Streamlining Prior-Authorization Workflows with Advanced Analytics to Reduce Administrative Burden and Accelerate Revenue Cycles

Mohamed Amine Ben Ali[1]

[1]Université de Kairouan, Département d'Informatique, 25 Avenue Ibn Khaldoun, Kairouan, Tunisia

2023

Abstract

This article provides an integrated analytical and computational architecture designed to streamline prior-authorization workflows in complex healthcare revenue cycle operations. By modeling the authorization process as a multi-stage stochastic network and applying advanced queuing theory, we derive performance metrics that quantify administrative burden and cycle time. We introduce a stochastic optimization formulation to minimize expected wait times and manual review costs, subject to capacity constraints across multiple review stages. Predictive analytics based on regularized logistic regression and deep neural network architectures forecast authorization outcomes and dynamically allocate review resources, thereby prioritizing high-impact cases and managing system variability. We employ heavy-traffic diffusion approximations to obtain tractable expressions for mean sojourn times and derive first-order conditions for optimal resource allocation under weighted throughput objectives. Computational experiments on large-scale simulated and real-world-inspired datasets demonstrate that the proposed framework reduces average authorization cycle times by over forty percent and decreases manual intervention by nearly sixty percent, enabling a significant acceleration of revenue realization. Scalability analysis shows that the end-to-end decision support system operates within sub-250 millisecond latency on commodity servers for organizations processing thousands of requests per day. The results establish a blueprint for next-generation intelligent prior-authorization systems capable of continuous learning and adaptive control, ultimately reducing administrative overhead and enhancing financial stability across diverse healthcare settings.

1 Introduction

Prior-authorization serves as a critical gatekeeper in contemporary healthcare delivery, mandating pre-approval from payers before certain services can be performed or reimbursed [1]. This process is characterized by intricate interactions among providers, payers, clinical reviewers, and administrative personnel [2]. Requests traverse multiple stages, often requiring comprehensive documentation of clinical necessity, adherence to payer-specific policy guidelines, and iterative communications to resolve deficiencies. The complexity of these interactions, combined with heterogeneous policy frameworks and fluctuating request volumes, engenders significant variability in processing times [3]. Consequently, healthcare organizations face mounting administrative burdens, unpredictable cash flows, and eroded patient satisfaction due to authorization delays. [4]

Conventional prior-authorization workflows rely predominantly on manual review and static, rule-based decision trees embedded within legacy information systems. These methods yield inconsistent outcomes and perpetuate bottlenecks when incoming volumes exceed reviewer capacity or when policy changes necessitate frequent updates [5]. As healthcare payment models evolve toward value-based arrangements, reducing administrative friction and optimizing resource utilization become strategic imperatives.

Recent advancements in data-driven decision support, including stochastic modeling and machine learning, offer promising avenues to transform authorization workflows [6]. By capturing the stochastic arrival of requests, service-time distributions, and routing probabilities, one can formulate quantitative models that elucidate system behavior under varying load regimes [7]. Incorporating predictive analytics further enables real-time prioritization of cases based on estimated approval likelihoods, thereby allocating scarce reviewer attention to cases with highest marginal benefit. Despite isolated deployments of machine learning for outcome prediction or discrete optimization for capacity planning, a comprehensive framework integrating stochastic network analysis, optimization, and predictive modeling remains absent in the literature. [8]

This paper addresses this gap by proposing an end-to-end framework that treats prior authorization as a controlled stochastic process [9]. We model the multi-stage workflow as a directed network of service nodes with class-dependent arrival rates and service rates. A control mechanism dynamically apportions reviewer capacity across classes and stages according to real-time system state and predictive scores [10]. We derive diffusion approximations for performance metrics under heavy-traffic scaling, enabling analytic expressions for mean queue lengths and sojourn times. A stochastic programming formulation balances expected waiting costs with manual review expenses, yielding optimal resource allocation policies [11]. Predictive models trained on feature-rich clinical and administrative datasets forecast approval probabilities and service durations, feeding into the control policy to prioritize cases adaptively. [12]

The paper is structured as follows. Section 3 formalizes the workflow characterization and analytical framework [13]. Section 4 develops advanced mathematical models, including diffusion approximations and stochastic optimization. Section 5 describes the integration of machine learning for outcome prediction and dynamic resource allocation [14]. Section 6 presents performance evaluation results, scalability analyses, and revenue cycle impact assessments [15]. Section 7 discusses implementation considerations, integration with existing information systems, and potential barriers. Section 8 concludes with reflections on future research directions and potential extensions. [16]

2 Workflow Characterization and Analytical Framework

We consider a healthcare provider organization processing authorization requests classified into C clinical service categories [17]. Requests arrive according to a nonhomogeneous Poisson process with rate function $\lambda_i(t)$ for class i. The system comprises S sequential review stages, each staffed by m_s reviewers [18]. Denote by $X_i^{(s)}(t)$ the number of class-i requests awaiting review at stage s at time t. Let $\mathbf{X}(t) \in \mathbb{N}^{C\times S}$ denote the full state.

Service times at stage s for class i are independent and identically distributed with mean $1/\mu_{s,i}$ and variance $\sigma_{s,i}^2$. Reviewers employ a processor-sharing discipline, allocating capacity across classes based on control weights $u_{s,i}(t)$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^{C} u_{s,i}(t) \le 1$. The instantaneous service rate for class i at stage s becomes $\mu_{s,i}u_{s,i}(t)$. Upon completing stage s, a request either advances to stage $s+1$ with probability $p_{s,i}$ or exits the process upon final approval or denial.

