The potential for digital patient symptom recording through symptom assessment applications to optimize patient flow and reduce waiting times in Urgent Care Centers: a simulation study.

Maryam Montazeri[1], Jan Multmeier[1], Claire Novorol[1], Shubhanan Upadhyay[1], Paul Wicks[1], Stephen Gilbert[1]

Correspondence to
Dr Stephen Gilbert; science@ada.com
1 - Ada Health GmbH, Karl-Liebknecht-Str. 1, 10178 Berlin, Germany.

ABSTRACT

Objectives: This study explores the effect of patient clinical history taking, using a digital symptom assessment app, on patient flow.

Design, methods and participants: We used a discrete event approach to simulate patient flow in an urgent care center.

Setting: The base case: a small center with 2 triage nurses, 2 doctors, 1 treatment/examination nurse and 1 discharge administrator in service.

Intervention/comparator: Four scenarios with different numbers of staff and with or without digital symptom assessment.

Outcome: Average overall patient waiting time and average queue length is measured to explore the optimality of patient flow.

Results: Compared to the base case, a decrease of 4.63 patients in the triage nurse queue length was observed when using a symptom assessment app. This was accompanied with increasing the doctors queue of 1.85 patients. Average overall patient waiting time was 6.61 minutes less than in the base case and the patients waiting time for triage was reduced from 34.06 to 15.54 minutes, a reduction of 54%.

Conclusions: Compared to the base case of the UCC, the use of app based intelligent digital symptom taking has the potential to decrease the average patient waiting to a similar degree to the addition of a triage nurse, and also, fewer people wait for examination by the doctors and the patient average overall patient waiting time is reduced. Most importantly, there is the potential to have a 54% reduction in waiting time to see the triage nurse and reducing this time

is known to reduce patient anxiety, staff anxiety and to improve patient care. These simulation results have been used for clinical trial hypotheses forming and have the potential, through this, to impact service provision and approaches to digitalisation.

Key words: Symptom assessment application, Discrete event simulation, Health care system, Patient flow modeling

Article Summary

Strengths and limitations of this study

This study addresses an important challenge: how digitalisation and AI-powered technology can help increase health care delivery efficiency and potentially ease overcrowding problems through the application of a discrete event simulation approach.

- The nature of UCCs varies from facility to facility and from country to country, with some facilities having some planned appointments, and many having only walk-in appointments.
- In our model, we only consider the UCC setting without any planned appointments and we considered a first-in-first-out flow of the patients.
- All modelling approaches require some degree of estimation of reasonable clinical parameters. Our model none-the-less describes a scenario relevant to many UCCs.

Introduction

Overcrowding in healthcare facilities occurs when, over a period of time, the number of patients seeking care exceeds the care facility capacity. This is often accompanied not only by a deterioration of patient outcomes, but also by a significant reduction in performance of the healthcare system. Long queues of patients can lead to delayed care delivery, increased health risk for urgent cases, nosocomial infections, increased stress, and increased staff burden [1,2].

Overcrowding has been specifically associated with increased occurrence of preventable medical errors and with negative effects on clinical trial outcomes [3–5]. Health care system performance can be measured in terms of patients' overall waiting time and quality of the service[6]. Patient flow modelling in a health care system helps the performance analysis of the whole system and can aid decision making in capacity and resource planning and appointment scheduling [7].

Optimizing patient flow in health care facilities, therefore, can be beneficial in the overall improvement of the performance of the health care delivery process. These benefits include the optimized use of physical and human resources, improving the care quality and patients' experiences through reduction of waiting time, and ultimately reducing costs. Ways to improve the flow, and ultimately the performance, of a healthcare delivery process include eliminating unnecessary and duplicate activities, performing activities in parallel, and identifying alternative process flows [7]. The taking and recording of patients' symptoms by skilled labour is an activity which is often duplicated during triage and treatment in urgent care centers (UCC) and emergency departments (EDs). First, a triage nurse, as the first point of contact, asks for symptoms and patient history to classify patients into different levels of severities. The treating physician then later re-assesses symptoms and takes a more detailed history to inform next diagnostic steps and potential diagnoses and treatments.

By contrast, a digital symptom assessment application used by patients in the waiting room to document symptoms and history has the potential to enable professionals to save time and treat more patients. This, in turn, has the potential to reduce system overload in the case of unexpectedly high demand.

