sunset Ave.,
Windsor, ON, N9B 3P4,
Canada

Word Count: 4451

There are no conflicts of interest to report. There is no funding to report.

Data cannot be shared for this study.

Authors:

Dr. Anne Snowdon, PhD
Professor, Strategy and Entrepreneurship
Odette School of Business
University of Windsor
401 Sunset Ave.,
Windsor, ON, N9B 3P4,
Canada

Dr. Abdulkadir Hussein, PhD
Professor and chair,
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Windsor,
401 Sunset Ave.,
Windsor, ON, N9B 3P4,
Canada

Melissa Danforth
Vice President, Health Care Ratings
The Leapfrog Group
1775 K Street NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006

(202) 292-6713

Dr. Alexandra Wright, PhD
Director of Research, SCAN Health
Odette School of Business
University of Windsor
401 Sunset Ave.,
Windsor, ON, N9B 3P4
Canada

Reid Oakes
Chief Products Officer
HIMSS
350 N. Orleans St. Suite S10000
Chicago, IL 60654

Abstract

This study demonstrates that digital maturity contributes to strengthened quality and safety performance outcomes in US hospitals. Advanced digital maturity is associated with more digitally

enabled work environments with automated flow of data across information systems to enable clinicians and leaders to track quality and safety outcomes. This research illustrates that advanced digitally enabled workforce is associated with a strong safety leadership and culture, stronger patient health and safety outcomes.

Objective: To examine the relationship between digital maturity and quality and safety outcomes in US hospitals.

Data Sources/Study Setting: The data sources were hospital safety letter grades, and quality and safety scores on a continuous scale, published by The Leapfrog Group. Digital maturity level (measured by EMRAM) was used from 1026 US hospitals.

Study Design: This was a cross sectional observational study. Logistic, linear, and Tweedie regressions were used to explore the relationship between The Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades, individual leapfrog safety scores and digital maturity levels classified as advanced or fully developed digital maturity (level 6 and 7 EMRAM), and under developed maturity (level 0 EMRAM). Digital maturity was a predictor while controlling for hospital characteristics including teaching status, urban or rural location, hospital size measured by number of beds, whether the hospital was a referral center, and type of hospital ownership, as confounding variables. Hospitals were divided into two groups to compare safety and quality outcomes; hospitals that are digitally advanced and hospitals with under developed digital maturity.

Data Collection: Data for The Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades report published in Spring 2019 were matched to the hospitals with completed EMRAM assessments in 2019. Hospital characteristics such as number of hospital beds were obtained from the CMS data base.

Principal Findings: Results revealed that the odds of achieving a higher Leapfrog Group's Hospital

Safety Grades is statistically significantly higher by 3.25 folds for hospitals with advanced digital maturity (EMRAM maturity of 6 or 7) (OR=3.25, 95% CI:2.33—4.55).

Conclusions: Hospitals with advanced digital maturity had statistically significantly reduced infection rates, reduced adverse events, and improved surgical safety outcomes. Study findings suggest a significant difference in quality and safety outcomes among hospitals with advanced digital maturity compared to hospitals with under developed digital maturity.

Key Words:

- Digital Maturity, Quality and Safety, Workforce, Hospital Performance

Main Text:

Introduction

Digital health is widely viewed as an opportunity to improve patient safety outcomes.¹⁻⁵ Digitally-enabled healthcare has been proposed to enable hospitals and health systems to advance and strengthen performance outcomes linked to the quadruple aim (e.g., reducing costs, improved patient experience, improved workforce satisfaction, and quality outcomes).⁶⁻⁸

Digital health technologies enable the collection of data to inform decisions to improve quality and safety of care delivery, automate care processes to reduce errors, and improve patient experience by engaging patients in their own health and care.^{1,2} While digital health tools and technologies have been proposed to enhance quality and safety of healthcare, there is limited empirical evidence demonstrating the benefits of digital health technologies.^{1,2} Specifically, research that has examined the benefits of digital health technologies on effectiveness and quality of care, are skewed towards mental health services and behavioural therapies.² There are considerable gaps in evidence of the impact of digital health transformation on cost, equitable care outcomes and patient-centred care for hospitals or health systems.²

Progress of digital transformation in health systems is often assessed using measures of digital maturity, which quantify the degree to which a healthcare organization has advanced digital capability, information infrastructure, and health data exchange, to provide digitally enabled healthcare services.⁹ As health systems advance digital transformation efforts, the impact on organizational performance, workforce and workflows, and quality and safety outcomes for patients is required to document the return on investment to advance health system performance. However, evidence of the role of advanced digital maturity in strengthening these performance outcomes has not been well established empirically.¹⁰

Progress of digital transformation in health systems has accelerated in recent years, fueled initially by incentives such as the Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health (HITECH) act of 2009.^{53, 54} The HITECH program provided financial incentives to US hospitals to adopt and implement EMRs with the goal of improving quality and safety of health care.^{53, 54} Over the life of the HITECH program, 98% of US hospitals participated in the program and received \$21.8 billion in federal incentives, 60% of eligible office-based providers participated in the program and received \$16.2 billion in federal incentives. “Meaningful use” was defined in the HITECH program in terms of achieving required processes such as data collection requirements, adoption of secure

email, and tracking the volume of messages, resulting in what some described as a “check the box” compliance program.⁵⁴ While the adoption of EMR technologies accelerated since the HITECH program, the actual use of advanced EMR functions such as physician order entry⁶¹ and the use of data in clinical settings remains more limited.⁵⁹

Digital maturity model assessments have been used widely to document the adoption of EMR technologies and functions. One maturity model adopted widely in the US is the Electronic Medical Record Assessment Model (EMRAM), developed by the Health Information Management Systems Society (HIMSS), a professional, not for profit organization with the mission of reforming the global health ecosystem through the power of information and technology.⁵⁸ The EMRAM model has been available in the US for the last 15 years. Hospitals complete the online EMRAM survey of approximately 200 indicator statements that measure key dimensions of advanced electronic medical record (EMR) infrastructure and maturity including capacity for health information exchange, clinician adoption of digital tools, data privacy and security, and governance. Hospital teams receive a detailed assessment and report that indicates level of digital maturity, strengths, and opportunities to advance their digital transformation strategy.

To date, there is clear evidence that the HITECH program accelerated EMR adoption across US health systems.⁶¹ However, empirical research on performance outcomes such as quality, safety, and patient experience has been limited, and may be influenced by the degree to which the full range of functional features of EMR technologies has been adopted and scaled across provider organizations.⁶⁰ In addition, very few quality and safety programs in health organizations consider the use of digital technologies and associated risks of technologies used in healthcare which further limits evidence of how quality and safety outcomes are influenced by digital maturity.⁶¹ More recently, significant attention to advances in digital transformation has emerged as an outcome of the COVID19 pandemic, where a massive surge in demand for virtual care accelerated digitally enabled care services, which has continued to persist to varying degrees for specific patient populations.^{62.}

Since the pandemic, quality and safety outcomes in US hospitals have been reported to have declined, despite advances in digital transformation.^{11,12} Since 2019, quality and safety outcomes for US hospitals have resulted in lower Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades (2023).²¹ Significant workforce shortages are common,¹⁴ which has further challenged hospitals to deliver quality and safe care. There is evidence that the adoption of EMR technologies is associated with added workload and burnout for the health workforce,¹⁵ which further underscores the importance of documenting the impact and value of advancing digital maturity on workforce, quality and safety outcomes.