We define cumulative processes $A_i(t)$ for arrivals, $S_{s,i}(t)$ for potential service completions, and $R_{s,i}(t)$ for routed completions entering the next stage. The controlled state dynamics satisfy

$$X_i^{(s)}(t) = X_i^{(s)}(0) + R_{s-1,i}(t) - S_{s,i}\Big(\int_0^t u_{s,i}(z)\,dz\Big),$$

with boundary conditions $R_{0,i}(t) = A_i(t)$ and $R_{S,i}(t) = 0$. The controlled service completion process $S_{s,i}\big(\int_0^t u_{s,i}(z)\,dz\big)$ is a time-changed renewal process driven by the cumulative allocation.

Key performance measures include the expected sojourn time T_i for class-i requests and reviewer utilization U_s [19]. These metrics inform the objective function in the subsequent optimization [20]. The high-dimensionality of $\mathbf{X}(t)$ necessitates approximation techniques for tractable analysis under realistic load conditions, as detailed in Section 4.

3 Advanced Mathematical Modeling of Prior-Authorization Processes

Under heavy-traffic scaling, let n denote a scaling parameter proportional to aggregate reviewer capacity. Define the fluid-scaled state $x_i^{(s)}(t) = X_i^{(s)}(t)/n$ and centered diffusion-scaled process

$$\hat{X}_i^{(s)}(t) = \frac{X_i^{(s)}(t) - n\rho_{s,i}(t)}{\sqrt{n}},$$

where $\rho_{s,i}(t) = \lambda_i(t)/\mu_{s,i}$ is the nominal load. The functional central limit theorem implies $\hat{X}_i^{(s)}(\cdot)$ converges to a reflected Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}_+^{C\times S}$ governed by

$$d\hat{X}_i^{(s)}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{C}\sum_{r=1}^{S}\big(\sigma_{(s,i),(r,j)}\,dW_{r,j}(t) - \kappa_{(s,i),(r,j)}\hat{X}_j^{(r)}(t)\,dt\big) + dR_i^{(s)}(t),$$

where $W_{r,j}(t)$ are standard Brownian motions, $\sigma_{(s,i),(r,j)}$ encapsulates arrival and service variability covariance, $\kappa_{(s,i),(r,j)}$ reflects routing feedback and capacity sharing, and $R_i^{(s)}(t)$ is the regulator ensuring nonnegativity.

Under proportional fair-sharing allocation $u_{s,i} \propto \rho_{s,i}$, the steady-state mean queue length for class i at stage s is approximated by

$$\mathbb{E}[X_i^{(s)}] \approx \frac{\rho_{s,i} + \frac{\sigma_{s,i}^2}{2}}{1 - \sum_{j=1}^{C} \rho_{s,j}}.$$

Aggregating across stages yields the mean sojourn time [21]

$$\mathbb{E}[T_i] \approx \sum_{s=1}^{S} \frac{1}{\mu_{s,i}(1 - \sum_j \rho_{s,j})} \Big(1 + \frac{\sigma_{s,i}^2}{2(1 - \sum_j \rho_{s,j})}\Big).$$

We formulate a stochastic optimization to minimize a weighted sum of expected sojourn times and manual review cost:

$$\min_{u(\cdot)} J = \sum_{i=1}^{C} \alpha_i \mathbb{E}[T_i] + \sum_{s=1}^{S} \beta_s \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^T \sum_{i=1}^{C} u_{s,i}(t)\, dt\Big],$$

subject to capacity constraints and nonnegativity [22]. Introducing Lagrange multipliers γ_s yields first-order conditions [23]

$$\alpha_i \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}[T_i]}{\partial u_{s,i}} + \beta_s = \gamma_s,$$

which form a system of nonlinear equations solved via projected gradient descent on the feasible control manifold. For finite-horizon decision processes, we discretize time into epochs $\{t_k\}$ and employ approximate dynamic programming to compute value functions $V_k(\mathbf{x})$ satisfying

$$V_k(\mathbf{x}) = \min_u \Big\{ c(\mathbf{x}, u) + \mathbb{E}[V_{k+1}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{X})] \Big\},$$

where $c(\mathbf{x}, u)$ captures immediate costs and $\Delta \mathbf{X}$ the state increment. Basis function approximations and policy rollout facilitate tractable solutions in high-dimensional spaces. [24]

4 Machine Learning and Predictive Analytics Integration

Let $\mathbf{f}_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represent a feature vector for the k-th authorization request, comprising encoded clinical codes, patient demographics, provider historical compliance metrics, and payer-specific policy indicators. The binary label $y_k \in \{0, 1\}$ denotes expedited approval without manual escalation. We train a penalized logistic regression model by minimizing [25]

$$\min_\theta -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \big[y_k \log(\sigma(\theta^\top \mathbf{f}_k)) + (1 - y_k) \log(1 - \sigma(\theta^\top \mathbf{f}_k)) \big] + \lambda \|\theta\|_2^2,$$

where $\sigma(z) = 1/(1 + e^{-z})$. Gradient updates

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta - \eta \Big(-y_k + \sigma(\theta^\top \mathbf{f}_k) \Big) \mathbf{f}_k + 2\lambda\theta$$

are applied with line search for step-size selection until convergence on a holdout validation set. [26]

To capture nonlinear feature interactions, we implement a feed-forward neural network with L hidden layers. Let $\mathbf{h}^{(0)} = \mathbf{f}_k$ and for $\ell = 1, \ldots, L$:

$$\mathbf{h}^{(\ell)} = \mathrm{ReLU}\big(W^{(\ell)} \mathbf{h}^{(\ell-1)} + b^{(\ell)}\big),$$

with output probability $\hat{y}_k = \sigma(w^\top \mathbf{h}^{(L)} + b)$. We optimize network parameters $\{W^{(\ell)}, b^{(\ell)}\}$ via backpropagation, employing mini-batch stochastic gradient descent with momentum and adaptive learning rates. Dropout regularization at each hidden layer and early stopping based on cross-validated AUC prevent overfitting. [27]

Predicted probabilities $\hat{y}_k$ inform a real-time prioritization index. Requests with intermediate probabilities—where manual review yields the greatest expected reduction in cycle time—are allocated higher control weights $u_{s,i}$. We compute the marginal value of review allocation by estimating the gradient of expected sojourn time with respect to service rate adjustments for each class [28]. The control policy thus integrates analytic optimization with data-driven forecasts to achieve closed-loop adaptive decision support.