One such tool, Ada, is a digital health app utilising a probabilistic reasoning engine to collect demographic information, medical history, and symptoms. A previous usability study found that patients using Ada's tools in a primary care waiting room reported them helpful and easy to use [8]. A clinical vignette study showed that Ada's reasoning engine has similar levels of coverage, accuracy, and safety as human general practitioners [9]. This is important as a patient digital symptom recording tool must be able to ask appropriate and targeted questions on the wide range of symptoms with which patients can present to primary care. However, it remains unclear what potential benefits might be experienced in a more urgent setting. The nature of UCCs varies depending on geographic location, and the term UCC is used to refer to different centre types [10]. The term UCC can refer to walk-in centres, urgent care centres, minor injury units and urgent treatment centres, all with different levels of service. The UCC, as it is modelled in this study, is a GP-led center, open for at least 12 hours a day, every day of the week, equipped to diagnose and

treat many of the most common ailments people go to the ED for, including sprains and strains, suspected broken limbs, minor head injuries, cuts and grazes, bites and stings, minor scalds and burns, ear and throat infections, skin infections and rashes, eye problems, coughs and colds, feverish illness in adults, feverish illness in children, abdominal pain, vomiting and diarrhoea and emergency contraception. This type of unit is now referred to in the NHS as an urgent treatment centre [11].

While most prior research on triage, waiting and consultation time distributions has studied primary health clinics [12–14] or the ED [15–18], relatively little has been reported about UCCs. We found only one study [19] that compared waiting and consultation times in UCCs and physician offices. As no study was identified which measures the triage time in an UCC, we extracted data from the studies by [16] and [15] which include information on time for triage in an ED. As we focussed on improving patient flow in an UCC, we looked for studies on health clinics where patients are seen without needing a prior appointment.

One approach that can be used to explore the effect of a new digital health technology or of a process change in health care system flow and efficiency is system simulation. This is a powerful methodology as it allows the optimal usage of a technology to be explored. Results of many simulation-based studies have already been implemented in real-world settings for better management of patient flow in health care systems. An example of this was the simulation of multiple measurement performance metrics to evaluate scheduling, process flow and resource levels in a real-life large scale oncology center [20], where the implementation of the changes proposed by the simulations resulted in the improvement of the centre's system-wide performance. Another example of real world implementation was in the application of discrete-event simulation to a military outpatient primary care clinic. Here the approach was used to design a hybrid appointment/walk-in model for improving patient flow and to optimize care provider utilization [21]. Another example was the application of a simulation model to analyse and identify factors contributing to flow blockage in an outpatient clinic of the Indiana University Medical Group. The strategic recommendations proposed from the simulation study led to significant improvements in real-life patient waiting time and physicians utilization [22].

In addition to analytical methods such as queuing theory, simulation methods such as system dynamics, agent-based simulation, and discrete event simulation have gained a lot of attention as a helpful method to tackle the complexities of analysis of patient flow in different areas. These applications include: (i) the detection of bottlenecks of the patient flow in healthcare facilities; (ii) optimizing flow management strategies such as scheduling and resource allocation rules; and,

(iii) estimating treatment cost in terms of the lengths of stay of patients [7,23,24]. Here we used discrete event simulation, where patients are considered as independent entities [25] interacting with resources such as nurses and doctors through events like arrival, admission, and discharge.

The usage scenario that we simulate in this study is based on current real-world use of intelligent digital symptom and history taking applications, and the imminent developments of the clinical use of these tools. We compare the scenario in which there is no patient digital symptom assessment to the scenario in which every patient entering the UCC waiting room has used the symptom assessment tool. The patient usage can be either: (i) via patients completing the assessment at home (using a web-embedded or phone application) - this is currently an option provided by some health care providers; or, (ii) via patients completing the assessment using check-in kiosks/terminals in a physically collocated ED department waiting room before fast track redirection/referral to the associated UCC; or, (iii) via patients arriving directly at the UCC, without prior completion of a symptom assessment, but then completing the assessment using check-in kiosks/terminals before entering the UCC-waiting room (this is not considered waiting time at the UCC as it is check-in time). In each case there is direct patient to clinical handover of the assessment report symptoms from the symptom assessment tool to the UCC digital electronic records system.

The model requires a parameter for how much time can be saved through digital patient symptom recording by symptom assessment applications. A 2017 pilot implementation of the Ada app in a busy 10,000 patient UK primary care practice saved an estimated 1.9 minutes, as reported by doctors from over 300 primary care consultations. In a second pilot exploratory study we conducted 5 structured interviews with clinicians in an ED in 2019, who viewed the symptom assessment report produced by an app used in a clinical trial. These clinicians estimated the potential time saving through use of these tools in the ED setting as between 4 to 6 minutes (unpublished data). We use this as a starting point in this simulation study and will definitively measure this parameter in future clinical studies. In the current study, we sought to understand what sort of systemic impact tools like Ada could have on patient flow in a frequently over-burdened health setting, the UCC.