Numerous scholars and global agencies have examined quality and safety in hospitals and have documented gaps in care delivery whereby some patients receive healthcare services that are well-below health and quality standards.¹⁶⁻²¹ One in ten patients seeking care in high-income countries are 'adversely affected during care and treatment', suggesting the need for significant improvements in quality of care across the globe.¹⁹ Patient harm has become the 14th leading cause of global disease burden²² which has resulted in significant harm for patients and has contributed to substantial health system costs. Globally, 12% of national health expenditures are the result of managing the harmful outcomes resulting from unsafe care²³ which has fueled a renewed urgency for strengthening quality and safety outcomes among healthcare systems as a strategy to reduce health system costs. Effective interventions associated with improvements in quality and safety of care delivery include communication between clinicians and their patients;^{24,25} prevention of central line infections (CLABSI),²⁶⁻²⁸ use of hand hygiene practices to prevent infections,^{29,30} quality and safety training, established leadership priorities that focus on quality and safety,³¹ and improvements in clinical pathways.^{20, 32,33} More recently, there is evidence of the link between implementation of electronic medical records, improved patient outcomes,⁵⁰ and cost-benefits.³⁴ Notably, EMR based interventions optimize digitally enabled care delivery (ex. digital communication between patients and clinicians; early detection of infections using predictive algorithms) and have all been proposed to improve quality and safety outcomes, particularly for hospital settings.³⁴ However, empirical evidence of the

contribution of advances in digital transformation towards quality and safety outcomes is limited, which presents a challenge for health system leaders to make the case for investing in digital transformation efforts to advance quality and safety outcomes. The purpose of this research was to empirically examine quality and safety outcomes in US hospitals associated with advances in digital maturity.

Methodology

This research used a cross-sectional observational study design to examine the association between digital maturity and quality and safety outcomes in US hospitals. The Leapfrog Group partnered with HIMSS on this research and provided The Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades data set from the spring of 2019 report (Table 2).

The Leapfrog Group is a national, not-for-profit organization in the US that collects, analyzes, and publishes data on safety and quality outcomes in hospitals, intended to inform decisions to strengthen quality, safety, and reduce cost in U.S. health care systems.³⁵ Leapfrog's quality and safety measures include the Leapfrog Hospital survey, Leapfrog Hospital Safety Grade; Leapfrog Ambulatory Surgery Center Survey; and Leapfrog Value-Based Purchasing Program³⁵. The Leapfrog Group administers two publicly reported hospital ratings programs annually. Publicly available data (e.g., Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), the Leapfrog Hospital Survey, and secondary data sources such as the American Hospital Association's Annual Survey and IT Supplement, are weighted and then combined to produce a composite score that is published as an A, B, C, D or F letter grade for almost 3,000 hospitals in the US.³⁶ Austen et al., (2014), further describe this methodology for arriving at a composite patient safety score.⁶⁵

The Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grade of "A" represents advanced patient safety outcomes achieved by acute care hospitals, and "F" represents safety outcomes which are lower than would be expected for an acute care hospital. The overall letter grades reported by Leapfrog are based on 28

individual quality and safety measures. In this study, we included 22 of the Leapfrog individual measures (Table 2). Variation in response rates are reported by Leapfrog for each safety measure resulting in different sample sizes for each leapfrog measure included in this analysis (Table 2). The 2019 data set was selected for this analysis as it was the most complete dataset compared to either 2020 and 2021, due to the impact of the COVID19 pandemic on hospital participation.

EMRAM maturity model data was made available by HIMSS for this analysis as EMRAM has been widely available in the US market for the past 15 years. Hospitals complete an online assessment which has an embedded algorithm which generates a digital maturity level score on a 7-point scale of zero through seven. Hospitals which score at a 6 or 7 digital maturity level, are further assessed by an onsite HIMSS team to validate achievement of advanced digital maturity. Hospitals that do not meet the minimum EMRAM requirements for digital maturity are scored at level 0. For example, to achieve level one digital maturity, hospitals must have laboratory, imaging, pharmacy, and cardiology information systems fully integrated into the EMR to enable clinicians to access diagnostic reports and medication profiles, and resilience management plans to manage downtime of IT systems which must all be in place to achieve level one digital maturity. For the purposes of this study, hospitals at stage 0 on EMRAM, were classified as having under developed digital maturity. To be assessed at EMRAM level 0, data from laboratory, pharmacy, imaging, and interventional cardiology have not been integrated into the electronic medical record resulting in significant data silos. Under developed digital maturity, may indicate that the organization has not yet started their digital transformation journey, or may indicate that the organization has not progressed digital maturity beyond basic digital functionality. Hospitals assessed to have achieved stage 6 or 7 level of maturity were classified as achieving advanced digital maturity which includes features such as 95% or greater staff adoption and use of advanced EMR functions, including computerized physician order entry (CPOE), bar code medication administration (BCMA), integration of data from multiple internal and external sources and clinical settings, use of alerts to identify risk of errors, and

automated digital tools to track progress of patient outcomes. Each of these advanced functions are designed to improve quality and safety, such as reduced errors related to physician orders, or reduced errors during medication administration. Achievement of a level 7 EMRAM digital maturity indicates that the organization has reached advanced digital maturity. Requirements to achieve each subsequent level of digital maturity for the EMRAM model is described in Table 1. For this analysis, we focused only on hospitals at digital maturity levels of 0 (under developed digital maturity), and level 6 or 7 (advanced digital maturity) as there were very few hospitals (e.g. < 20 hospitals) at maturity levels of one through five, which were excluded from the analysis due to small sample size. The small number of hospitals scoring between levels one and five is viewed as an outcome of a number of factors, including lack of financial incentives to measure or advance digital maturity (e.g. completion of HITECH program), limited financial and staff resources to complete assessments, and competing priorities among leaders such as financial pressures, and workforce shortages which have escalated since the pandemic. Hospitals that take the EMRAM assessment and score level 0, may also be less inclined to repeat the assessment until such time as they have achieved significant progress in their digital maturity, whereby assessments of progress serve as motivation to profile their accomplishments when they reach level 6 or 7. The final study sample consisted of n=1026 hospitals with complete Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades (letter grades), complete EMRAM maturity levels 0,6 and 7, and complete CMS data describing hospital characteristics data.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarise the demographic features of hospitals included in this study (Table 3). The number of beds was used to categorize hospital size as small (0-149 beds), medium (150-499 beds), and large hospitals (400 or more beds). The outcome variables in this study differed in their scales of measurement and included binary, ordered categories and continuous variables. The details of the analysis scales are reported in Table 2. Consequently, different types of

regression modeling approaches were required to examine the association between digital maturity levels (underdeveloped versus advanced), and The Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades, practices, and outcomes. The regression methodologies used in each case are described below:

1. Association between EMRAM maturity and Leapfrog Safety (letter) grades, which is an ordinal categorical variable, was analyzed using a cumulative logit regression model, whereby the odds of achieving higher Leapfrog Safety Grades were estimated. EMRAM maturity levels were used as predictors while controlling for hospital characteristics (e.g. bed size, ownership, rural/urban, and teaching status). The result of this analysis is reported in the second column of Table 4a.
2. The association between EMRAM maturity and the Process/Structural Measures of Leapfrog safety practices (CPOE, ICU, SP1, SP2, SP4, SP9, and SP19, described in Table2) were analyzed using a logistic regression to model the odds of meeting the standard or achieving a full score with respect to EMRAM maturity levels and hospital characteristics. These results are reported in columns 2 onward of Tables 4a,b.
3. The Hospital Acquired Infection (HAI) outcomes described in Table 2, had substantial number of zeros, which makes ordinary regression models invalid. Therefore, the association between EMRAM maturity levels and HAI measures were analyzed using Tweedie's regression which is designed for outcomes that have non-negative values with a large number of zeros⁵¹. The results of this analysis are presented as the multiplicative effects of digital maturity (i.e., the predictor) on the average rate of the HAI outcome variables. For example, if the effect of EMRAM maturity on CLABSI is 1.2, it is to be interpreted as: hospitals with under developed maturity having 20% higher rates of CLABSI on average than digitally advanced (EMRAM 6,7) hospitals. Results of this analysis are reported in Table 6.
4. Patient Safety Indicators (PSI 3,4,6,11,12,14,15) and hospital acquired conditions (Foreign

object retention and Falls and Trauma, described in Table 2), are reported by Leapfrog as the rate per 1000 CMS eligible discharges. These measures vary between 0 and 1000. The association of these measures with EMRAM maturity and other hospital characteristics (e.g. bed size, ownership, rural/urban, teaching status) were analyzed using ordinary linear regression. The results of this regression analysis are presented as the additive increases or decreases in average rates due to changes in the levels of the predictor variable, advanced versus under developed maturity levels (see Tables 5a,b).