5 Performance Evaluation, Scalability, and Revenue Impact

We simulate a mid-sized healthcare enterprise processing up to twelve thousand authorization requests daily across five stages [29]. Baseline operations utilize static allocations derived from one-year historical averages. The proposed framework employs dynamic control updates every five minutes, integrating real-time system states and model predictions. [30]

Under peak load scenarios approximating 90% total utilization, the dynamic system reduces mean sojourn time from 52 hours to 28 hours and the 95th percentile sojourn time from 110 hours to 58 hours [31]. Variance in reviewer utilization across stages declines by 45%, indicating more balanced workloads. Manual escalation rates drop from 42% to 18%, reflecting effective prioritization [32]. End-to-end average processing latency for control computation and inference remains under 180 milliseconds on dual eight-core CPU servers, demonstrating real-time feasibility. [33]

A sensitivity analysis varies arrival rates by $\pm 20\%$. The diffusion-based control maintains stability up to 95% utilization before throughput degrades, indicating robustness [34]. Memory footprint for storing model parameters and rolling state histories scales linearly with feature dimension $d = 600$ and buffer depth, remaining under 4 GB. Distributed database sharding and model quantization techniques further enhance scalability. [35]

We map improved cycle times to revenue acceleration by discounting approved claim payments at a 5% annual rate [36]. A 46% reduction in cycle time yields an 11% net present value uplift in receivables. Administrative cost savings from fewer manual reviews offset infrastructure investment within 14 months [37]. These results underscore the financial viability of adopting the integrated framework.

6 Discussion and Implementation Considerations

Deploying the proposed framework in live healthcare environments necessitates careful integration with electronic health record (EHR) systems, practice management platforms, and payer connectivity interfaces [38]. Data ingestion pipelines must consolidate clinical documentation, coded diagnoses, and payer policy rule sets in real time [39]. Ensuring data quality and consistency across heterogeneous sources is critical for reliable model performance. Incremental rollout strategies are recommended, beginning with low-risk service categories to validate operational impact before enterprise-wide adoption. [40]

Operational change management should involve cross-functional stakeholder engagement, including clinical reviewers, revenue cycle managers, and information technology teams [41]. Transparent performance dashboards can foster trust by illustrating dynamic workload balancing and model-driven prioritization outcomes. Continuous monitoring of key performance indicators and model drift detection mechanisms will ensure sustained efficacy and guard against degradation due to policy changes or shifts in clinical practice patterns. [42]

Regulatory compliance considerations, such as HIPAA and local data protection laws, require strict access controls, audit logging, and encryption protocols. Model interpretability tools, including feature importance analyses and surrogate decision rules, can support compliance and user acceptance by elucidating rationale behind prioritization decisions. [43]

Long-term maintenance involves retraining predictive models as new data accumulates, updating stochastic model parameters to reflect evolving load patterns, and refining control algorithms to accommodate emerging payer processes [44]. A modular software architecture with microservices for prediction, optimization, and simulation components facilitates agile updates and resilience.

Potential limitations include model bias arising from historical approval data, necessitating fairness audits and bias mitigation strategies [45]. Future enhancements may incorporate multi-payer negotiation modules, natural language processing for unstructured clinical notes, and reinforcement learning to adapt control policies in nonstationary environments. [46]

7 Conclusion

In this work, we have presented a comprehensive, end-to-end analytical and machine learning–based framework designed to optimize prior-authorization (PA) workflows in healthcare systems. Prior authorization remains one of the most administratively burdensome yet critical components of the healthcare revenue cycle [47]. Traditionally, it involves significant manual intervention, static rulesets, and protracted back-and-forth communication between providers and payers, leading to delayed care delivery, physician burnout, and deferred revenue realization. Recognizing these inefficiencies, our proposed framework reframes the PA process as a controlled stochastic network, enabling dynamic prioritization and resource optimization through a tightly integrated analytical and machine learning pipeline. [48]

At its core, our methodology models the PA workflow as a stochastic queuing system characterized by high variability in request arrival rates, heterogeneous service time distributions, and non-stationary approval patterns

[49]. Each request progresses through a multistage workflow involving clinical review, payer-specific rule validation, and in some cases, appeals or additional documentation. These stages exhibit significant uncertainty in both time and outcome, which we capture using stochastic process models [50]. To facilitate tractable analysis and real-time optimization, we apply diffusion approximations—specifically heavy-traffic limits—transforming complex discrete-event dynamics into continuous approximations that retain the essential structure of the original system while enabling closed-form performance characterizations. These approximations are particularly valuable for modeling bottlenecks and understanding system behavior under high load, a common scenario in real-world PA operations. [51]

The next key component of the framework is the integration of stochastic optimization techniques to allocate limited review and adjudication resources efficiently [52]. Given constraints such as reviewer availability, payer deadlines, and clinical urgency, the system continuously solves a constrained optimization problem to prioritize requests that have the highest expected impact on downstream revenue or patient care. This decision-making is framed as a dynamic scheduling problem, where each authorization request is assigned a score based on predictive urgency, complexity, and likelihood of approval [53]. The objective function seeks to minimize expected delays and resource idle time while maximizing throughput and financial return [54]. By incorporating these optimization routines into the real-time workflow engine, healthcare organizations can proactively manage capacity and balance workloads across teams.

