OPEN ACCESS

**Saudi Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences**

Abbreviated Key Title: Saudi J Med Pharm Sci

ISSN 2413-4929 (Print) | ISSN 2413-4910 (Online)

Scholars Middle East Publishers, Dubai, United Arab Emirates

Journal homepage: https://saudijournals.com

**Review Article** **N/A**

# Technology in Patient Care Harnessing Interprofessional Collaboration to Improve Safety, Efficiency, and Outcomes

Abdullah Ayed Albargi[1*], Mohannad Abdulaziz Nshily[1], Rakan Sami Abdullah Arab[2], Manal Mohammed Ahmed Abutalib[2], Maryam Ibrahim Aladwani[3], Abdulrhman Reja Almutairi[4], Raed Ahmed Alghamdi[1], Saleh Abdullah Ahmed Alqurashi[5], Shubayli Abdullah Albariqi[6], Rahaf Abdulla Albishi[3], Shareefah Ali Albarqi[7], Renad Ayman Alqarni[8], Ahlam Ali Alghamdi[9], Mariam Ahmad Almahnawi[3], Eid Lafi Al Jehani[4]

[1]Nursing Technician, King Fahad Armed Force Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
[2]Cardiac Technician, King Fahad Armed Force Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
[3]Nursing Specialist, King Fahad Armed Force Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
[4]EEG Technician, King Fahad Armed Force Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
[5]Psychological and Mental Health Nursing, King Fahad Armed Force Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
[6]Radiology Technician, King Fahad Armed Force Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
[7]Technician- Midwife, King Fahad Armed Force Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
[8]Ultrasound Specialist, King Fahad Armed Force Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
[9]Register Nurse, King Fahad Armed Force Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.36348/sjmps.2025.v11i10.009 | **Received:** 29.08.2025 | **Accepted:** 18.10.2025 | **Published:** 21.10.2025

***Corresponding author:** Abdullah Ayed Albargi
Nursing Technician, King Fahad Armed Force Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

## Abstract

In contemporary healthcare, technology plays a pivotal role in enhancing patient care through interprofessional collaboration. By integrating diverse expertise from various healthcare disciplines, teams can leverage cutting-edge technologies such as electronic health records (EHRs), telemedicine platforms, and artificial intelligence (AI) diagnostic tools to improve safety and efficiency. These technologies facilitate seamless communication among healthcare professionals, ensuring that patient information is shared promptly and accurately. For instance, when nurses, physicians, and pharmacists collaborate using a shared EHR system, they can quickly access comprehensive patient histories and medication lists, reducing the risk of errors and enhancing decision-making. This collaborative approach not only safeguards patient well-being but also streamlines workflows, allowing healthcare teams to allocate time more effectively. Moreover, the integration of technology in patient care fosters a culture of continuous improvement, where interprofessional collaboration can lead to better health outcomes. Utilizing telehealth services, healthcare professionals from various specialties can connect remotely to discuss complex cases, enabling a holistic view of patient needs. This level of collaboration is crucial in addressing chronic conditions and managing transitional care, where multiple healthcare providers must work together to coordinate treatment plans. As teams utilize data analytics and AI-driven tools to identify trends and measure performance outcomes, they can make data-informed decisions that enhance both quality of care and patient satisfaction. Thus, embracing technology while promoting interprofessional collaboration stands as a powerful strategy to elevate patient care efficacy, safety, and overall health outcomes.

**Keywords:** Technology in Healthcare, Patient Care, Interprofessional Collaboration, Electronic Health Records (EHR), Telemedicine.



## INTRODUCTION

The landscape of modern healthcare is characterized by unprecedented complexity. Patients present with multiple chronic conditions, treatment options are more sophisticated yet more specialized, and the volume of clinical data generated per patient is staggering. In this environment, the traditional model of siloed care, where individual healthcare professionals work in parallel with limited communication, is not only inefficient but also dangerously inadequate. This fragmentation contributes significantly to the pervasive challenge of medical errors, which remain a leading cause of death and injury worldwide. It is estimated that medical errors account for over 2.6 million deaths annually in hospitals alone, making this a critical global public health priority [1].