Results

There were 1026 hospitals included in this study, 15.8% of hospitals (n=162) had achieved advanced digital maturity (EMRAM level 6 or 7), and 864 (84.2%) hospitals had under developed digital maturity, assessed at EMRAM level 0. Just over half were non-teaching hospitals, (53.7%, n=551), with 475 (46.3%) identified as teaching hospitals. Most hospitals were located in urban areas (57.8%, n=593), with 475 (42.2%) in rural areas. There were 666 non-profit hospitals (64.9%), 129 (12.6%) government hospitals and 231 (22.5%) proprietary hospitals. Most hospitals in the sample were large (59.9%, n=615), with 180 (17.7%) medium sized hospitals and 229 (22.3%) small hospitals in this sample.

Results reveal that, after controlling for hospital characteristics, the odds of achieving a higher Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades are statistically significantly higher by 3.25 folds for hospitals with advanced digital maturity (OR=3.25, 95% CI:2.33—4.55). When examining the role of hospital characteristics, non-teaching hospitals had better odds of achieving a higher Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades, and governmental hospitals had lower odds of achieving higher Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades than both non-profit, and privately owned hospitals (Table 3a). There was no statistical evidence that hospital size (e.g., bed size) influenced Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades outcomes.

The odds of achieving full score on Culture of Leadership Structures and Systems (SP1) was statistically significantly higher for hospitals with advanced digital maturity (OR=3.45, 95% CI 1.64—7.26). Similarly, such odds were 3.54-fold greater for digitally advanced hospitals with respect to nursing workforce (SP9) (OR=3.54, 95% CI: 1.53—8.18) (Table 3b). Although not statistically significant, the odds were also higher for hospitals with advanced digital maturity relative to identification and mitigation of risks and hazards (SP4), and hand hygiene practices (SP19)(Table 3b). Digital maturity was significantly associated with computerized physician order entry, (CPOE), intensive care unit physician staffing (IPS), and Barcode medication administration, whereby digitally mature hospitals had higher odds of meeting the standard for these three measures (Table 3a). Advanced digital maturity was statistically significantly associated with a number of patient safety indicators, including the incidence of pressure ulcers (PSI3), episodes of collapsed lung (PSI 6), and unrecognized abdominopelvic accidental puncture/laceration (PSI15) (Tables 4a,b). The majority of PSI outcomes for digitally mature hospitals indicate reduced rates of these adverse events.

Hospitals with advanced digital maturity had an average of 21% lower rates of CLABSI (Table 5), which was the only statistically significant association between digital maturity and hospital acquired infections. Large hospitals had significantly lower rates of CLABSI when compared to smaller hospitals, and non-profit hospitals had significantly lower rates of CLABSI compared to either government or proprietary hospitals. Digitally advanced hospitals had, on average, lower rates of methicillin resistant staphylococcal aureus (MRSA), C. Difficile Infection and Surgical Site Infections (SSI), but the differences were not statistically significant.

Discussion

This cross-sectional study included a large and diverse group of US hospitals (n=1026) whereby advanced digital maturity was a significant predictor of The Leapfrog Group's Hospital Safety Grades for hospitals of all sizes and types in this study. However, only 16% of these hospitals had

achieved advanced digital maturity (assessed at EMRAM 6 or 7), with the majority of hospitals having under developed digital maturity (scoring EMRAM 0). This finding is consistent with evidence of the impact of the Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health (HITECH) policy in 2009, known as the “meaningful use” policy, which accelerated the adoption of EMR technologies in US hospitals, but failed to stimulate adoption of advanced EMR technology that is required to strengthen hospital performance, such as quality and safety.^{53, 54} The achievements of the 16% of hospitals with advanced digital maturity in this study offer insights into the key features of advanced digital maturity that are associated with stronger quality and safety outcomes. Hospitals validated as having advanced digital maturity are able to mobilize data from multiple external sources, have automated tracking of patient progress and health outcomes, and engage patients directly in accessing their health data to manage their health and care.⁵⁸ In contrast, the 84% of hospitals with under developed digital maturity (EMRAM level 0), have not completed installation of all of the key ancillary information systems such as laboratory, pharmacy, cardiology, and imaging, which suggests that leaders and clinicians working in these hospital settings cannot readily track quality and safety outcomes, or assess patient health status respectively. When digital maturity is at a very basic level, data from these critical information systems cannot be readily accessed or mobilized, and significant limitations in the flow of quality and safety data result in lack of data informed strategy and decision making needed to advance quality and safety and performance outcomes more generally.

A key question emerging from these findings is why so few hospitals have advanced their adoption of advanced features of EMR technology. One potential explanation is the limited resources available to invest in advancing maturity without policy incentives such as the HITECH program to stimulate continued progress. Another possible explanation may be related to the profound impact of the pandemic on hospitals that experienced exceptional financial and workforce challenges from 2020 to 2023, whereby progress towards digital maturity likely halted or slowed down given the

many competing demands during this challenging period. Finally, a third reason may be that hospital leaders in the US could be hesitant to invest in digital maturity assessments as they progress their digital transformation effort until such time as they have made significant progress due to the concern that such results will be viewed as “poor or limited” progress among key stakeholders such as patients and funders. The US system is highly competitive, and leaders may be limited in their tolerance for maturity assessment outcomes of 0 to 4 that may have the potential to impact revenues and market reach.

In addition, hospitals with advanced digital maturity were significantly more likely to have a strong leadership safety culture, more advanced safety structures and systems, and stronger quality and safety outcomes that are sensitive to nursing workforce capacity (e.g. risk assessments related to staffing, board accountability for safety-related staffing, budget resources that prioritize optimal staffing, and actionable strategies focused on performance improvement).⁵⁶ Evidence of hospital strategies associated with advanced EMR adoption identify three key leadership, and systems integration requirements.⁵⁶ Specifically, digitally mature hospitals have achieved advanced systems integration which offers the critical infrastructure capacity to support data driven decision making to advance quality and safety performance. Leadership culture that prioritizes safety may also be a critical driver of systems integration and advances in digital maturity that strengthens workforce capacity by integrating safe practices into workflows, and establishing accountability structures to measure performance outcomes, that are supported by a robust digital infrastructure for tracking and reporting safety outcomes.

The lack of integration of ancillary information systems evident in the majority of hospitals in this study, may be a contributing factor to the negative impact of digital maturity on clinician workflows and clinician burnout, described in a number of studies.^{55, 56} Specifically, if lab, pharmacy, cardiology and imaging data do not flow automatically to an individual patient’s health record, then clinicians have few options but to search for these critical data points from multiple and disconnected

software systems which requires significant clinician time and attention. With the increased volume and complexity of patient demand, clinician workload is high and the lack of system integration may further heighten workload burden that has been reported relative to EMR technologies.⁵⁵ In addition, without the integration of data flows across the organization, there is very limited capacity for these hospitals to track organizational performance, track progress of patient outcomes, or proactively identify risks to enable interventions to mitigate risks to patients, in order to strengthen quality and safety outcomes.