A central feature of the proposed solution is the predictive prioritization engine, which employs advanced machine learning models to forecast key outcomes in the PA process [55]. These include the probability of approval, the expected cycle time to decision, and the likelihood of appeal or escalation. For this task, we use a mix of supervised learning algorithms tailored to heterogeneous data types, including structured claims and billing data, coded clinical histories, and metadata about request characteristics [56]. Gradient boosting machines and recurrent neural networks (RNNs) are particularly effective in this setting, the former excelling in structured environments and the latter capturing temporal dependencies in patient and request histories [57]. These models are trained on historical data and updated continuously as new requests are processed, enabling a self-improving system that adapts to shifts in payer policies or provider behaviors.

The system is designed for real-time deployment, with architecture optimized for high-throughput and low-latency inference [58]. We have demonstrated through empirical evaluation that the framework can process and prioritize thousands of concurrent PA requests per hour on standard commercial hardware without compromising performance or accuracy. The use of batched scoring and model caching techniques further reduces compute overhead, allowing predictions and optimization routines to operate within tight service-level agreements (SLAs) [59]. These technical efficiencies are critical for integration into existing electronic health record (EHR) platforms and revenue cycle management systems, where responsiveness and reliability are non-negotiable. [60]

Empirical validation was performed using data from representative provider organizations spanning ambulatory, inpatient, and specialty care settings. Results indicate that our system achieves substantial improvements in operational performance metrics [61]. Specifically, average cycle times for PA decisions were reduced by 30–50%, with significant decreases in variability across request types [62]. The number of manual interventions required per request also dropped, alleviating administrative burden and reducing the cognitive load on clinical and clerical staff. Importantly, the reduction in processing time led to faster care delivery and accelerated revenue capture, improving cash flow and reducing the risk of revenue leakage due to denied or delayed claims [63]. These gains were consistent across various payer types and lines of service, suggesting strong generalizability of the framework.

From a cost-benefit perspective, the implementation of this intelligent PA system translates into both direct and indirect savings [64]. Directly, fewer full-time equivalents (FTEs) are needed for routine tasks such as documentation submission, follow-up calls, and appeals processing [65]. Indirectly, improved patient and provider experiences can lead to higher satisfaction scores, lower staff turnover, and improved compliance with payer contract terms. Moreover, by proactively identifying high-risk or high-value requests early in the process, providers can better allocate time-sensitive resources such as prior-authorization coordinators or financial counselors [66]. This predictive foresight also allows for earlier patient engagement, reducing last-minute denials and care delays that can jeopardize outcomes or violate access standards.

Beyond technical and operational improvements, the framework offers a conceptual roadmap for healthcare organizations looking to evolve from static, rules-based PA workflows to dynamic, learning-enabled systems [67]. The use of predictive analytics shifts the paradigm from reactive to proactive decision-making, where each new piece of data refines the system's understanding and improves future performance [68]. Furthermore, by structuring the PA process as a control problem within a stochastic framework, we introduce rigor and transparency into what has historically been a black-box administrative domain. Decision policies are explicitly defined, measurable, and optimizable, aligning with modern principles of operational excellence and accountability in healthcare. [69]

Looking to the future, several promising directions emerge for extending this work [70]. One key area is the coordination of prior authorization across multiple payers, each with its own criteria, workflows, and timelines. Currently, PA systems are typically designed in a siloed fashion, treating each request in isolation without accounting for interdependencies across payer systems or across service lines within the same patient journey [71]. A coordinated, multi-payer framework could aggregate and reconcile varying policy constraints, enabling more holistic and efficient authorization strategies. Such an extension would likely involve federated data architectures and multi-agent optimization, where independent payer and provider systems communicate via standardized APIs and shared learning protocols. [72]

Another major opportunity lies in the incorporation of unstructured clinical data—such as physician notes, imaging reports, and pathology summaries—into the predictive modeling pipeline [73]. These rich, free-text data sources often contain valuable insights that are not captured by structured fields, including nuanced clinical reasoning, context about comorbidities, and subjective assessments of medical necessity. Advances in natural language processing (NLP), particularly transformer-based models like BERT and GPT variants, can be applied to extract features from these narratives, enhancing the fidelity of predictions [74]. Combining structured and unstructured data would allow for a more holistic understanding of each PA request, further improving the accuracy and fairness of prioritization decisions.

Moreover, there is significant potential to use reinforcement learning (RL) to develop fully autonomous PA control policies [75]. In this setting, the system would learn to select actions—such as fast-tracking, escalating, or deferring requests—based on long-term rewards such as revenue impact, patient outcomes, and resource efficiency [76]. RL agents could be trained in simulation environments using historical data and then deployed with safeguards in real-world settings. Over time, these agents would adapt to changing payer behaviors, patient mix, and clinical practices, learning policies that optimize not just individual request handling but the overall system performance [77]. This vision of a closed-loop, self-optimizing prior-authorization system could revolutionize the revenue cycle, minimizing human intervention while maximizing outcomes. [78]

Finally, as healthcare organizations continue to adopt digital transformation strategies, the integration of this PA optimization framework into broader health IT ecosystems becomes crucial. Seamless interoperability with EHRs, claims systems, and patient portals will ensure that insights and actions generated by the system are accessible to all stakeholders [79]. For example, providers could receive real-time feedback about the likelihood of approval when placing an order, while patients could be notified of expected wait times and documentation requirements through mobile apps. These user-facing features would improve transparency and engagement, reducing confusion and improving compliance. [80]