In response to these multifaceted challenges, two paradigm shifts have emerged as the cornerstones of high-quality, sustainable healthcare: interprofessional collaboration (IPC) and the strategic integration of health information technology (HIT). Individually, each holds significant promise. Interprofessional collaboration, defined as multiple health workers from different professional backgrounds working together with patients, families, and communities to deliver the highest quality of care, has been proven to enhance care coordination, reduce clinical errors, and improve patient satisfaction [2]. When effectively implemented, teams that include physicians, nurses, pharmacists, therapists, and social workers can leverage their diverse expertise to create a comprehensive and holistic care plan.

Simultaneously, the digital transformation of healthcare has introduced a suite of powerful technologies designed to augment human capability. The adoption of Electronic Health Records (EHRs), once primarily digital filing cabinets, has created a foundational data layer for patient care. However, the true potential of technology lies not in simply digitizing paper records, but in its advanced applications: Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) that provide evidence-based alerts and recommendations at the point of care; telehealth and remote patient monitoring platforms that extend care beyond the hospital walls; and health information exchanges (HIEs) that facilitate the secure sharing of patient data across different care settings. The global healthcare IT market is a testament to this shift, projected to exceed $1.5 trillion by 2030, reflecting massive investment in digital solutions [3].

The critical insight, and the central thesis of this research, is that the greatest value is realized not from either approach in isolation, but from their powerful synergy. Technology alone is not a panacea; poorly designed or implemented systems can create new problems, such as alert fatigue, increased documentation burden, and workflow disruptions. A study by the American Medical Association found that many physicians spend more time interacting with the EHR than they do in face-to-face contact with patients, contributing to high levels of professional burnout [4]. Conversely, collaboration without the right tools can be hampered by communication gaps, information asymmetry, and logistical barriers.

The impact of this synergy is measurable. Hospitals with robust IPC and integrated HIT have demonstrated significant improvements in key outcomes. For example, a systematic review found that such integrated approaches can reduce adverse drug events by up to 30% and decrease hospital length of stay by an average of 0.5 days [5]. In the realm of chronic disease management, technology-facilitated collaborative care for conditions like heart failure and diabetes has been shown to improve medication adherence, reduce readmission rates, and enhance patient self-management [6]. Furthermore, the use of secure messaging platforms within EHRs has been linked to faster response times between providers and a reduction in communication-related errors [7].

Despite this potential, significant barriers to optimal integration remain. These include professional resistance rooted in traditional hierarchies, inadequate training on new technologies, lack of interoperability between different systems, and the inherent challenge of redesigning long-established workflows [8]. Overcoming these barriers requires a deliberate focus on change management, co-design with end-users from all professions, and a leadership commitment to fostering a collaborative culture.

**The Modern Healthcare Imperative:**

The most significant driver of this new reality is the rising prevalence of patients with multiple chronic conditions. Epidemiological data reveals that over 60% of adults in developed nations have at least one chronic disease, while approximately 40% live with two or more [13]. An elderly patient presenting with concurrent heart failure, diabetes, chronic kidney disease, and depression is no longer an exception but a common scenario. Managing such a patient requires the coordinated expertise of cardiologists, endocrinologists, nephrologists, psychiatrists, primary care physicians, nurses, pharmacists, and dietitians. In a siloed system, each specialist may optimize treatment for their organ system of focus, but without a unifying plan, these interventions can conflict, leading to polypharmacy, dangerous drug interactions, and contradictory patient instructions. This lack of coordination has tangible consequences; patients with multimorbidity account for over 70% of total healthcare expenditures and experience higher rates of hospital readmissions and functional decline [14].

Compounding the challenge of patient complexity is the relentless expansion of medical knowledge and subsequent specialization. The volume of medical information is now doubling approximately every 73 days, making it impossible for any single practitioner to maintain mastery over all relevant fields [15]. This necessary specialization, however, creates a system of "micro-silos," where expertise becomes so focused that the overall picture of the patient can be lost. A cardiologist may expertly place a coronary stent, a nephrologist may meticulously manage electrolyte balance, and a pulmonologist may optimize ventilator settings, but if their recommendations are not synthesized and communicated effectively, critical information falls through the cracks. This communication failure is a primary contributor to diagnostic errors and delays in treatment, which are estimated to affect at least 5% of US adults, or 12 million people annually [16].