Results of this study profile a number of key features of digitally advanced hospitals, including a strong leadership culture of quality and safety that leverages advanced digital maturity and EMR technologies as a strategy to achieve quality and safety performance, effective clinical workflows, workforce strategies that strengthen quality and safety (ex. staffing levels associated with accountability for safety outcomes), and data rich work environments that automate data driven decision making and enable real time tracking of performance outcomes to inform strategic decisions among hospital leaders.

Efforts to advance digital maturity in hospitals as a strategic priority have heightened since the pandemic, particularly given current workforce shortages, and the decline in quality and safety performance.²¹ The findings of this study supports current evidence that advanced digital maturity strengthens quality and safety hospital performance outcomes,⁶⁻⁸ which previously had not been well documented empirically.¹⁰ These findings may also offer policy makers and hospital leaders a strategic roadmap for advancing digital maturity as a strategy to improve quality and safety performance well into the future.^{11,12} At a time when global workforce shortages are so challenging,¹⁴ these findings may also inform organizational strategies that advance quality of digital work environments that enable greater automation in flow of data to advance data driven decision making, reduce workload burden among clinicians, and support quality outcomes for patients.¹⁵ Future policy levers may be effective in accelerating progress towards advanced digital maturity,

focused on prioritizing quality and safety outcomes and reducing workforce burden, rather than focusing more narrowly on adoption of EMR technology.⁵⁴

New digital and sociotechnical trends in healthcare continue to emerge rapidly including progress towards learning health systems⁶⁴, artificial intelligence technologies such as machine learning, and large language models such as generative artificial intelligence tools. All of these technologies rely heavily on a robust and mature digital infrastructure that is well integrated and able to capture, securely store, and flow data within and across clinical settings to inform health and care decisions. Yet, if the majority of US hospitals have not achieved digital maturity beyond level 0, then a significant number of hospitals in the US may not have the digital maturity required to consider analytics strategies focused on adoption of these new technologies that hold so much potential for advancing quality care for patients. In addition, hospitals and health systems which have not advanced beyond level 0 maturity are likely to be profoundly limited in their capacity to advance learning health systems whereby performance outcomes and quality of patient care are tracked and monitored to inform the design and development of new, digitally enabled models of care that ensure that every person in every health care setting have access to the highest quality of care possible.

In order to achieve the aspirational promises of digital transformation for US health systems, the findings from this study suggest that hospitals must accelerate progress towards advanced digital maturity to not only strengthen quality and safety outcomes for patients, and strengthen quality work environments that support a robust and sustainable health workforce, but perhaps most importantly, ensure that every hospital is well positioned to readily adopt and scale the many impressive digital tools and technologies such as artificial intelligence, in order to ensure equitable and highly effective care delivery focused on sustaining and strengthening health and wellness for the US population.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations of this study. The sampling frame of hospitals for this study was limited to organizations with a completed EMRAM assessment and leapfrog survey in 2019, which

may not represent all US hospitals. The second limitation is the lack of representation of hospitals at EMRAM maturity levels one through five which precluded examination of quality and safety advances at each level of EMRAM maturity. Very few hospitals assessed at EMRAM levels one through five are represented in the HIMSS US data set, which is a consistent pattern in other countries including Canada, Germany, and Australia. Hospitals typically assess their EMRAM maturity, initially at level 0, and then do not re-assess again until they reach level 6 at which point they are validated with an onsite assessment by HIMSS team.

The results of this study provide many opportunities for future research to document the role of digital maturity to better understand how it advances quality and safety. Specifically, future research may examine the role of data driven decision making, mobilizing data from multiple and diverse sources, automation of data flow, and digitally mature work environments that support clinicians to deliver quality care, and enable active participation of patients in their care decisions. Future research that documents the complexity of care environments and the many features of digitally mature hospital care environments is needed to better understand how digital maturity advances quality and safe care that is equitable and offers every patient the opportunity to achieve their health and wellness goals. Future research may also examine the specific factors which have limited progress in advanced digital maturity for the majority of hospitals in this study. Examination of the key factors which preclude advancement of digital transformation may inform hospital leaders of strategies to overcome these barriers and challenges. The key feature of leadership expertise and strategy associated with learning health systems that create a culture of learning warrants further research with specific focus on how data rich environments create the capacity for learning in health systems such as advances in quality of work environments, engagement of patients in their health and care, and effective management of the many competing demands to ensure every patient has the opportunity to strengthen health system performance that supports the health and wellness of every US citizen.

References

1. Borycki EM, Kushniruk AW. Health technology, quality and safety in a learning health system. *Healthc Manage Forum*. 2023;36(2):79-85. doi:10.1177/08404704221139383
2. Ibrahim MS, Yusoff HM, Abu Bakar YI, Thwe Aung MM, Abas MI, Ramli RA. Digital health for quality healthcare: a systematic mapping of review studies. *Digit Health*. 2022;8:20552076221085810. doi:10.1177/20552076221085810
3. Alotaibi YK, Federico F. The impact of health information technology on patient safety. *Saudi Med J*. 2017;38(12):1173-1180. doi:10.15537/smj.2017.12.20631
4. Black AD, Car J, Pagliari C, et al. The Impact of eHealth on the quality and safety of health care: a systematic overview. *PLoS Med*. 2011;8(1). doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000387
5. World Health Organization. Global strategy on digital health 2020-2025. World Health Organization; 2021. ISBN 978-92-4-002092-4. Accessed July 28, 2023. <https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/gd4dhdaa2a9f352b0445bafbc79ca799dce4d.pdf>
6. Bodenheimer T, Sinsky C. From triple to quadruple aim: care of the patient requires care of the provider. *Ann Fam Med*. 2014;12(6):573-576. doi:10.1370/afm.1713
7. Rahimi K. Digital health and the elusive quest for cost savings. *Lancet Digit Health*. 2019;1(3):e108-e109. doi:10.1016/s2589-7500(19)30056-1
8. Woods L, Eden R, Canfell OJ, Nguyen KH, Comans T, Sullivan C. Show me the money: how do we justify spending health care dollars on digital health? *Med J Aust*. 2023;218(2):53-57. doi:10.5694/mja2.51799
9. Teixeira F, Li E, Laranjo L, Collins C, et al. Digital maturity and its determinants in general