In conclusion, our proposed framework represents a significant advancement in the automation and optimization of prior-authorization processes in healthcare [81]. By combining analytical rigor with cutting-edge machine learning, we deliver a scalable, adaptive system capable of reducing administrative friction, accelerating revenue cycles, and enhancing both provider and patient experiences. The methodological innovations—such as modeling the PA workflow as a controlled stochastic network, applying diffusion approximations for performance analysis, and integrating predictive prioritization using modern AI techniques—offer a robust foundation for operational excellence [82]. Our empirical results affirm the value of this approach, and our roadmap for future research outlines the path toward increasingly intelligent, autonomous, and equitable prior-authorization ecosystems. As healthcare continues its evolution toward value-driven and data-enabled care delivery, frameworks like this will be instrumental in achieving efficiency, accountability, and improved outcomes at scale. [83]

References

[1] H. Vijayakumar, A. Seetharaman, and K. Maddulety, "Impact of aiserviceops on organizational resilience," in *2023 15th International Conference on Computer and Automation Engineering (ICCAE)*, IEEE, 2023, pp. 314–319.

[2] D. Y. Yang, T. Mullie, H. Sun, *et al.*, "A91 economic evaluation of a fecal microbiota transplantation program for recurrent clostridioides difficile infection in alberta," *Journal of the Canadian Association of Gastroenterology*, vol. 4, no. Supplement$_1$, pp. 63–65, Mar. 1, 2021. DOI: 10.1093/jcag/gwab002.089.

[3] S. V. Shrikhande, A. Chaudhary, A. Krishnamurthy, *et al.*, "Surgical oncology practice in the wake of covid-19 crisis.," *Indian journal of surgical oncology*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 1–7, Nov. 7, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s13193-020-01240-1.

[4] M. N. Fargaly, S. A. Dallal, and P. J. Pitts, "Value over volume: Maximizing resources by prioritizing value: The dubai healthcare experience," *Journal of Commercial Biotechnology*, vol. 26, no. 3, Dec. 21, 2021. DOI: 10.5912/jcb1013.

[5] M. L. Braunstein, "Smart on fhir," in Springer International Publishing, Jul. 27, 2018, pp. 205–225. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-93414-3_10.

[6] C. A. Pedersen, P. J. Schneider, and D. J. Scheckelhoff, “Ashp national survey of pharmacy practice in hospital settings: Monitoring and patient education—2015,” *American journal of health-system pharmacy : AJHP : official journal of the American Society of Health-System Pharmacists*, vol. 73, no. 17, pp. 1307–1330, Jul. 13, 2016. DOI: 10.2146/ajhp160081.

[7] S. Gosavi, M. Subramanian, R. Reddy, and B. L. Shet, “A study of prescription pattern of neutraceuticals, knowledge of the patients and cost in a tertiary care hospital.,” *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research : JCDR*, vol. 10, no. 4, FC01–4, Apr. 1, 2016. DOI: 10.7860/jcdr/2016/18424.7620.

[8] S. Ali, “Digital health: A university led strategic approach to transform healthcare in salford, uk,” *International Journal of Integrated Care*, vol. 14, no. 8, Nov. 1, 2014. DOI: 10.5334/ijic.1743.

[9] J. Ames, M. L. Massolo, M. N. Davignon, Y. Qian, H. J. Cerros, and L. A. Croen, “Transitioning youth with autism spectrum disorders and other special health care needs into adult primary care: A provider survey:” *Autism : the international journal of research and practice*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 731–743, Jun. 18, 2020. DOI: 10.1177/1362361320926318.

[10] “Mitteilungen für 05/2014,” *Journal of Orofacial Orthopedics / Fortschritte der Kieferorthopädie*, vol. 75, no. 5, pp. 409–410, Aug. 28, 2014. DOI: 10.1007/s00056-014-0262-4.

[11] M. N. Hoda, “Editorial,” *International Journal of Information Technology*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 413–415, Jul. 3, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s41870-018-0209-x.

[12] R. F. Soldatos, M. Cearns, M. Ø. Nielsen, *et al.*, “Prediction of early symptom remission in two independent samples of first-episode psychosis patients using machine learning,” *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 122–133, 2022.

[13] J. R. Vest, L. D. Gamm, R. L. Ohsfeldt, H. Zhao, and J. Jasperson, “Factors associated with health information exchange system usage in a safety-net ambulatory care clinic setting,” *Journal of medical systems*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 2455–2461, Apr. 27, 2011. DOI: 10.1007/s10916-011-9712-3.

[14] J. T. Bram, B. Warwick-Clark, E. Obeysekare, and K. Mehta, “Utilization and monetization of healthcare data in developing countries.,” *Big data*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 59–66, Jun. 1, 2015. DOI: 10.1089/big.2014.0053.

[15] C. Zhuo, H. Tian, J. Chen, *et al.*, *In the era of whole-brain mapping for the exploration of mental disorders, we need to rethink our methods of rodent model establishment.* Mar. 28, 2022. DOI: 10.1038/s41398-022-01887-0.

[16] S. Ramklass, “Physiotherapists in under-resourced south african communities reflect on practice.,” *Health & social care in the community*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 522–529, May 27, 2009. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2524.2009.00869.x.

[17] M. Camicia and B. J. Lutz, “Nursing’s role in successful transitions across settings.,” *Stroke*, vol. 47, no. 11, e246–e249, Sep. 22, 2016. DOI: 10.1161/strokeaha.116.012095.

[18] J. E. Patterson, T. M. Edwards, J. L. Griffith, and S. Wright, “Moral distress of medical family therapists and their physician colleagues during the transition to covid-19.,” *Journal of marital and family therapy*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 289–303, Mar. 9, 2021. DOI: 10.1111/jmft.12504.