Methods

We simulated a UCC in the first four hours of its opening. In the first step of the patient journey (see **Figure 1**), a triage nurse assesses the symptoms of the patient. In the next step, the patient visits the doctor and either visits the examination/treatment room (with the probability of λ) or is discharged (with the probability of 1-λ). If a patient visits the examination/treatment room, he or she is either redirected to the doctor for further investigations (with the probability of ω) or discharged (with the probability of 1-ω). Triage duration, consultation duration, number of staff in-service and arrival rate of the patients affect the patient flow in the UCC. The baseline scenario of staffing of the UCC was based on professional experience of one coauthor (S.U.) and another colleague (A.B.) who have each worked for over 5 years in a combination of NHS general practices, UCCs and EDs. We assumed that there were two triage nurses, two doctors, one nurse for examination/treatment and one administrator responsible for discharge (**Table 1**). We simulated the effects of each patient using a symptom assessment app on average overall patient waiting time and queue size. We used the package *Simmer* (version 4.4.0) developed by [26] specifically for discrete event simulations in R. **Figure 2** illustrates the patient trajectory through the UCC in the *Simmer* environment.



Figure 1
Illustration of the UCC, where patients arrive without any planned appointment. In the first step a triage nurse runs a symptom assessment, then patients are directed to the doctor. Depending on their situation they may be examined/treated by another nurse and then discharged or sent back to a doctor, or discharged immediately by administrative staff.

Baseline setting	Triage nurse	Doctor	Examination/ treatment nurse	Administration staff
Average duration of interaction (min)	15	20	15	5
Number	2	2	1	1

Table 1
Number of staff and average duration of patient-staff interaction in the baseline setting of the UCC.



Figure 2
Illustration of the urgent care center, as described in **Figure 1,** as modelled in the *Simmer* environment.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the impact of a symptom assessment app in enhancing the patient flow by reducing the patient queue length and overall patient waiting time. Therefore, we first simulated the flow with different arrival rates to select an arrival rate which leads to

overcrowding. Here we considered overcrowding as an average overall patient waiting time of more than 30 minutes. We simulated the patient trajectory starting with an arrival rate of 0.1 patients per minute. The average overall patient waiting time and queue size for each arrival rate and simulation number are reported in **Table 2**. As the final results are dependent on the number of simulations, we calculated the desired metrics in different runs of simulation,i.e. 500, 1000, 5000 and 10000. We saw that after 5000 runs of simulations, the results were stable. For the arrival rate of 0.1 patients per minute, we observed an average overall patient waiting time of fewer than 30 minutes, average queue size of around 1.27 and 2.43 patients for triage nurse and doctors respectively. As we increased the patient arrival rate from 0.1 to 0.2 patients per minute, we observed an increase in nurse queue size from 1.27 to 8.46 patients and a corresponding increase in average overall patient waiting time from 24.18 to 49.16 minutes. For our further analysis, we used the arrival rate of 0.2 patients per minute, as the purpose of the study was to investigate the potential benefit of a symptom assessment app in an overcrowded health care center.

Arrival rates (patients per minute)	**0.1**				**0.2**			
Simulation runs	500	1000	5000	10000	500	1000	5000	10000
Patient overall waiting time (min)	23.42	23.73	24.18	24.18	48.82	48.99	49.17	49.16
Triage nurse queue size	1.30	1.38	1.27	1.26	8.60	8.60	8.46	8.46
Doctors queue size	2.30	2.30	2.43	2.43	5.30	5.30	5.30	5.41

Table 2.
Results of patient flow metrics for different arrival rate and different simulation runs

We then simulated different *what-if-scenarios* to investigate the effect of changing the number of staff and using a symptom assessment app on queue status and overall patient waiting time. We assumed that patient arrivals, triage, consultation and discharge (all the events in patient flow through the UCC) follow Poisson distributions. Therefore, in our simulations, the time interval distribution between all the events follow exponential distributions.

Patient and public involvement

Patients were not involved in setting the research questions, the design, outcome measures or implementation of the study. They were not asked to advise on interpretation or writing up of results. No patients were advised on dissemination of the study or its main results.