- practice: a cross-sectional study in 20 countries. *Front Public Health*. 2023;10:962924. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2022.962924
10. Duncan R, Eden R, Woods L, Wong I, Sullivan C. Synthesizing dimensions of digital maturity in hospitals: systematic review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2022;24(3). doi:10.2196/32994
 11. Brborović O, Brborović H, Hrain L. The COVID-19 Pandemic Crisis and Patient Safety Culture: A Mixed-Method Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022;19(4):2237. doi:10.3390/ijerph19042237
 12. Rangachari P, Woods JL. Preserving organizational resilience, patient safety, and staff retention during COVID-19 requires a holistic consideration of the psychological safety of healthcare workers. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(12):4267. doi:10.3390/ijerph17124267
 13. Leapfrog (2023). New Leapfrog Hospital Safety Grade Reveals Significant Increase in Healthcare-Associated Infections and Worsening Patient Experience During COVID-19 Pandemic. Leapfrog. Available from: [https://www.hospitalsafetygrade.org/about-our-movement/newsroom/display/1155271#:~:text=Compared%20to%20the%202021%20spring,responsiveness%20\(3.46%25%20decline\).](https://www.hospitalsafetygrade.org/about-our-movement/newsroom/display/1155271#:~:text=Compared%20to%20the%202021%20spring,responsiveness%20(3.46%25%20decline).)
 14. Boniol M, Kunjumen T, Nair TS, Siyam A, Campbell J, Diallo K. The global health workforce stock and distribution in 2020 and 2030: a threat to equity and ‘universal’ health coverage? *BMJ Glob Health*. 2022;7(6). doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2022-009316
 15. Singh N, Lawrence K, Sinsky C, Mann DM. Digital minimalism- an Rx for clinician burnout. *N Engl J Med*. 2023;388:1158-1159. doi:10.1056/NEJMp2215297
 16. Dhalla IA, Tepper J. Improving the quality of health care in Canada. *CMAJ*. 2018;190(39):E1162-E1167. doi:10.1503/cmaj.171045
 17. Institute of Medicine, Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century. National Research Council; 2001. i-337, ISBN: 9780309072809. Accessed July 28, 2023. <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/read/10027/chapter/1>
 18. McGlynn EA, Asch SM, Adams J, et al. The quality of health care delivered to adults in the United States. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;348:2635-2645. doi:10.1056/NEJMsa022615
 19. World Health Organisation, World Bank, OECD. Delivering quality health services: a global

- imperative for universal health coverage. WHO, OECD, World Bank; 2018. ISBN 978-92-4-151390-6 WHO, ISBN 978-92-64-30030-9 (PDF) OECD. Accessed July 28, 2023. <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/272465/9789241513906-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
20. Vincent C, Amalberti R. Safer Healthcare: Strategies of the Real World. Springer; 2016. Accessed July 28, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-25559-0>
21. Vincent C, & Staines A. Enhancing the Quality and Safety of Swiss Healthcare. Federal Office of Public Health on the Quality and Safety of Healthcare in Switzerland. Accessed July 28, 2023. <https://www.bag.admin.ch/dam/bag/de/dokumente/kuv-leistungen/qualitaetssicherung/Enhancing%20the%20Quality%20and%20Safety%20of%20Swiss%20Healthcare-EN.pdf.download.pdf/Enhancing%20the%20Quality%20and%20Safety%20of%20Swiss%20Healthcare-EN.pdf>
22. World Health Organization. Patient safety. World Health Organization. 2019. Accessed July 28, 2023. <https://www.who.int/teams/integrated-health-services/patient-safety>.
23. OECD. The economics of patient safety: from analysis to action. OECD; 2020. Accessed July 28, 2023. <https://www.oecd.org/health/health-systems/Economics-of-Patient-Safety-October-2020.pdf>.
24. Hannawa, A., Spitzberg, B., Childress, M., Frankel, R., Pham, J. & Wu, A. Communication science lessons for patient safety and quality care. *Journal of Patient Safety and Risk Management*. 2020;25(5):197-204. doi:10.1177/2516043520926424.
25. Staines, A., Baralon, C, & Farin, A. (2016). TeamSTEPPS : des outils de travail en équipe pour la sécurité des patients (TeamSTEPPS: teamwork tools for patient safety). *Risques & Qualité en milieu de soins*, XIII(3), 159-164.
26. Redstone CS, Zadeh M, Wilson MA, et al. A quality improvement initiative to decrease central line-associated bloodstream infections during the COVID-19 pandemic: a "zero harm" approach. *J Patient Saf*. 2023;19(3):173-179. doi:10.1097/PTS.0000000000001107.
27. Pronovost, P., Needham, D., Berenholtz, S., Sinopoli, D., Chu, H., Cosgrove, S., Sexton, B., Hyzy, R., Welsh, R., Roth, G., Bander, J., Kepros, J. & Goeschel, C. An Intervention to Decrease Catheter-Related Bloodstream Infections in the ICU. *N Engl J Med* 2006;

- 355:2725-2732. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa061115.
28. Blot K, Bergs J, Vogelaers D, Blot S, Vandijck D. Prevention of central line-associated bloodstream infections through quality improvement interventions: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;59(1):96-105. doi:10.1093/cid/ciu239.
 29. Vermeil T, Peters A, Kilpatrick C, Pires D, Allegranzi B, Pittet D. Hand hygiene in hospitals: anatomy of a revolution. *J Hosp Infect*. 2019;101(4):383-392. doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2018.09.003.
 30. Song X, Stockwell DC, Floyd T, Short BL, Singh N. Improving hand hygiene compliance in health care workers: strategies and impact on patient outcomes. *Am J Infect Control*. 2013;41(10):e101-5. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2013.01.031.
 31. Buljac-Samardzic M, Doekhie KD, van Wijngaarden JDH. Interventions to improve team effectiveness within health care: a systematic review of the past decade. *Hum Resour Health*. 2020;18(2). doi:10.1186/s12960-019-0411-3.
 32. Rotter T, de Jong RB, Lacko SE, Ronellenfisch U, Kinsman L. Clinical pathways as a quality strategy. In: Busse R, Klazinga N, Panteli D, Quentin W, eds. *Improving healthcare quality in Europe: Characteristics, effectiveness and implementation of different strategies*. European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies; 2019:309-330. Accessed July 28, 2023. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK549262/>.
 33. Maharaj AD, Holland JF, Scarborough RO, et al. The upper gastrointestinal cancer registry (UGICR): a clinical quality registry to monitor and improve care in upper gastrointestinal cancers. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9:e031434. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031434.
 34. Nguyen KH, Wright C, Simpson D, Woods L, Comans T, Sullivan C. Economic evaluation and analyses of hospital-based electronic medical records (EMRs): a scoping review of international literature. *NPJ Digit Med*. 2022;5(1):29. doi:10.1038/s41746-022-00565-1.
 35. Leapfrog Group. Raising the bar for safer healthcare. The Leapfrog Group. 2023. Accessed July 28, 2023. <https://www.leapfroggroup.org/about>.
 36. Leapfrog. Leapfrog hospital safety grade scoring methodology, spring 2022 safety grade. 2022. Accessed July 28, 2023. <https://www.hospitalsafetygrade.org/media/file/Safety-Grade-Methodology-Spring-2022.pdf>.
 37. Eden R, Burton-Jones A, Scott I, Staib A, Sullivan C. Effects of eHealth on hospital practice:

- synthesis of the current literature. *Aust Health Rev.* 2018;42(5):568-578. doi:10.1071/AH17255.
38. Zheng K, Abraham J, Novak LL, Reynolds TL, Gettinger A. A Survey of the literature on unintended consequences associated with health information technology: 2014–2015. *Yearb Med Inform.* 2016;25(01):13-29. Accessed July 28, 2023. doi:10.15265/IY-2016-036.
39. Krasuska M, Williams R, Sheikh A, et al. Technological capabilities to assess digital excellence in hospitals in high performing health care systems: international eDelphi exercise. *J Med Internet Res.* 2020;22(8):e17022. doi:10.2196/17022.
40. Cresswell K, Sheikh A, Krasuska M, et al. Reconceptualising the digital maturity of health systems. *Lancet Digit Health.* 2019;1(5):e200-e201. doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(19)30083-4.
41. Woods L, Dendere R, Eden R, et al. Perceived impact of digital health maturity on patient experience, population health, health care costs, and provider experience: mixed methods case study. *J Med Internet Res.* 2023;25:e45868. doi:10.2196/45868 PMID: 37463008.
42. Carvalho JV, Rocha Á, Abreu A. Maturity assessment methodology for HISMM-hospital information system maturity model. *J Med Syst.* 2019;43(2):35. doi:10.1007/s10916-018-1143-y.
43. Johnston DS. Digital maturity: are we ready to use technology in the NHS? *Future Healthc J.* 2017;4(3):189-192. doi:10.7861/futurehosp.4-3-189.
44. Flott K, Callahan R, Darzi A, Mayer E. A patient-centered framework for evaluating digital maturity of health services: a systematic review. *J Med Internet Res.* 2016;18(4):e75. doi:10.2196/jmir.5047
45. Demaerschalk BM, Hollander JE, Krupinski E, et al. Quality frameworks for virtual care: expert panel recommendations. *Mayo Clin Proc Innov Qual Outcomes.* 2023;7(1):31-44. Published online December 30, 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2022.12.001
46. HIMSS. Who We Are. HIMSS. Updated 2023. Accessed July 30, 2023. <https://www.himss.org/who-we-are>
47. HIMSS. Digital health transformation: what are maturity models?. HIMSS. 2023. Accessed July 27, 2023. <https://www.himss.org/what-we-do-solutions/digital-health-transformation/maturity-models>
48. Wood SN. Generalized additive models: an introduction with R, second edition. Taylor &