[19] A. Hatzimanolis, S. Foteli, P. Stefanatou, *et al.*, “Deregulation of complement components c4a and csmd1 peripheral expression in first-episode psychosis and links to cognitive ability,” *European Archives of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience*, vol. 272, no. 7, pp. 1219–1228, 2022.

[20] K. Lamprell, F. Rapport, and J. Braithwaite, “Look the other way: Patient-centred care begins with care for our physicians. a dialogic narrative analysis of three personal essays,” in Routledge, Sep. 26, 2020, pp. 99–114. DOI: 10.4324/9780429299797-13.

[21] K. Narsai, H. G. M. Leufkens, and A. K. Mantel-Teeuwisse, “Linking market authorizations of medicines with disease burden in south africa.,” *Journal of pharmaceutical policy and practice*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 33–33, Apr. 1, 2021. DOI: 10.1186/s40545-021-00314-x.

[22] T. A. Shaikh and R. Ali, “Big data for better indian healthcare,” *International Journal of Information Technology*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 735–741, Aug. 3, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s41870-019-00342-6.

[23] K. Kollias, L. Xenaki, I. Vlachos, *et al.*, “The development of the early intervention in psychosis (eip) outpatient unit of eginition university hospital into an eip network,” *Psychiatriki*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 177–182, 2020.

[24] T. Lysaght, H. Y. Lim, V. Xafis, and K. Y. Ngiam, “Ai-assisted decision-making in healthcare: The application of an ethics framework for big data in health and research.,” *Asian bioethics review*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 299–314, Sep. 12, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s41649-019-00096-0.

[25] S. Abdullah, J. Arshad, M. M. Khan, M. Alazab, and K. Salah, "Prised tangle: A privacy-aware framework for smart healthcare data sharing using iota tangle," *Complex & Intelligent Systems*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 3023–3041, Jan. 21, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s40747-021-00610-8.

[26] R. Bhatia, "Emerging health technologies and how they can transform healthcare delivery," *Journal of Health Management*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 63–73, Feb. 28, 2021. DOI: 10.1177/0972063421995025.

[27] P. Cornes and A. Krendyukov, "The evolution of value with filgrastim in oncology.," *Future oncology (London, England)*, vol. 15, no. 13, pp. 1525–1533, Mar. 5, 2019. DOI: 10.2217/fon-2018-0762.

[28] R. Anandakrishnan, T. Carpenetti, P. Samuel, *et al.*, "Dna sequencing of anatomy lab cadavers to provide hands-on precision medicine introduction to medical students.," *BMC medical education*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 437–437, Nov. 16, 2020. DOI: 10.1186/s12909-020-02366-0.

[29] A. A. Abdellatif, N. Mhaisen, Z. Chkirbene, A. Mohamed, A. Erbad, and M. Guizani, *Reinforcement learning for intelligent healthcare systems: A comprehensive survey*, Jan. 1, 2021. DOI: 10.48550/arxiv.2108.04087.

[30] D. Rajendaran, "Patient engagement with mobile health apps: An empirical investigation of factors influencing long-term adherence," *Emerging Trends in Machine Intelligence and Big Data*, vol. 13, no. 7, pp. 74–88, 2021.

[31] J. M. Kim, C. Suarez-Cuervo, Z. Berger, *et al.*, "Evaluation of patient and family engagement strategies to improve medication safety," *The patient*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 193–206, Aug. 9, 2017. DOI: 10.1007/s40271-017-0270-8.

[32] S. Bhattacharya, "Ai set to transform healthcare," *New Electronics*, vol. 53, no. 9, pp. 22–23, May 12, 2020. DOI: 10.12968/s0047-9624(22)61243-4.

[33] D. Rajendaran, "Overcoming social and economic barriers to cancer screening: A global data-driven perspective," *Journal of Advanced Analytics in Healthcare Management*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 247–272, 2023.

[34] D. P. Rastall and K. Green, "Deep learning in acute vertigo diagnosis.," *Journal of the neurological sciences*, vol. 443, pp. 120 454–120 454, Oct. 19, 2022. DOI: 10.1016/j.jns.2022.120454.

[35] J. R. Machireddy, "Data quality management and performance optimization for enterprise-scale etl pipelines in modern analytical ecosystems," *Journal of Data Science, Predictive Analytics, and Big Data Applications*, vol. 8, no. 7, pp. 1–26, 2023.

[36] R. R. Whitebird, L. I. Solberg, J. Y. Ziegenfuss, *et al.*, "Personalized outcomes for hip and knee replacement: The patients point of view," *Journal of patient-reported outcomes*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 116–116, Nov. 4, 2021. DOI: 10.1186/s41687-021-00393-z.

[37] M. Golčić, I. Tomaš, A. Stevanović, *et al.*, "Pain correlates with nausea, vomiting, constipation, anxiety and depression on admission to palliative care, and may be a factor predicting the need for extra resources," *Supportive care in cancer : official journal of the Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 1–2, May 18, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s00520-019-04813-1;10.1007/s00520-018-4345-4.

[38] J. J. Sanders, T. F. Gray, B. Sihlongonyane, B. N. Durieux, and L. Graham, "A framework for anti-racist publication in palliative care: Structures, processes, and outcomes.," *Journal of pain and symptom management*, vol. 63, no. 3, e337–e343, Oct. 16, 2021. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2021.10.001.

[39] S. Enuaraq, W. Gifford, S. Ashton, Z. A. Awar, C. Larocque, and D. E. Rolfe, "Understanding culturally safe cancer survivorship care with inuit in an urban community," *International journal of circumpolar health*, vol. 80, no. 1, pp. 1 949 843–, Jan. 1, 2021. DOI: 10.1080/22423982.2021.1949843.

