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Background

An electronic medical record (EMR) is an electronic version of patient record that phyilihan inventories for their patients which can be a simple office-based system, shared within a group practice or networked Canadian medical institutions (Protective Association, 2006).

Assessment of the perceived impact of EMR systems have been made in the National Physician Survey (2007) but requires a review to the extent of use in practice as of (2008). Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate the impact of such systems. Survey-based research consists of administering questionnaires to respondents to collect first-hand experiences or views.

We conducted a systematic review to determine what areas of EMR impact have been addressed using survey research reports. This study examined 102 survey-based research reports for the years 2000-2010, and the findings were conducted with the help of the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR) and Canada Health Infoway through the eHealth Chair Award.

Preliminary Findings

The majority of background areas corresponded to the Macro-level and the most frequent may suggest respondent characteristics to consider for future survey design (see Table 1). Other areas looking at aspects of implementation were mainly noted in the Micro-level. Categories most addressed for impact were "Appropriateness/Effectiveness" and "Efficiency" (see Table 2).

Methods

In this study, we identified and categorized areas based on the major aspects addressed in the survey papers. The areas were also grouped into three categories for discussion: background, other, and impact-specific (which were considered for the second part of the review).

Preliminary Results

The three charts below represent frequencies of individual metrics for the areas which mapped to each level, dimensions, and category of the Clinical Adoption Framework. Sometimes there were several metrics for an area within the same paper. The areas were also grouped into three categories for discussion: background, other, and impact-specific (which were considered for the second part of the review).
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