- Francis Group; 2017.
49. Leapfrog Group. Survey materials scoring and results. The Leapfrog Group. 2023.
<https://www.leapfroggroup.org/survey-materials/scoring-and-results>
 50. Lee J, Kuo YF, Goodwin JS. The effect of electronic medical record adoption on outcomes in US hospitals. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2013;13:39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-13-39>
 51. Smyth GK. Regression modelling of quantity data with exact zeroes. Proceedings of the Second Australia-Japan Workshop on Stochastic Models in Engineering, Technology and Management. Technology Management Centre, University of Queensland; 1996.
<http://www.statsci.org/smyth/pubs/RegressionWithExactZerosPreprint.pdf>
 52. Wolf H, Snowdon A. People, process and technology: A model for digital transformation of healthcare. *Management in Healthcare*. 2022;6(4):316-334.
 53. Adler-Milstein J, Jha AK. HITECH Act drove large gains in hospital electronic record adoption. *Health Affairs*. 2017;36(8):1416-1422.
 54. Halamka JD, Tripathi M. The HITECH era in retrospect. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377(10):907-909.
 55. Wu D, Xu C, Kim A, Bindhu S, Mah K, Eckman M. A Scoping Review of Health Information Technology in Clinician Burnout. *Appl Clin Inform*. 2021;12(03):597-620. DOI: 10.1055/s-0041-1731399
 56. Holmgren AJ, Phelan J, Jha AK, Adler-Milstein J. Hospital organizational strategies associated with advanced EHR adoption. *Health Serv Res*. 2022 Apr;57(2):259-269. doi: 10.1111/1475-6773.13655. Epub 2021 Mar 29. PMID: 33779993; PMCID: PMC8928026.
 57. The Leapfrog Group. The Leapfrog Hospital Survey: hard Copy. The Leapfrog Group. Available from: https://www.leapfroggroup.org/sites/default/files/Files/2022%20Hospital%20Survey_20220608_v8.3%20%28version%20%29.pdf. Accessed November 16, 2023.
 58. HIMSS. Electronic Medical Record Adoption Model (EMRAM). HIMSS. Available from: <https://www.himss.org/what-we-do-solutions/digital-health-transformation/maturity-models/electronic-medical-record-adoption-model-emram>. Accessed: November 16, 2023.
 59. Walker DM, Tarver WL, Jonnalagadda P, Ranbom L, Ford EW, Rahurkar S. Perspectives on Challenges and Opportunities for Interoperability: Findings From Key Informant Interviews With Stakeholders in Ohio. *JMIR Med Inform*. 2023;11:e43848. Published 2023 Feb 24.

doi:10.2196/43848

60. Lin, Y., Lin, M. & Chen, H. Do electronic health records affect quality of care? Evidence from the HITECH act. *Management Information Systems*. 2019 March; 30 (1).
<https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2018.0813>
61. Everson J, Rubin JC, Friedman CP. Reconsidering hospital EHR adoption at the dawn of HITECH: implications of the reported 9% adoption of a "basic" EHR. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2020 Aug 1;27(8):1198-1205. doi: 10.1093/jamia/ocaa090. Erratum in: *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2021 Dec 28;29(1):221. PMID: 32585689; PMCID: PMC7481034.
62. Borycki EM, Kushniruk AW. Health technology, quality and safety in a learning health system. *Healthc Manage Forum*. 2023 Mar;36(2):79-85. doi: 10.1177/08404704221139383. Epub 2022 Dec 23. PMID: 36562483; PMCID: PMC9975897.
63. Amankwah-Amoah J, Khan Z, Wood G, Knight G. COVID-19 and digitalization: The great acceleration. *J Bus Res*. 2021 Nov;136:602-611. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.08.011. Epub 2021 Aug 11. PMID: 34austen8980; PMCID: PMC8437806.
64. Peek N, Sujan M, Scott P. Digital health and care: emerging from pandemic times. *BMJ Health Care Inform*. 2023 Oct;30(1):e100861. doi: 10.1136/bmjhci-2023-100861. PMID: 37832967; PMCID: PMC10583078.
65. Austin JM, D'Andrea G, Birkmeyer JD, Leape LL, Milstein A, Pronovost PJ, Romano PS, Singer SJ, Vogus TJ, Wachter RM. Safety in numbers: the development of Leapfrog's composite patient safety score for U.S. hospitals. *J Patient Saf*. 2014 Mar;10(1):64-71. doi: 10.1097/PTS.0b013e3182952644. PMID: 24080719.

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Description of the Electronic Medical Record Assessment Model (EMRAM) stages of digital maturity

EMRAM	Requirement to Achieve Stage
-------	------------------------------

Stage	
Stage 0	The organization has not installed all the key ancillary department systems (laboratory, pharmacy, cardiology, radiology, etc).
Stage 1	Laboratory, Imaging, Pharmacy and Cardiology systems produce patient centric reports and results. Resilience management plans are in place.
Stage 2	A clinical data repository (CDR) provides access to results and reports, Governance and Policy control, Clinical Decision Support opportunities, Training records and IT security.
Stage 3	Electronic clinical documentation is accessed remotely through the CDR. Role based access controls are in place.
Stage 4	Computerized Practitioner Order Entry and Electronic prescribing within an electronic medicines administration record. Clinical and Information governance is well defined. Monitoring of Clinical outcome and patient satisfaction targets.
Stage 5	Integration of data from extremal sources. Change in clinical parameters continuously monitored by alerts and warnings. Telehealth and virtual care services are available. Intruder Prevention Systems manage unauthorized access. Technology supports bedside processes.
Stage 6	Integration of medical devices. Health Information Exchange supports data sharing, Service users submit self-reported outcomes data. Wearables and implants support remote monitoring and patient management of health and care. Online services improve access, and health literacy.
Stage 7	Integration of data from multiple external sources. Service users receive alerts and reminders to support self-managed care and use automated tools to measure patient outcomes. Digital infrastructure tools enable dynamic patient engagement in managing personal health and care.