Results

We simulated multiple scenarios to measure overall patient waiting time, triage nurse queue size and doctor queue size. A list of all simulated scenarios are shown in **Table 3** and their corresponding results are shown in **Table 4**. Each scenario was simulated 5000 times and the result metrics are reported as the overall mean of 5000 simulations. **Supplementary Figure 3** displays the histogram of overall patient waiting time for different scenarios. The base case scenario was an UCC staffed with two triage nurses, two doctors, one treatment nurse and one administrator responsible for the discharge. An example simulation run in a basic set up is shown in **Supplementary Figure 1**. As indicated in **Supplementary Figure 1-A**, the triage nurse was being used at 100% capacity. Also because of the arrival rate of 0.2 patients per minute, a large queue formed (**Supplementary Figure1-B**). Adding one triage nurse reduced the nurse queue size from 8.43 to 3.37 patients and average overall patient waiting time from 49.74 to 45.76 minutes, but increased the doctor queue size by 4.13 patients, creating a new bottleneck at the doctors (see **Supplementary Figure 2**, particularly panel B). Providing one additional doctor resulted in a significant reduction in doctor queue size (5.56 patients), and the resultant average overall patient waiting time (33.9 minutes). Compared to the base case, using a symptom assessment app substantially reduced the triage nurse queue length and patient waiting time for triage nurse by 4.63 patients and 18.52 minutes respectively (i.e. a reduction in the patient waiting time for triage of 54%), while increasing the doctors queue by 1.85 patients. Patients waited on average 6.61 minutes less than in the base case in their whole journey through the clinic.

Scenario	Triage nurse	Doctors	Treatment nurse
	Number of staff/ [Duration] (min)	Number of staff/ [Duration] (min)	Number of staff / [Duration] (min)
Base case	2 nurses / [15 min]	2 doctors / [20 min]	1 nurse / [15 min]
Base case + 1 triage nurse	3 nurses / [15 min]	2 doctors / [20 min]	1 nurse / [15 min]
Base case + 1 triage nurse + 1 doctor	3 nurses / [15 min]	3 doctors / [20 min]	1 nurse / [15 min]
Base case + symptom assessment app	2 nurses / [10 min]	2 doctors / [15 min]	1 nurse / [15 min]

Table 3.
Number of staff and consultation and triage time in different scenarios.

Scenario	Queue Properties		
	Overall patient waiting time (min)	Nurse queue size (patients)	Doctors queue size (patients)
Base case	49.78	8.43	5.41
Base case + 1 triage nurse	45.76	3.37	9.54
Base case + 1 triage nurse + 1 doctor	33.9	3.47	5.56
Base case + symptom assessment app	43.17	3.8	7.26

Table 4.
Simulation results for different what-if-scenarios in terms of average overall patient waiting time and queue length

Discussion

Principal findings

Digital symptom assessment apps have the potential to improve the patient flow in health care facilities such as hospitals, primary clinics, EDs, and UCCs [27], where a long queue of patients not only puts a lot of pressure on the health care workers, but also on patients. In this study, we simulated the patient flow of an UCC with and without app based intelligent digital symptom taking prior to consulting the triage nurse. In our base case setting, we consider opening hours of 8:00 am to 12:00 pm, the arrival rate of 0.2 patients per minute, two triage nurses, two doctors, one nurse responsible for treatment and one administrator responsible for the discharge. Our simulations resulted in an average overall patient waiting time of 49.78 minutes, and an average triage nurse and doctor queue sizes of 8.43 and 5.41, respectively. This result suggests that service delivery in the simulated UCC scenario could be optimised through the addition of more staff, to improve patient flow and shorten overall patient waiting times. An optimal patient flow was achieved with the provision of one extra triage nurse (i.e. a total of three triage nurses) and one additional doctor (i.e. a total of two doctors). However, this approach may not be feasible due to limitations of available staff and due to the high associated costs. Therefore, we hypothesized that the use of a digital symptom assessment app before the triage process could be another possible solution. Our simulation suggested that providing digital history-taking

through a symptom assessment app reduces both average overall patient waiting time and triage nurse queue length comparable to adding an extra triage nurse, but increases the queue size of doctors only moderately. Most importantly, the patient-app based history taking reduced the patient waiting time for the triage nurse from 34.06 minutes to 15.54 minutes i.e. a reduction in waiting time for triage of 54%. Reduced waiting time is not only inconvenient for patients, but particularly in an urgent care setting it also results in patients anxiety and this is more pronounced for older patients [28,29]. Unacceptable waiting times, also cause staff stress, and this is particularly the case in waiting for the triage nurse [29]. In circumstances, when staff can do nothing to reduce non-acceptable waiting times, they may react with frustration, shame, and eventually resignation [29]. Unacceptable waiting for the triage nurse can also result in the deterioration of the medical condition of patients, as their total wait for treatment can be longer, and as patients with truely urgent conditions requiring immediate assessment cannot be fast-tracked by the triage nurse [29]. For the reasons outlined above, the utilization of app based intelligent digital symptom and history taking might be more cost-effective or a better solution when there are not enough nurses available and might reduce patient anxiety, reduce staff anxiety and improve patient medical care.