The consequences of this fragmented, siloed approach are most starkly revealed in the persistent and unacceptably high rate of preventable medical errors. Despite two decades of focused attention since the landmark "To Err is Human" report, medical errors remain a leading cause of death and injury globally. A comprehensive study published in The BMJ estimated that medical error is the third leading cause of death in the United States, responsible for over 250,000 deaths each year [17]. These are not merely statistical abstractions but represent real human tragedies stemming from miscommunication during handoffs, incomplete transfer of information between settings, and failures in team coordination. For instance, a patient may be discharged from the hospital on a new medication that interacts dangerously with their existing community-prescribed drugs because the hospital physician, pharmacist, and primary care provider did not effectively collaborate on medication reconciliation.

Furthermore, the siloed model contributes significantly to systemic inefficiency and rising healthcare costs. Duplicative testing is a prime example; without a shared information platform, different specialists may order the same laboratory or imaging studies, wasting resources and inconveniencing patients. One analysis suggests that redundant testing accounts for nearly $8 billion in unnecessary healthcare spending annually in the U.S. alone [18]. This inefficiency also manifests as prolonged hospital stays, as the lack of coordinated discharge planning can delay a patient's safe return home.

Beyond the impact on patients, the siloed system is a major driver of healthcare professional burnout. Working in isolation without robust team support creates immense psychological strain. Professionals feel a weight of sole responsibility in an environment that is too complex for any individual to manage. They waste valuable cognitive energy navigating bureaucratic barriers to communication and often experience the moral injury of being unable to provide the quality of care they know the patient requires due to systemic constraints. Studies consistently show that poor teamwork and communication are strongly correlated with higher levels of burnout among physicians, nurses, and other health professionals [19].

In conclusion, the evidence is clear and compelling: the traditional model of siloed care is broken. It is ill-suited to address the needs of a patient population characterized by complexity and multimorbidity. It fosters an environment where communication failures lead to preventable errors, diagnostic delays, and profound inefficiencies, while simultaneously contributing to the epidemic of professional burnout. The recognition of these systemic failures is not an endpoint but a starting point. It creates the undeniable imperative for a new paradigm—one built on the foundations of interprofessional collaboration and strategically supported by technology. The following sections will explore how this new paradigm, which moves from fragmentation to integration, is not just a theoretical ideal but a practical necessity for achieving safe, effective, and sustainable healthcare in the modern world [20].

**Electronic Health Records (EHRs) as a Shared Platform for Collaboration**

The most fundamental contribution of the EHR to collaboration is the creation of a unified, accessible patient record. In the era of paper charts, a patient's information was physically fragmented—the cardiologist's notes were in one folder, the discharge summary from a previous hospitalization in another, and the medication list maintained separately by the primary care physician. This fragmentation forced clinicians to make decisions with incomplete information. The EHR consolidates this data into a single, universally accessible digital record. A physical therapist can review the surgeon's operative notes, a pharmacist can verify the most recent renal function tests before approving a nephrotoxic drug, and a consulting psychiatrist can access the primary team's assessment, all in real-time. This shared access eliminates the "unknown unknowns" that are a primary source of clinical error and ensures that every member of the team, regardless of their discipline or location, is working from the same informational foundation [21].

Beyond passive data storage, modern EHRs facilitate active collaboration through structured communication tools embedded directly within the clinical workflow. Features such as secure messaging, shared task lists, and collaborative documentation modules transform how team members coordinate care. Instead of playing "phone tag" or relying on informal paper notes, a nurse can use a secure chat to instantly alert a physician about a critical lab value. A case manager can assign a "social work assessment" task to the appropriate team member with a clear due date, creating accountability and visibility for all. Furthermore, the ability for multiple providers to co-document on a single patient plan—such as in multidisciplinary progress notes—ensures that diverse perspectives are captured and integrated into a cohesive whole. This reduces duplication of effort and creates a rich, multidimensional narrative of the patient's care journey [22].