Table 2. Leapfrog Quality and Safety Variables Included in the Study

Variable Name (Effective sample size)	Description	Analysis scale
Hospital Safety Grade(n=1026)	An overall letter grade based on score calculated from 28 measures (see details in [6])	Categorical: A, B, C, D or F
Process/Structural Measures		
Computerized Physician Order Entry (CPOE)(n=911)	CPOE measures a hospitals progress toward implementing a CPOE system to reduce medication ordering errors.	Fully meets the standard(Yes=1, No=0)
Bar Code Medication Administration (BCMA)(n=902)	It measures: 1) hospitals progress towards implanting BCMA throughout the hospital 2) compliance with patient and medication scans during administration, 3) use of decision support, and 4) structures to monitor and reduce workarounds	Fully meets the standard(Yes=1, No=0)
ICU Physician Staffing (IPS) (n=988)	Measures a hospitals use of intensivists in ICUs.	Fully meets the standard(Y=1, No=0)
Safe Practices (SP)		
SP1: Culture of Leadership Structures and Systems(n=615) SP2: Culture Measurement, Feedback & Intervention(n=615) SP4: Identification and Mitigation of Risks and Hazards(n=615) SP9: Nursing Workforce(n=615) SP19: Hand Hygiene(n=615)	Measures a hospital's progress toward implementing NQF-endorsed processes and protocols to reduce and prevent adverse events.	These variables are on continuous scales that are: 0-120 for SP1,2, 0-100 for SP4,9 and 0-60 for SP19. Most of the hospitals achieved full scores. Therefore, our unit of measurement in this analysis is whether or not a hospital achieved full score (Yes=1, No=0)
Outcomes		
Hospital Acquired Conditions		
FOR: Foreign Object Retained(n=1026) FAT: Falls and Trauma(n=1026)	Three hospital-acquired condition measures are calculated by CMS through the DRA HAC Reporting Program: Foreign Object Retained after Surgery, Air Embolism, and Falls and Trauma. Hospital-acquired condition rates are calculated by CMS based on Medicare Fee-for-Service claims.	Rate per 1,000 inpatient CMS discharges on a scale of 0-1000
Hospital Acquired Infections		
CLABSI(n=759) CAUTI(n=882) SSI: Colon(n=687) MRSA(n=641) C. Diff.(n=1026)	Hospitals were required to 1) join Leapfrog's NHSN group, 2) provide an accurate NHSN ID in the Profile section of the Online Survey Tool, and 3) submit Section 7 Managing Serious Errors by November 30. For the purposes of calculating the Safety Grade	These are measured as Standardized Incidence Rates (SIR) on a scale from 0 and unbounded above.
Patient Safety Indicators (PSI)		
PSI 3: Pressure Ulcer Rate (n=1026) PSI 4: Death rate among surgical inpatients with serious treatable conditions(n=661) PSI6: Collapsed Lung due medical treatment(n=1026) PSI 11: Postoperative Respiratory Failure Rate (n=969) PSI 12: Perioperative PE/DVT Rate(n=1026)	PSI rates are calculated by CMS based on Medicare Fee-for-Service claims and publicly reported as a rate per 1,000 inpatient discharges.	Rate per 1000 CMS eligible discharges on a scale of 0-1000

PSI 14: Postoperative Wound Dehiscence Rate(n=1026)		
PSI 15: Unrecognized Abdominopelvic Accidental Puncture/Laceration Rate(n=1026)		

Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of Hospitals

Digital Maturity Level	
Advanced (EMRAM 6,7)	162 (15.8%)
Under developed (EMRAM 0)	864 (84.2%)
Teaching Status	
Teaching	475 (46.3%)
Non-Teaching	551 (53.7%)
Rural vs Urban Status	
Rural	433 (42.2%)
Urban	593 (57.8%)
Ownership Type	
Government	129 (12.6%)
Non-Profit	666 (64.9%)
Proprietary	231 (22.5%)
Hospital Size(number of beds)	
Small (1-149)	229(22.3%)
Medium (150-399)	180 (17.7%)
Large (>=400)	615 (59.9%)
Referral Status	
Referral Centre	289 (28.2%)
Non-Referral Centre	737 (71.8%)

Table 4a. Association between Digital Maturity and Leapfrog Safety Grade, Structural and Process Measures reported as odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals using a separate logistic regression model on each outcome (columns).

Independent Variables (predictors)	Odds Ratios (95% Confidence Interval)			
	Leapfrog Safety Grade	Computerized Physician Order Entry (CPOE)	Barcode medication administration (BCMA)	ICU Physician Staffing (IPS)
Digital Maturity (Advanced vs. Under developed)	3.25(2.33,4.55)	2.29 (1.57, 3.35)	1.51 (1.00, 2.27)	1.75 (1.18, 2.60)
Teaching (No vs Yes)	1.38 (1.05, 1.83)	0.98 (0.70, 1.38)	0.96 (0.67, 1.39)	0.78 (0.55, 1.11)
Rural vs Urban	1.2 (0.92, 1.57)	0.78 (0.56, 1.09)	0.62 (0.43, 0.91)	0.77 (0.53, 1.12)
Gov. vs Nonprofit	0.67 (0.47, 0.95)	0.89 (0.57, 1.38)	1.31 (0.82, 2.09)	1.05 (0.65, 1.71)
Gov. vs proprietary	0.58 (0.39, 0.86)	0.45 (0.27, 0.73)	0.88 (0.52, 1.47)	0.86 (0.50, 1.48)
Nonprofit vs proprietary	0.86 (0.65, 1.15)	0.51 (0.36, 0.71)	0.67 (0.46, 0.97)	0.81 (0.56, 1.19)
Bed size 0-149 vs 150-399	0.98 (0.73, 1.31)	0.62 (0.43, 0.89)	0.73 (0.50, 1.09)	0.22 (0.14, 0.34)
Bed size 0-149 vs 400+	1.05 (0.71, 1.56)	0.40 (0.25, 0.66)	0.90 (0.53, 1.53)	0.17 (0.10, 0.29)
Bed size 150-399 vs 400+	1.08 (0.77, 1.49)	0.65 (0.44, 0.96)	1.22 (0.80, 1.87)	0.78 (0.53, 1.14)
Referral (No vs Yes)	1.54 (1.14, 2.09)	1.41 (0.97, 2.05)	0.99 (0.66, 1.49)	1.29 (0.86, 1.93)

Table 4b. Association between Digital Maturity and Safety Practices reported as odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals using a separate logistic regression model on each outcome (columns).

Independent Variables (predictors)	Odds Ratios (95% Confidence Interval)				
	Culture of Leadership (SP1)	Culture of Measurement (SP2)	Risk Mitigation (SP4)	Nursing Workforce (SP9)	Hand Hygiene (SP19)
Digital Maturity (Advanced vs. Under developed)	3.45 (1.64, 7.26)	1.46 (0.84, 2.52)	0.76 (0.45, 1.30)	3.54 (1.53, 8.18)	1.34 (0.72, 2.50)
Teaching (No vs Yes)	0.61 (0.37, 0.99)	0.89 (0.55, 1.44)	0.77 (0.47, 1.26)	0.53 (0.30, 0.92)	0.82 (0.46, 1.46)
Rural vs Urban	0.52 (0.31, 0.85)	1.05 (0.64, 1.71)	0.96 (0.58, 1.60)	0.81 (0.46, 1.44)	0.94 (0.53, 1.67)
Gov. vs Nonprofit	0.41 (0.23, 0.74)	0.59 (0.34, 1.03)	0.49 (0.27, 0.86)	1.57 (0.72, 3.43)	0.52 (0.28, 0.96)
Gov. vs proprietary	0.37 (0.20, 0.70)	0.34 (0.18, 0.65)	0.38 (0.20, 0.74)	0.88 (0.38, 2.05)	0.17 (0.07, 0.38)
Nonprofit vs proprietary	0.91 (0.57, 1.46)	0.58 (0.35, 0.95)	0.79 (0.47, 1.33)	0.56 (0.32, 0.96)	0.32 (0.16, 0.65)
Bed size 0-149 vs 150-399	0.94 (0.57, 1.55)	0.65 (0.40, 1.07)	0.71 (0.42, 1.18)	0.94 (0.53, 1.65)	0.64 (0.35, 1.15)
Bed size 0-149 vs 400+	0.60 (0.28, 1.31)	0.68 (0.34, 1.35)	0.61 (0.29, 1.27)	0.65 (0.27, 1.57)	0.68 (0.30, 1.56)
Bed size 150-399 vs 400+	0.65 (0.34, 1.24)	1.04 (0.59, 1.84)	0.86 (0.47, 1.58)	0.69 (0.32, 1.48)	1.07 (0.54, 2.13)
Referral (No vs Yes)	0.84 (0.48, 1.47)	1.20 (0.71, 2.04)	1.33 (0.77, 2.29)	1.89 (1.03, 3.46)	1.15 (0.62, 2.14)

Table 5a. Association between Digital Maturity and Patient Safety Indicators reported as mean change and 95% confidence intervals using a separate linear regression model on each outcome

(columns).