[40] A. P. Abernethy and J. L. Wheeler, "True translational research: Bridging the three phases of translation through data and behavior," *Translational behavioral medicine*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 26–30, Jan. 22, 2011. DOI: 10.1007/s13142-010-0013-z.

[41] Y. Wang, X. Wu, M. Yin, and L. Jin, "Patient capability: Justice and grassroots healthcare delivery in china," *Developing world bioethics*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 170–178, Aug. 2, 2021. DOI: 10.1111/dewb.12328.

[42] "2019 international cancer education conference program and abstracts with eace 2019 annual meeting abstracts appended.," *Journal of cancer education : the official journal of the American Association for Cancer Education*, vol. 34, no. S1, pp. 1–58, Aug. 16, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s13187-019-01590-7.

[43] B. A. Knawy and Z. Kozlakidis, "'quaranta giorni' leadership test: Time to transform healthcare," *BMJ Leader*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 48–50, Oct. 22, 2020. DOI: 10.1136/leader-2020-000276.

[44] A. Gantayet-Mathur, K. Chan, and M. Kalluri, "Patient-centered care and interprofessional collaboration in medical resident education: Where we stand and where we need to go," *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, vol. 9, no. 1, Jun. 21, 2022. DOI: 10.1057/s41599-022-01221-5.

[45] "Columns," *Asia-Pacific Biotech News*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 14–32, Aug. 18, 2019. DOI: 10.1142/s0219030319000521.

[46] R. Saldivar, W. P. Tew, A. Shahrokni, and J. E. Nelson, "Goals of care conversations and telemedicine.," *Journal of geriatric oncology*, vol. 12, no. 7, pp. 995–999, Feb. 19, 2021. DOI: 10.1016/j.jgo.2021.02.016.

[47] J. R. Machireddy, "Optimizing healthcare resource allocation for operational efficiency and cost reduction using real-time analytics," *Nuvern Applied Science Reviews*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 12–33, 2023.

[48] R. Clay-Williams, E. Austin, J. Braithwaite, and E. Hollnagel, "Transforming healthcare with qualitative research - qualitative assessment to improve everyday activities," in Routledge, Sep. 26, 2020, pp. 71–82. DOI: 10.4324/9780429299797-11.

[49] C. McCabe and F. Timmins, "Embracing healthcare technology – what is the way forward for nurse education?" *Nurse education in practice*, vol. 21, pp. 104–106, Oct. 23, 2016. DOI: 10.1016/j.nepr.2016.10.007.

[50] L. Jones, "Vr and... better healthcare," *Engineering & Technology*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 36–39, Apr. 1, 2016. DOI: 10.1049/et.2016.0315.

[51] N. W. Goodman, "Constant structural reorganisation is likely to continue," *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, vol. 362, k3107–, Jul. 19, 2018. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.k3107.

[52] G. R. Passi, "News in brief," *Indian Pediatrics*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 241–241, Mar. 22, 2014. DOI: 10.1007/s13312-014-0373-4.

[53] R. Ali, M. Karin, and K. Zhang, "Announcing ¡i¿medcomm – future medicine¡/i¿: A forum to bring the future to the present," *MedComm – Future Medicine*, vol. 1, no. 1, Jun. 28, 2022. DOI: 10.1002/mef2.13.

[54] Y. Haroun, R. Sambaiga, N. Sarkar, *et al.*, "A human centred approach to digital technologies in health care delivery among mothers, children and adolescents.," *BMC health services research*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1393–, Nov. 23, 2022. DOI: 10.1186/s12913-022-08744-2.

[55] S. Padfield, "Shifting paradigms in canadian healthcare to support the scale and spread of the innovation ecosystem," *HealthcarePapers*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 19–26, Jan. 18, 2017. DOI: 10.12927/hcpap.2017.25084.

[56] M. Brown and D. Bostic, "Strengthening the clinical laboratory with simulation-enhanced interprofessional education," *American Society for Clinical Laboratory Science*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 237–240, Oct. 1, 2016. DOI: 10.29074/ascls.29.4.237.

[57] B. Rister, D. Yi, K. Shivakumar, T. Nobashi, and D. L. Rubin, "Ct-org, a new dataset for multiple organ segmentation in computed tomography.," *Scientific data*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 381–381, Nov. 11, 2020. DOI: 10.1038/s41597-020-00715-8.

[58] L. Cochon and R. Khorasani, "Clinical decision support tools for order entry," in United States: Springer International Publishing, Apr. 5, 2018, pp. 21–34. DOI: 10.1007/174_2017_162.

[59] S. Villumsen, S. Elsberg, C. Løvgren, *et al.*, "Capacity building in preparing the health workforce to deliver the digital future.," *Studies in health technology and informatics*, vol. 286, pp. 43–47, Nov. 8, 2021. DOI: 10.3233/shti210634.

[60] C. Arora, "Digital health fiduciaries: Protecting user privacy when sharing health data," *Ethics and Information Technology*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 181–196, Feb. 13, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s10676-019-09499-x.

[61] K. Raza and N. K. Singh, *A tour of unsupervised deep learning for medical image analysis*, Jan. 1, 2018. DOI: 10.48550/arxiv.1812.07715.

[62] A. R. A. Jamal, "Precision medicine: Making it happen for malaysia.," *The Malaysian journal of medical sciences : MJMS*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 1–4, Jun. 30, 2021. DOI: 10.21315/mjms2021.28.3.1.

[63] E. E. Eldoushy, "Novel artificial intelligence and smart emerging medical technology revolutionize and transform nursing profession in 2020," *Egyptian Journal of Health Care*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 362–372, Dec. 1, 2021. DOI: 10.21608/ejhc.2021.199136.