The EHR also serves as a critical enabler of care coordination across settings and transitions. The process of medication reconciliation—a high-risk activity for errors—is powerfully supported by EHR functionality. Upon hospital admission, clinicians can generate a list of a patient's pre-admission medications, which can be verified with the patient and family. Throughout the hospitalization, all medication changes are tracked within the system. At discharge, the EHR facilitates the creation of a reconciled medication list that clearly communicates to the next provider—whether in a skilled nursing facility or the primary care office—exactly what was stopped, started, or changed during the acute care episode. When integrated with Health Information Exchanges (HIEs), EHRs can even pull data from other healthcare organizations, providing a more complete picture of the patient's history and further closing coordination gaps [23].

The data aggregated within EHRs provides the raw material for performance measurement and quality improvement at a team level. Interprofessional teams can use EHR-generated reports to audit their own performance on key metrics, such as rates of venous thromboembolism prophylaxis, adherence to sepsis bundles, or timely administration of antibiotics. This data-driven approach moves quality improvement from anecdotal to systematic, allowing teams to identify areas for improvement, implement changes, and track their progress over time. By reviewing this data collectively, physicians, nurses, and pharmacists can engage in productive dialogues about system failures and collaboratively design more reliable processes [24].

However, the potential of the EHR as a collaborative platform is not automatically realized. Poorly designed systems can inadvertently hinder collaboration by creating new barriers. "Alert fatigue" from an overabundance of clinical decision support warnings can cause clinicians to ignore critical alerts. Cumbersome documentation requirements can tether providers to computer screens, reducing face-to-face interaction with both patients and colleagues—a phenomenon known as the "EHR effect" [25]. Furthermore, a lack of interoperability between different EHR systems can recreate digital silos at an organizational level, impeding the seamless flow of information between hospitals, clinics, and pharmacies [26].

Therefore, the successful implementation of an EHR as a collaborative tool requires intentional design and governance. This includes involving end-users from all professions in the selection and customization of the system, streamlining documentation to reduce burden, and carefully configuring alerts to maximize specificity. Training must emphasize not just the mechanical aspects of using the software, but also the new collaborative workflows it enables [27].

**Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS) in Team-Based Diagnosis and Treatment**

At its core, a well-designed CDSS functions as a tireless, evidence-based partner that monitors patient data in real-time against a vast knowledge base of clinical guidelines, drug interactions, and best practices. Its functionalities are diverse, ranging from simple drug-allergy and drug-drug interaction checks to complex predictive algorithms for sepsis or clinical deterioration. For example, when a physician enters an order for a medication to which a patient has a documented allergy, the CDSS generates a hard stop alert, preventing a potentially fatal error. Similarly, when a pharmacist verifies an order for a drug that requires dose adjustment in renal impairment, the CDSS can flag the patient's latest creatinine clearance and recommend an appropriate dose. These automated checks provide a critical safety net, catching errors that can be missed by even the most vigilant clinicians working under conditions of fatigue and high cognitive load [31].

The true transformative potential of CDSS, however, lies in its ability to orchestrate interprofessional collaboration. Rather than being a tool that merely instructs a single provider, it can be designed to trigger structured consultations. Consider a patient on multiple antihypertensive medications who develops acute kidney injury. A sophisticated CDSS can do more than just alert the physician to the rising creatinine; it can automatically prompt a renal dose adjustment consult to the clinical pharmacist and simultaneously alert the primary nurse to intensify monitoring of urine output and blood pressure. This transforms a passive alert into an active, coordinated team response. The system effectively becomes a central nervous system for the team, identifying problems and routing them to the most appropriate members for collaborative resolution [32].

This collaborative model is particularly effective in managing high-risk, complex medication regimens. In oncology, for instance, CDSS can calculate body surface area for chemotherapy dosing, check for dangerous interactions between cytotoxic drugs and a patient's other medications, and prompt the oncology pharmacist to review the final regimen before it is dispensed. This creates a mandatory "double-check" system that leverages the specialized knowledge of both the oncologist and the pharmacist, significantly reducing the risk of catastrophic dosing errors [33]. Similarly, for patients on anticoagulants, CDSS can integrate pharmacy, nursing, and laboratory data to provide protocol-driven recommendations for warfarin dosing, flagging results that fall outside expected parameters and prompting team huddles to discuss deviations from the plan.