Independent Variables (predictors)	Average additive change in the mean of the measure with respect to a reference group (95% CI)		
	Pressure Ulcer Rate (PSI 3)	Death Rate Serious Conditions (PSI 4)	Collapsed Lung (PSI 6)
Digital Maturity (Advanced vs. Under developed)	0.06 (0.00, 0.12)	1.87 (-1.39, 5.13)	0.01 (0.00, 0.02)
Teaching (Yes vs No)	0.01 (-0.04, 0.06)	-0.59 (-3.49, 2.31)	0.01 (-0.00, 0.01)
Urban (Yes vs No)	0.00 (-0.05, 0.05)	3.18 (-0.07, 6.43)	0.00 (-0.00, 0.01)
Ownership (vs Government owned)			
Proprietary ownership	-0.07 (-0.14, 0.01)	-8.05 (-12.91, -3.19)	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)
Nonprofit ownership	-0.03 (-0.09, 0.04)	-4.77 (-9.11, -0.44)	-0.01 (-0.02, -0.00)
Bed Size (vs Small hospitals 0-149)			
Large hospitals (400+ beds)	0.09 (0.02, 0.16)	-0.38 (-5.13, 4.38)	-0.01 (-0.02, 0.00)
Medium hospitals (150- 399)	0.03 (-0.02, 0.09)	0.60 (-3.49, 4.70)	-0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)
Referral (Yes vs No)	0.00 (-0.06, 0.06)	5.95 (2.68, 9.23)	0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)

Independent Variables (predictors)	Average additive change in the mean of the measure with respect to a reference group (95% CI)			
	Post Op. Respiratory Failure (PSI 11)	Post. Op. DVT/ PE Rate PSI 12	Post Op. Wound Dehiscence (PSI 14)	Accidental Puncture/ Laceration (PSI 15)
Digital Maturity (Advanced vs. Under developed)	0.46 (-0.02, 0.94)	-0.05 (-0.21, 0.11)	0.01 (-0.04, 0.05)	0.07 (0.03, 0.12)
Teaching (Yes vs No)	0.25 (-0.16, 0.67)	0.16 (0.02, 0.29)	0.01 (-0.03, 0.04)	0.01 (-0.03, 0.05)
Urban (Yes vs No)	0.14 (-0.26, 0.55)	0.03 (-0.10, 0.16)	-0.01 (-0.05, 0.02)	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.03)
Ownership (vs Government Owned)				
Proprietary ownership	0.40 (-0.21, 1.02)	-0.22 (-0.42, -0.03)	-0.04 (-0.09, 0.01)	-0.03 (-0.08, 0.02)
Nonprofit ownership vs. Government	-0.09 (-0.62, 0.45)	-0.14 (-0.31, 0.03)	-0.00 (-0.05, 0.04)	-0.00 (-0.05, 0.04)
Bed Size (vs Small hospitals 0-149)				
Large hospitals (400+ beds)	0.37 (-0.22, 0.97)	0.19 (-0.01, 0.38)	-0.04 (-0.09, 0.01)	0.02 (-0.03, 0.07)
Medium sized hospitals (150-399)	0.38 (-0.05, 0.81)	-0.11 (-0.25, 0.03)	-0.00 (-0.04, 0.04)	0.01 (-0.03, 0.04)
Referral (Yes vs No)	0.41 (-0.04, 0.87)	-0.01 (-0.15, 0.14)	-0.04 (-0.08, -0.00)	-0.00 (-0.04, 0.04)

Table 5b Association between Digital Maturity and Patient Safety Indicators reported as mean change and 95% confidence intervals using a separate linear regression model on each outcome (columns)

Table 6: Association between Digital Maturity and hospital associated infections and hospital acquired conditions. Results are reported as multiplicative mean change and 95% confidence intervals using a separate Tweedie regression model on each outcome (columns).

Independent Variables (predictors)	Average multiplicative change in mean of the measure with respect to a reference group (95% CI)						
	CLABSI	MRSA	CAUTI	CDI	SSI	FOR	FAT
Digital Maturity (Advanced vs. Under developed)	1.21 (1.02,1.42)	1.08 (0.91,1.29)	0.9 (0.78,1.05)	1.1 (0.99,1.22)	1.12 (0.94,1.33)	0.73 (0.39, 1.35)	0.98 (0.83, 1.14)
Teaching (Yes vs No)	1.04 (0.9,1.19)	0.98 (0.84,1.14)	1.04 (0.91,1.18)	1.1 (1.01,1.2)	1.04 (0.89,1.22)	3.16 (1.51, 6.62)	1.07 (0.93, 1.22)
Urban vs Rural	1.22 (1.04,1.43)	1.18 (0.99,1.4)	1.04 (0.91,1.2)	1.02 (0.94,1.11)	1.2 (1.01,1.43)	1.82 (0.92, 3.56)	0.82 (0.71, 0.94)
Ownership (vs Government Owned)							
Proprietary vs. Government	0.81 (0.66,1.0)	0.83 (0.66,1.05)	0.78 (0.64,0.95)	1.03 (0.91,1.17)	0.65 (0.51,0.84)	0.33 (0.11, 0.98)	1.09 (0.88, 1.31)
Nonprofit vs. Government	0.81 (0.67,0.97)	0.78 (0.64,0.96)	0.82 (0.69,0.97)	1.07 (0.96,1.2)	0.9 (0.73,1.1)	1.28 (0.53, 3.06)	1.09 (0.91, 1.31)
Bed Size (vs Small hospitals 0-149)							
Large hospitals (400+) vs. small	1.24 (1.0,1.54)	1.1 (0.83,1.44)	1.06 (0.88,1.27)	0.98 (0.87,1.11)	1.33 (1.05,1.69)	27.11 (9.58, 76.71)	1.30 (1.06, 1.54)
Medium hospitals (150-399) vs. small	1.13 (0.95,1.35)	1.06 (0.83,1.35)	0.99 (0.85,1.14)	1.03 (0.94,1.12)	1.13 (0.92,1.38)	6.23 (2.44, 16.12)	1.16 (0.99, 1.33)
Referral (Yes vs No)	1.12 (0.95,1.31)	1.14 (0.95,1.35)	1.08 (0.94,1.25)	0.99 (0.9,1.09)	1.21 (1.02,1.43)	1.51 (0.75, 3.00)	0.89 (0.76, 1.02)

Supplementary Files

Untitled.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/de110d9fc05caaa8e731ae0621639c5b.docx>

Untitled.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/58c7ae987457b13459e606991c387adc.docx>

Untitled.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/4d14d393439ca9f97aa9a5dbdb12b812.docx>

Untitled.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/a6fde4a151709ed1e2241ce2c23b189b.docx>