

Landmark EMR Studies

EMR systems have been the topic of many studies with conflicting conclusions regarding savings to the healthcare system, quality of patient care and the efficacy of computer-generated documentation. But when landmark studies examine the impact of traditional EMR on physician practices, the clear, consistent conclusion is that traditional EMRs negatively impact physicians and their practices which inhibits meaningful adoption. There are four such landmark studies performed by respected, venerable institutions:

- A recent [National Research Council report](#) states that: (i) EMRs cause inefficient workflows; (ii) clinicians spend more time entering data than using it; (iii) meaningful interoperability is almost non-existent; and (iv) benefits are significantly less than anticipated. This landmark study was produced by a committee of industry thought leaders from many of the most respected organizations in the world, including Harvard, MIT, Stanford, University of Pennsylvania, Brown, Google, and Intel. Committee members shadowed clinicians using traditional electronic medical records software at nationally recognized centers of medical care.
- In an enlightening [New England Journal of Medicine article](#), renowned physicians and Harvard professors maintain that EMR technology diverts the physician's attention from the patient and creates chart notes in a way that is seriously flawed.
- In 2008, the [Congressional Budget Office](#) released a study that was submitted as testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee. The study claims that "office-based physicians may see no benefits [from traditional EMRs] and may even suffer financial harm."
- A U.S. government-funded study by the [MGMA](#) reported a decrease in physician productivity of up to 15% usually lasting a year or more. The study concluded that it is "difficult to establish a business case for EHR adoption."