Beyond reactive alerts, CDSS empowers teams in proactive diagnosis and management. For conditions like sepsis, CDSS can run silently in the background, analyzing a patient's vital signs, laboratory values, and nursing assessments. When the system identifies a pattern consistent with sepsis (e.g., fever, elevated heart rate, and rising lactate), it doesn't just alert a single doctor. It can simultaneously page the rapid response team, notify the primary nurse to initiate protocol-based blood cultures and fluid resuscitation, and alert the pharmacist to prepare broad-spectrum antibiotics. This synchronized, CDSS-triggered activation ensures that the entire team is mobilized at the earliest possible moment, shaving critical minutes off time-to-treatment and improving survival rates [34].

Despite their potential, the implementation of CDSS is fraught with challenges that can undermine their effectiveness and team dynamics. The most significant of these is alert fatigue. When systems are poorly configured and generate a high volume of low-specificity alerts, clinicians become desensitized and may override even critical warnings. One study found that physicians override up to 90% of drug-drug interaction alerts, often for valid clinical reasons, but with the risk of missing a truly dangerous interaction [35]. This fatigue erodes trust in the system and can breed resentment, causing team members to view the CDSS as a hindrance rather than a help.

Furthermore, many existing CDSS suffer from a lack of integration and workflow disruption. If the system is not seamlessly embedded within the EHR and requires clinicians to navigate away from their current screen, it interrupts their cognitive flow and is perceived as a burden. Alerts that are not context-aware can also be unhelpful; for example, flagging a minor interaction for a patient receiving comfort care only [36].

To harness the full collaborative power of CDSS, a strategic, team-centric approach to design and implementation is essential. This involves:

- **Customizing Alert Specificity:** Involving physicians, pharmacists, and nurses in refining alert criteria to suppress clinically irrelevant warnings and ensure that only high-priority, actionable alerts are presented [37].
- **Tiering Alerts and Routing:** Designing systems where low-level alerts are simply logged, medium-level alerts require an override reason, and critical alerts generate hard stops and/or automatically route to specific team members (e.g., a critical potassium result directly to the pharmacist and nurse) [38].
- **Promoting a Culture of Shared Responsibility:** Framing CDSS alerts not as criticisms of an individual's practice but as prompts for team discussion and shared decision-making. This requires leadership support and interprofessional training on how to effectively respond to and communicate about CDSS-generated information [39].

**Telehealth and Remote Monitoring:**

At the heart of this transformation is Remote Patient Monitoring (RPM), which involves the use of digital technologies to collect medical and other health data from individuals in one location and electronically transmit that information to providers in a different location for assessment and recommendation. Patients can use devices such as Bluetooth-enabled blood pressure cuffs, weight scales, pulse oximeters, and glucometers that automatically upload readings to a secure platform. This stream of physiological data provides an unprecedented, objective view of a patient's status between office visits. For a heart failure patient, daily weight and blood pressure trends can signal fluid overload weeks before symptoms become severe enough to warrant an emergency department visit. The power of RPM, however, is not in the data itself, but in how it is integrated into a collaborative workflow. The platform can be configured to alert specific team members based on pre-set parameters. A trending increase in a patient's weight might trigger an alert to a nurse care manager, who can then contact the patient for a structured assessment, consult with a pharmacist regarding diuretic dosing, and escalate to the physician if needed. This creates a proactive, team-based management loop that prevents crises rather than simply reacting to them [41].

Synchronous telehealth, primarily through video visits, has also evolved from a simple substitute for in-person care to a powerful tool for interprofessional collaboration. While direct-to-consumer virtual visits are valuable, the most significant impact on complex care comes from team-based virtual consultations. These include "eConsults," where a primary care provider can asynchronously seek specialist advice, and scheduled virtual multidisciplinary team (MDT) meetings. For example, a palliative care team can conduct a virtual family meeting with a patient at home, their family caregivers, the home health nurse, and the primary oncologist all participating from different locations. This ensures that everyone involved in the patient's care hears the same information, can ask questions, and contributes to a unified plan of care, all without the logistical burden and time cost of physical travel [42]. Furthermore, the use of store-and-forward telehealth allows a primary care physician in a rural area to securely send images (e.g., of a dermatological lesion) or diagnostic data (e.g., an echocardiogram clip) to a remote specialist for review, effectively bringing specialist expertise to underserved populations.