Comparisons to the wider literature

One of the principal reasons patients choose UCCs is that perceived waiting times are lower than in GP practices or in the ED [30]. However, we were unable to identify any time series studies that report waiting times or other clinical processes in UCCs, and there has been little systematic data gathering on UCC clinical efficiency [10]. There is more substantial health service delivery and clinical efficiency research on the ED setting [31], and although time series studies have been carried out, it is not reported with certainty how long the taking and recording of clinical history and symptoms takes, nor how much time can be saved through digital history taking tools.

Implications for clinicians and policymakers

This simulation study explores the potential for, and the possible impact of, the introduction of a new technology in the UCC setting. Its purpose is to guide the further design of the technology, to explore the potential for the technology, to assist in hypothesis development for clinical trials testing, and to aid meaningful real world implementation of the technology once it is fully validated.

It is widely recognised, as reviewed in [32], that many promising digital innovations in healthcare are ultimately not adopted in practice, or are abandoned soon after limited local pilot utilization. Often it is not the not the individual limitations of the technology, or individual difficulties in

implementation that ultimately determine the success of the pilots and wider adoption, but rather the dynamic interactions between many of these factors [33]. One approach proposed to reduce the attrition rate of new technologies is to use frameworks for evaluation of new technologies [32]. Another approach, as used in this study, and as described above and in [20–22], is to use simulation methods to explore the potential effect, optimisation and implications for the technology in the complex healthcare system.

An implication of this study for clinicians and policymakers, is that patient self-digital history taking, using intelligent symptom assessment applications, has the potential to make substantial improvements to healthcare system efficiency, and that these technologies are worthy of further investment in the areas of research validation and in implementation.

Unanswered questions and future research

This study shows the potential for app based intelligent digital symptom taking to decrease the average patient waiting to a similar degree to the addition of a triage nurse, to reduce the number of people waiting for treatment and to reduce patient average waiting time. These results will be used for the formation of hypotheses for evaluation in clinical trials, followed by real world evaluation after implementation. As these are simulation study results, they cannot be used alone to guide mainstream technology utilisation and therefore clinical trial validation or carefully controlled pilot implementation should first be carried out.

This study explores the potential effects of patient digital symptom and history taking on patient flow and queuing, but it does not explore the wider implications of the technology for the quality of care delivery, of patient experience, of patient safety or of the working experience of health care staff. These interlinked phenomena need to be addressed in future studies. The purpose of introducing digital technologies to healthcare should not be limited to flow optimisation and efficiency gains in a narrow health economic sense, but rather to the wider goal of the improvement of service provision and service experience.

Overcrowding, at least within EDs, is mainly caused by patients not requiring urgent treatment [5]. Patients with non-urgent medical problems must, just like patients with urgent medical problems, have a medical history taken and documented. It is known that high documentation burden and overcrowding are linked, particularly with respect to history and symptom taking (anamnesis) documentation burden [34]. For example, in the UK, 41% of ED doctors' time can be taken up by documenting the patients [34], although the recorded time is for all documentation, not just of anamnesis. Overcrowding leads to interruptions and these then lead

to slow history taking and documentation [5], particularly for inexperienced junior physicians who are overstretched.

At least within the ED setting, staffing levels have been highlighted as a key ingredient for a safe care environment [34]. In the acute hospital setting, the time required to undertake key tasks of the admission process including history taking reduces with increasing seniority: senior members of the team (consultants) were more able to perform elements of the admission process concurrently, whereas less experienced members did so sequentially and can take over three times as long. Experienced physicians do symptom and history taking faster than inexperienced physicians, but taking less time does not necessarily equate with greater accuracy or quality of the documentation. It has been shown that documentation completeness is less among senior doctors [35]. Overall, medical performance reduces with stress and over-stretching in the ED, and is likely to result in greater error making, including in documentation [36]

