On the subject of electronic health records and the administrative burdens placed upon doctors.

1. I have not seen any reliable study that has concluded that the adoption of electronic health records in doctors’ private offices has led to improved health care or reduced costs of health care.
2. As a frequent recipient of electronic health care records, I have found this mode of information retrieval is more often an impediment than an asset; as vital data is never highlighted and is usually either omitted or buried within a large file of irrelevant data.
3. The costs in physician and staff time coupled with the software costs create such a burden on our practice that it has led many of colleagues to stop practicing, and will be the primary cause for my impending retirement.
4. The penalties for inadequate attestation for E.H.R. use are consistently arbitrary and extremely time consuming.
5. I have found that my patients are consistently critical of offices where physicians are observed spending time on a computer, as it takes time away from eye-to-eye contact with the patient.
6. Our patients should be empowered to determine the value of electronic health records when they choose their doctors. Those who insist on E.H.R. would simply choose the clinics that have invested in that technology.
7. Within the hospital setting, I have found electronic health records to be a life threatening obstacle to patient care. When a computer monitor takes the place of a simple vital sign monitor, I’ve had to wait for as long as ten minutes for nurses to acquire the simplest of vital sign measurements.
8. In my community, had the local hospital been motivated to spend the same money on health care that was wasted on an overly complex and inefficient computer system, our town would be enjoying the finest health care at no cost whatsoever. Instead, tens of millions of dollars leave the community to pay for a large computer service corporation.