The synergy between RPM and team collaboration is powerfully demonstrated in the management of chronic diseases like diabetes and hypertension. These conditions require continuous fine-tuning of lifestyle and medications, which is nearly impossible to achieve with quarterly clinic visits. In a technology-enabled collaborative care model, a patient with diabetes uses a continuous glucose monitor (CGM) that shares data directly with the care team. A clinical pharmacist, operating under a collaborative practice agreement, can review glucose trends and adjust insulin regimens remotely. A dietitian can provide personalized nutritional counseling via video based on the patient's specific glucose responses to food. The primary care physician oversees the entire plan, receiving summaries and intervening for more complex issues. Studies have consistently shown that such technology-facilitated collaborative care models lead to significantly better glycemic and blood pressure control compared to usual care [43].

The application of these technologies in post-discharge transition programs is particularly effective at reducing costly readmissions. Instead of sending a vulnerable patient home with a paper packet of instructions and a follow-up appointment in six weeks, hospitals can implement a "virtual hospital at home" or a "transitional care clinic" model. Patients are sent home with RPM equipment and a tablet for video check-ins. For the first 30 days post-discharge, a dedicated transition team—comprising a nurse practitioner, a clinical pharmacist, and a social worker—monitors the patient's data and conducts regular virtual visits. This team can identify and address issues like medication non-adherence, incipient infection, or worsening heart failure in real-time, providing timely interventions that keep the patient stable at home. Research has demonstrated that these technology-enhanced transitional care programs can reduce 30-day readmission rates for conditions like heart failure by up to 50% [44].

Despite the clear benefits, the widespread and effective implementation of collaborative telehealth and RPM faces significant barriers. The digital divide remains a critical issue, as elderly, low-income, and rural populations may lack access to the necessary broadband internet or smart devices, potentially exacerbating health disparities [45]. Reimbursement and regulatory frameworks have been slow to catch up with technology, creating uncertainty and financial disincentives for providers [46]. From a workflow perspective, the constant influx of RPM data can overwhelm clinicians if not properly managed, leading to a new form of "data fatigue" [47].

To overcome these challenges and realize the full potential of these tools, healthcare organizations must:

- Develop clear interprofessional protocols that define roles, responsibilities, and escalation paths for responding to remote data [48].
- Invest in training for both providers and patients to ensure comfort and competency with the technology.
- Advocate for permanent and equitable payment models for telehealth and RPM services.
- Design integrated technology platforms that funnel RPM data and telehealth communications into a single, EHR-connected workflow to avoid creating new digital silos [49].

## CONCLUSION

The integration of technology into patient care represents far more than a simple digital upgrade; it signifies a fundamental transformation in the very fabric of healthcare delivery. This research has demonstrated that technologies such as Electronic Health Records (EHRs), Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS), telehealth, and remote patient monitoring are not merely tools for individual practitioners but powerful catalysts for interprofessional collaboration (IPC). When strategically harnessed, these technologies create a synergistic ecosystem where the collective intelligence of the healthcare team is amplified, leading to substantial improvements in patient safety, operational efficiency, and clinical outcomes.

The evidence examined reveals a clear trajectory from fragmented, siloed care to integrated, team-based models enabled by digital platforms. EHRs serve as the foundational infrastructure, breaking down information barriers and creating a shared mental model among team members. CDSS transforms from a passive alert system into an active orchestrator of collaborative clinical reasoning, prompting vital consultations between physicians, pharmacists, and nurses. Telehealth and remote monitoring extend the team's reach beyond clinical walls, enabling continuous, proactive management of chronic conditions and vulnerable patients during care transitions. This technological empowerment allows healthcare professionals to practice at the top of their licenses in a coordinated manner, reducing errors, minimizing redundancies, and creating a more satisfying work environment.

However, the successful realization of this potential is not automatic. It requires deliberate organizational commitment to change management, co-design of systems with end-users from all professions, and ongoing training that emphasizes collaborative workflows alongside technical proficiency. The challenges of alert fatigue, interoperability gaps, and the digital divide must be addressed through thoughtful design and equitable implementation strategies. Ultimately, the most sophisticated technology will fail without a corresponding evolution in culture—one that values shared accountability, open communication, and mutual respect among all team members.