It has been argued that the introduction of Electronic Medical Records (EMRs) has in many situations led to increased physician documentation workload, and potentially reduced efficiency, a phenomenon referred to as the *documentation problem* [37,38]. There is the potential, through intelligent digital technology, for a new paradigm, in which the documentation burden for clinicians is reduced through digital apps used by their patients, with the resultant records then accessed and interacted with by clinicians, and where the digital tool acts as an adjunct and assistant to the physician, rather than a distracting system that must be fed with information. There is potential for health care workers and AI to work together to provide a faster-to-complete and more accurate documentation. Documentation error can negatively impact patient safety [27,37]. The role of interactive pre-populated electronic data records and handling is argued by many to be part of the solution to the documentation problem [37,38]. Being part of the solution means that the AI must assist the patient and doctor to quickly create accurate useful documentation, rather than creating additional digital and documentation burden. Research on the quality of EMRs confirm that EMRs do not, by themselves, support enhanced physician documentation, support clarity, support accuracy, support completeness, or support other measures of quality - a metaanalysis of this issue [27] recognised the large opportunities that exist to incorporate advances in artificial intelligence and machine learning into chart documentation processes. They concluded that in the future these technologies have the potential to reduce inaccurate, imprecise, incomplete, or inappropriate documentation.

Modern hospitals are under huge pressure and their work practices are being forced to change [39]. One particular area where interactive pre-populated electronic data records and digital

symptom and history taking tools may find a role in the ED is associated with the ED department 'fast tracks' [38]. Fast tracks are a common strategy in EDs and consist of dedicated pathways for patients with non-serious medical conditions. The fast tracks aim to deliver fast healthcare for this patient group by scheduling them for rapid treatment appropriate to their clinical need, and therefore also assisting their rapid discharge from the ED [40]. Effectively, most fast tracks are the implementation of an UCC within the ED. Intelligent digital symptom and history taking tools have the potential to facilitate fast tracks and fast tracks have been shown to facilitate improved patient satisfaction metrics (doubled values) and may play an important role in Improvement of ED performance on clinical quality performance benchmarks [41].

The role of intelligent digital patient symptom taking tools in reducing documentation burden, facilitating fast tracks, increasing the patient safety through more accurate documentation and through reducing ED and UCC overcrowding and congestion requires more research in simulation studies, clinical investigations and pilot technology role-out.

Strengths and limitations of this study

We acknowledge that the choice of modeling technique, model structure, and chosen parameter values limit the generalizability of results. We used discrete-event simulation to simulate a queue of events. In our simulation, patients and resources are all treated as passive and we did not consider any ongoing learning that can influence patients and health worker interactions. We consider that there will be minimal ongoing learning that will be relevant to queuing times, as the health workers are already familiar and working optimally in the UCC environment, irrespective of the precise staffing provision, and that patients will have minimal influence on queuing time through learned behaviour. Therefore, for the scenarios investigated in this study, the use of the DES method is not a major limitation. However, if it was relevant to introduce the dynamic behaviour of patients and resources, DES is not an optimal solution, and other simulation techniques such as agent-based modelling could be considered.

Also, the nature of UCCs varies from facility to facility and from country to country [10], with some facilities having some planned appointments, and many having only walk-in appointments. In our model, we only consider the UCC setting without any planned appointments. Also, we considered a first-in-first-out flow of the patients, not considering the urgency of treatment of individual patients. However, the use of a poisson distribution for treatment durations implicitly captured higher resource use of more severe cases. We do not explicitly model the low number of patients for which the triage nurse will fast-track a patient to immediate consultation with a doctor. When this happens, it is very important for the individual patient, but occurs relatively

uncommonly in the setting we modeled in this study, approximately once or twice per day in the experience of the UCC clinicians we have consulted in the planning phase of this study. This rate of occurrence will have minimal effect on the overall simulation results.

Our conclusion that reduced patient waiting time to see the triage nurse is likely to reduce patient anxiety is based upon the evidence that, even for the proportion of patients that use the digital symptom assessment tool on arrival at the UCC waiting room, the activity of completing the assessment does not contribute to anxiety in the same manner as inactive waiting.

The time saving through use of a symptom assessment app for clinical history taking is based on an estimate from clinicians in the ED setting, and not an UCC. No precise data on time saving in the UCC setting is available and this will be the subject of later research. Future studies should explore the effect of a symptom assessment application in a real-world setting, where demand, staffing and organizational structure may vary.

For minor injuries, the triage nurse may not always carry out an extensive history and symptom talking and may proceed straight away with simple treatment, e.g., applying bandages. These cases are not included in our model and would lead to a longer queue at the triage nurse, increasing the bottleneck in the base case scenario.