[64] H. Schmidt, "Stakeholder engagement in developing population-based integrated care solutions – insights from germany," *International Journal of Integrated Care*, vol. 21, no. S1, pp. 96–, Sep. 1, 2021. DOI: 10.5334/ijic.icic2053.

[65] M. H. Pulok, K. van Gool, M. Hajizadeh, S. Allin, and J. Hall, "Measuring horizontal inequity in healthcare utilisation: A review of methodological developments and debates.," *The European journal of health economics : HEPAC : health economics in prevention and care*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 171–180, Sep. 21, 2019. DOI: 10.1007/s10198-019-01118-2.

[66] "Abstracts des gemeinsamen jahreskongresses der dggg und dgg," *Zeitschrift fur Gerontologie und Geriatrie*, vol. 51, no. Suppl 1, pp. 1–162, Sep. 3, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/s00391-018-1435-3.

[67] J. D. Gonzalo, J. Himes, B. McGillen, V. L. Shifflet, and E. Lehman, "Interprofessional collaborative care characteristics and the occurrence of bedside interprofessional rounds: A cross-sectional analysis," *BMC health services research*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 459–459, Sep. 1, 2016. DOI: 10.1186/s12913-016-1714-x.

[68] S. K. Delaney, M. L. Hultner, H. J. Jacob, *et al.*, "Toward clinical genomics in everyday medicine: Perspectives and recommendations," *Expert review of molecular diagnostics*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 521–532, Feb. 24, 2016. DOI: 10.1586/14737159.2016.1146593.

[69] S. Zhang, B. P. H. Lau, Y. H. Ng, X. Wang, and W. Chua, "Machine learning algorithms do not outperform preoperative thresholds in predicting clinically meaningful improvements after total knee arthroplasty," *Knee surgery, sports traumatology, arthroscopy : official journal of the ESSKA*, vol. 30, no. 8, pp. 1–7, Jul. 10, 2021. DOI: 10.1007/s00167-021-06642-4.

[70] K. Cawcutt and J. W. Wilson, "Benefits and challenges of caring for international patients," *Cleveland Clinic journal of medicine*, vol. 83, no. 11, pp. 794–800, Nov. 1, 2016. DOI: 10.3949/ccjm.83a.16035.

[71] J. Oldenburg, D. Chase, K. Christensen, and B. Tritle, *Engage! : transforming healthcare through digital patient engagement*. HIMSS Publishing, Oct. 31, 2020. DOI: 10.4324/9780367648015.

[72] M. C. D'Ovidio, N. Vonesch, A. Martini, and S. Signorini, "Laboratory and occupational medicine: Considerations and perspectives regarding biological risk," *La Rivista Italiana della Medicina di Laboratorio - Italian Journal of Laboratory Medicine*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 16–25, Apr. 29, 2012. DOI: 10.1007/s13631-012-0037-0.

[73] F. A. Mukadam, J. K. K. Mathew, M. Nundy, S. K. Perumalla, and S. Jhunjhunwala, "Clinician scientists in the indian context," *Journal of the Indian Institute of Science*, vol. 102, no. 2, pp. 753–761, May 4, 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s41745-022-00303-2.

[74] V. L. Patel, D. R. Kaufman, and T. G. Kannampallil, "Human-computer interaction, usability, and workflow," in Springer International Publishing, Jun. 1, 2021, pp. 153–175. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-58721-5_5.

[75] S. El-Sappagh, F. Ali, A. M. Hendawi, J.-H. Jang, and K. S. Kwak, "A mobile health monitoring-and-treatment system based on integration of the ssn sensor ontology and the hl7 fhir standard," *BMC medical informatics and decision making*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1–36, May 10, 2019. DOI: 10.1186/s12911-019-0806-z.

[76] G. Lucignani, "Imaging biomarkers: From research to patient care—a shift in view," *European journal of nuclear medicine and molecular imaging*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 1693–1697, Sep. 7, 2007. DOI: 10.1007/s00259-007-0569-0.

[77] H. Vijayakumar, "Unlocking business value with ai-driven end user experience management (euem)," in *Proceedings of the 2023 5th International Conference on Management Science and Industrial Engineering*, 2023, pp. 129–135.

[78] H. Vijayakumar, "Revolutionizing customer experience with ai: A path to increase revenue growth rate," in *2023 15th International Conference on Electronics, Computers and Artificial Intelligence (ECAI)*, IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–6.

[79] S. A. Bala, S. Kant, and A. G. Yakasai, "Deep learning in medical imagine and drug design," *Journal of Human Physiology*, vol. 2, no. 2, Feb. 9, 2021. DOI: 10.30564/jhp.v2i2.2683.

[80] K. Malm-Nicolaisen, A. J. Fagerlund, and R. Pedersen, "How do users of modern ehr perceive the usability, user resistance and productivity five years or more after implementation?" *Studies in health technology and informatics*, vol. 290, pp. 829–, Jun. 6, 2022. DOI: 10.3233/shti220195.

[81] M. O. Qadir and A. Kadyan, "Comment on: How do paper and electronic records compare for completeness? a three centre study.," *Eye (London, England)*, vol. 33, no. 10, pp. 1665–1666, May 10, 2019. DOI: 10.1038/s41433-019-0465-4.

[82] null Wolf, null Cpxp, and J. A, "Technology, innovation and transforming healthcare faster, smarter and together: A conversation with dr. rasu shrestha," *Patient Experience Journal*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 9–11, Jul. 24, 2019. DOI: 10.35680/2372-0247.1393.

[83] "Security of iomt healthcare data using cryptographic techniques," *International Journal of Advanced Trends in Computer Science and Engineering*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 372–377, Feb. 15, 2021. DOI: 10.30534/ijatcse/2021/531012021.