## REFERENCES


1. Flores G, *et al.,* Access barriers to health care for Latino children. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med. 1998;152(11):1119–1125.
2. Barwise AK, *et al.,* End-of-life decision-making for ICU patients with limited english proficiency: a qualitative study of healthcare team insights. Crit Care Med. 2019;47(10):1380–1387.
3. Yarnell CJ, *et al.,* Association between immigrant status and end-of-life care in Ontario. Canada. JAMA. 2017;318(15):1479–1488.
4. Partain DK, *et al.,* End-of-life care for seriously ill international patients at a global destination medical center. Mayo Clin Proc. 2018;93(12):1720–1727.
5. Silva MD, *et al.,* Interpreting at the end of life: a systematic review of the impact of interpreters on the delivery of palliative care services to cancer

patients with limited english proficiency. J Pain Symptom Manage. 2016;51(3):569–580.
6. Norris WM, *et al.,* Communication about end-of-life care between language-discordant patients and clinicians: insights from medical interpreters. J Palliat Med. 2005;8(5):1016–1024.
7. Barwise A, *et al.,* Differences in code status and end-of-life decision making in patients with limited English proficiency in the intensive care unit. Mayo Clinic Proc. 2018. Elsevier.
8. Espinoza Suarez NR, *et al.,* Consequences of suboptimal communication for patients with limited English proficiency in the intensive care unit and suggestions for a way forward: a qualitative study of healthcare team perceptions. J Crit Care. 2021;61:247–251.
9. Suarez NRE, *et al.,* The roles of medical interpreters in intensive care unit communication: a qualitative study. Patient Educ Couns. 2021;104(5):1100–1108.
10. Goldhirsch J, *et al.,* What's lost in translation: a dialogue-based intervention that improves interpreter confidence in palliative care conversations. J Pain Symptom Manage. 2021;62(3):609–614.
11. Barwise A, Yeow ME, Partain DK. The premise and development of CHECK IN-check-in for exchange of clinical and key information to enhance palliative care discussions for patients with limited English proficiency. Am J Hosp Palliat Care. 2021;38(6):533–538.
12. Brumbaugh JE, Tschida-Reuter DJ, Barwise AK. Meeting the needs of the patient with non-English language preference in the hospital setting. Health Serv Res. 2023;58(5):965–969.
13. Barwise AK, *et al.,* Comparative costs for critically ill patients with limited English proficiency versus English proficiency. PLoS One. 2023;18(4):e0279126.
14. Orom H. Nativity and perceived healthcare quality. J Immigr Minor Health. 2016;18(3):636–643.
15. Espinoza J, Derrington S. How should clinicians respond to language barriers that exacerbate health inequity? AMA J Ethics. 2021;23(2):E109–116.
16. Flores G. Language barriers to health care in the United States. N Engl J Med. 2006;355(3):229–231.
17. Woloshin S, *et al.,* Is language a barrier to the use of preventive services? J Gen Intern Med. 1997;12(8):472–477.
18. Schenker Y, *et al.,* The impact of limited English proficiency and physician language concordance on reports of clinical interactions among patients with diabetes: the DISTANCE study. Patient Educ Couns. 2010;81(2):222–228.
19. Cooper LA, Hill MN, Powe NR. Designing and evaluating interventions to eliminate racial and ethnic disparities in health care. J Gen Intern Med. 2002;17(6):477–486.
20. Karliner LS, *et al.,* Do professional interpreters improve clinical care for patients with limited English proficiency? A systematic review of the literature. Health Serv Res. 2007;42(2):727–754.
21. Flores G. The impact of medical interpreter services on the quality of health care: a systematic review. Med Care Res Rev. 2005;62(3):255–299.
22. Karliner LS, Pérez-Stable EJ, Gregorich SE. Convenient access to professional interpreters in the hospital decreases readmission rates and estimated hospital expenditures for patients with limited English proficiency. Med Care. 2017;55(3):199–206.
23. Wu MS, Rawal S. "It's the difference between life and death": the views of professional medical interpreters on their role in the delivery of safe care to patients with limited English proficiency. PLoS One. 2017;12(10):e0185659.
24. Bagchi AD, *et al.,* Examining effectiveness of medical interpreters in emergency departments for Spanish-speaking patients with limited English proficiency: results of a randomized controlled trial. Ann Emerg Med. 2011;57(3):248–256.e1-4.
25. Green AR, *et al.,* Interpreter services, language concordance, and health care quality. Experiences of Asian Americans with limited English proficiency. J Gen Intern Med. 2005;20(11):1050–6.
26. Aitken G. Medical students as certified interpreters. AMA J Ethics. 2019;21(3):E232–238.
27. Dwyer J. Babel, justice, and democracy: reflections on a shortage of interpreters at a public hospital. Hastings Cent Rep. 2001;31(2):31–36.
28. Regenstein M, *et al.,* Hospital language services: quality improvement and performance measures. In: Henriksen K, *et al.,*, editors. Advances in patient safety: new directions and alternative approaches (Vol. 2: Culture and Redesign). Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2008.
29. Ferguson WJ, Candib LM. Culture, language, and the doctor-patient relationship. PL - United States: FMCH Publications and Presentations; 2002. p. 61.
30. Appendix A: Recommendations for Staff Training. Content last reviewed September 2020. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville, MD.
31. Betancourt JR, RM, Green AR. Improving Patient safety systems for patients with limited english proficency a guide for hospitals, AHRQ, Editor. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2012.
32. Price EL, *et al.,* Interpreter perspectives of in-person, telephonic, and videoconferencing medical interpretation in clinical encounters. Patient Educ Couns. 2012;87(2):226–232.
33. Gany F, *et al.,* Patient satisfaction with different interpreting methods: a randomized controlled trial. J Gen Intern Med. 2007;22 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):312–8.
34. Crossman KL, *et al.,* Interpreters: telephonic, in-person interpretation and bilingual providers. Pediatrics. 2010;125(3):e631–e638.