The duplication of medical history-taking is well recognised in the clinical literature, with the history taken repeatedly from the same patient by different medical personnel. An example of this in the ED setting is described by [34], who reported history taking: (i) by the triage nurse; (ii) by the clerking (student) physician; (iii) by the 2nd-clerking on transfer to the acute medical unit; (iv) at history review in the general ward round; (v) at history retaking on admission to a speciality ward. Studies have shown that, in the ED setting, the retaking of clinical history provides no clinical benefit, with the history often recorded near verbatim to the previous history, as part of a recognised 'futile clinical cycle' [34]. Although there is no data in the literature on repeated history taking in the UCC setting, in this study, we model with the assumption that history taking time is saved for both the triage nurse and for the treating physician, based on the assumption both the triage nurse and the treating physician benefit from the highly structured information recorded in the clinical history report from the symptom assessment application.

Taking symptoms and patient histories by the triage nurse and the treating doctor have different purposes - while the triage nurse needs to flag down potentially life-threatening emergencies, the doctor's symptom and history taking aims to uncover the underlying cause for complaints

and assessing risk factors for therapeutic interventions. We assume that the information queried and the time spent in both cases overlap to a large degree and thus assessing symptoms once using a digital symptom assessment tool, which collects a thorough history, creates efficiencies. Furthermore, we assume that nurses and doctors can assess the recorded symptoms within their standard workflow. Disruptions in the workflow caused by introducing digital symptom assessment tools likely reduce the observed efficiencies in the initial implementation and learning phase of the technology.

Conclusions

Our simulation results show that compared to the base case of the UCC, the use of app based intelligent digital symptom taking has the potential to decrease the average patient waiting to a similar degree to the addition of a triage nurse, and in addition, fewer people wait for examination by the doctors and the patient average overall patient waiting time is reduced. Most importantly, there is the potential to have a 54% reduction in waiting time to see the triage nurse and reducing this time is known to reduce patient anxiety, staff anxiety and to improve patient care. These simulation results have been used for clinical trial hypotheses forming and have the potential, through this, to impact service provision and approaches to digitalisation.

Footnotes

- **Author Contribution**

MM, JM, CN, SU & SG contributed to the planning (study conception, protocol development). MM carried out the simulation setup and simulations. MM, JM & SG contributed to the data analysis & interpretation. MM, JM, CN, SU, PW & SG contributed to the reporting (report writing). All the authors contributed to commenting on drafts of the report. SG is the guarantor for this work. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

- **Disclosures** MM, JM, SU, CN, & SG are employees or company directors of Ada Health GmbH and some of the listed hold stock options in the company. PW has a consultancy contract with Ada Health GmbH. The Ada Health GmbH research team has received research grant funding from Fondation Botnar and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. PW has received speaker fees from Bayer and honoraria from Roche, ARISLA, AMIA, IMI, PSI, and the BMJ.
- **Funding** This study was funded by Ada Health GmbH.
- **Disclaimer** None

- **Competing interests** Some of the authors are employees of/hold equity in the manufacturer of digital history taking app, the effects of which are simulated in this study (Ada Health GmbH). See author affiliations.
- **Patient consent for publication** Not relevant - no direct patient data.
- **Provenance and peer review** Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.
- **Data availability statement** All data relevant to the study are included in the article or uploaded as supplementary information.
- **Acknowledgments** Adel Baluch (Medical Expert, Ada Health GmbH) provided advice on the normal structure, layout and working practices of UCCs.

References

1 Derlet RW, Richards JR. Ten Solutions for Emergency Department Crowding. *West J Emerg Med* 2008;**9**:24–7.
2 Zhao L, Lie B. Modeling and Simulation of Patient Flow in Hospitals for Resource Utilization. *Simul Notes Eur* Published Online First: 2010. doi:10.11128/sne.20.tn.09976
3 Epstein SK, Huckins DS, Liu SW, *et al.* Emergency department crowding and risk of preventable medical errors. *Intern Emerg Med* 2012;**7**:173–80. doi:10.1007/s11739-011-0702-8
4 Pines JM, Hilton JA, Weber EJ, *et al.* International Perspectives on Emergency Department Crowding: INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON ED CROWDING. *Academic Emergency Medicine* 2011;**18**:1358–70. doi:10.1111/j.1553-2712.2011.01235.x
5 Schmiedhofer M, Möckel M, Slagman A, *et al.* Patient motives behind low-acuity visits to the emergency department in Germany: a qualitative study comparing urban and rural sites. *BMJ Open* 2016;**6**:e013323. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-013323
6 Ashour OM, Okudan Kremer GE. Dynamic patient grouping and prioritization: a new approach to emergency department flow improvement. *Health Care Manag Sci* 2016;**19**:192–205. doi:10.1007/s10729-014-9311-1
7 Bhattacharjee P, Ray PK. Patient flow modelling and performance analysis of healthcare delivery processes in hospitals: A review and reflections. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 2014;**78**:299–312. doi:10.1016/j.cie.2014.04.016
8 Miller S, Gilbert S, Virani V, *et al.* Patients' utilisation and perception of an AI based symptom assessment and advice technology in a British primary care waiting room: Questionnaire study. *JMIR Preprints*;:05/05/2020:19713 [Preprint]. doi:10.2196/preprints.19713
9 Gilbert S, Mehl A, Baluch A, *et al.* How accurate are digital symptom assessment apps for suggesting conditions and urgency advice?: a clinical vignettes comparison to GPs. *medRxiv* 2020;:2020.05.07.20093872 [Preprint]. doi:10.1101/2020.05.07.20093872
10 Chen CE, Chen CT, Hu J, *et al.* Walk-in clinics versus physician offices and emergency rooms for urgent care and chronic disease management. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2017.