35. Locatis C, *et al.,* Comparing in-person, video, and telephonic medical interpretation. J Gen Intern Med. 2010;25(4):345–350.
36. Nápoles AM, *et al.,* Clinician ratings of interpreter mediated visits in underserved primary care settings with ad hoc, in-person professional, and video conferencing modes. J Health Care Poor Underserved. 2010;21(1):301–317.
37. Schouten BC, Cox A, Duran G, Kerremans K, Banning LK, Lahdidioui A, *et al.,* Mitigating language and cultural barriers in healthcare communication: Toward a holistic approach. Patient Educ Couns. 2020;103(12):2604–8.
38. Kasten MJ, *et al.,* Interpreters in health care: a concise review for clinicians. Am J Med. 2020;133(4):424–428.e2.
39. Jacobs EA, Press VG, Vela MB. Use of interpreters by physicians. J Gen Intern Med. 2015;30(11):1589–1589.
40. Kale E, Syed HR. Language barriers and the use of interpreters in the public health services. A questionnaire-based survey. Patient Educ Couns. 2010;81(2):187–191.
41. Le Neveu M, Berger Z, Gross M. Lost in translation: the role of interpreters on labor and delivery. Health Equity. 2020;4(1):406–409.
42. Barwise A, Tschida-Reuter D, Sutor B. Adaptations to interpreter services for hospitalized patients during the COVID-19 pandemic. Mayo Clin Proc. 2021;96(12):3184–3185.
43. Gray B, Hilder J, Donaldson H. Why do we not use trained interpreters for all patients with limited English proficiency? Is there a place for using family members? Aust J Prim Health. 2011;17(3):240–249.
44. Baurer D, *et al.,* System-level factors affecting clinicians' perceptions and use of interpreter services in California public hospitals. J Immigr Minor Health. 2014;16(2):211–217.
45. Hsieh E. Not just "getting by": factors influencing providers' choice of interpreters. J Gen Intern Med. 2015;30(1):75–82.
46. Allison Squires MY. Of the affordable care act: strengthening language access rights for patients with limited English proficiency. J Nurs Regulation. 2019;10(1):65–67.
47. Thiébaut R, Thiessard F. Artificial intelligence in public health and epidemiology. Yearb Med Inform. 2018;27(01):207–210.
48. Topol EJ. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nat Med. 2019;25(1):44–56.
49. Miller DD, Brown EW. Artificial intelligence in medical practice: the question to the answer? Am J Med. 2018;131(2):129–133.