11 When to visit an urgent treatment centre. nhs.uk. 2018.https://www.nhs.uk/using-the-nhs/nhs-services/urgent-and-emergency-care/when-to-visit-an-urgent-care-centre/ (accessed 2 Jun 2020).
12 Ahmad B, Khairatul K, Farnaza A. An assessment of patient waiting and consultation time in a primary healthcare clinic. *Malays Fam Physician* 2017;**12**:14–21.
13 Irving G, Neves AL, Dambha-Miller H, *et al.* International variations in primary care physician consultation time: a systematic review of 67 countries. *BMJ Open* 2017;**7**:e017902. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-017902
14 Potisek NM, Malone RM, Shilliday BB, *et al.* Use of patient flow analysis to improve patient visit efficiency by decreasing wait time in a primary care-based disease management programs for anticoagulation and chronic pain: a quality improvement study. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2007;**7**:8. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-7-8
15 Ashour OM, Okudan Kremer GE. A simulation analysis of the impact of FAHP–MAUT triage algorithm on the Emergency Department performance measures. *Expert Systems with Applications* 2013;**40**:177–87. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2012.07.024
16 Maull R, Smart PA, Harris A, *et al.* An evaluation of “fast track” in A&E: A discrete event simulation approach. *Service Industries Journal* 2009;**29**. doi:10.1080/02642060902749534
17 Spechbach H, Rochat J, Gaspoz J-M, *et al.* Patients’ time perception in the waiting room of an ambulatory emergency unit: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Emerg Med* 2019;**19**:41. doi:10.1186/s12873-019-0254-1
18 Wiler JL, Bolandifar E, Griffey RT, *et al.* An emergency department patient flow model based on queueing theory principles. *Acad Emerg Med* 2013;**20**:939–46. doi:10.1111/acem.12215
19 Patwardhan A, Davis J, Murphy P, *et al.* Comparison of waiting and consultation times in convenient care clinics and physician offices: a cross-sectional study. *J Prim Care Community Health* 2013;**4**:124–8. doi:10.1177/2150131912450030
20 Matta ME, Patterson SS. Evaluating multiple performance measures across several dimensions at a multi-facility outpatient center. *Health Care Manage Sci* 2007;**10**:173–94. doi:10.1007/s10729-007-9010-2
21 Findlay M, Grant H. An application of discrete-event simulation to an outpatient healthcare clinic with batch arrivals. In: *Proceedings of the 2011 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*. 2011. 1166–77. doi:10.1109/WSC.2011.6147839
22 Chand S, Moskowitz H, Norris JB, *et al.* Improving patient flow at an outpatient clinic: study of sources of variability and improvement factors. *Health Care Manag Sci* 2009;**12**:325–40. doi:10.1007/s10729-008-9094-3
23 Cassidy R, Singh NS, Schiratti P-R, *et al.* Mathematical modelling for health systems research: a systematic review of system dynamics and agent-based models. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2019;**19**:845. doi:10.1186/s12913-019-4627-7
24 Zhang X. Application of discrete event simulation in health care: a systematic review. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2018;**18**:687. doi:10.1186/s12913-018-3456-4
25 Allen M, Spencer A, Gibson A, *et al. What is discrete event simulation, and why use it?* NIHR Journals Library 2015. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK293948/ (accessed 15 May 2020).
26 Ucar I, Smeets B, Azcorra A. simmer: Discrete-Event Simulation for R. *Journal of Statistical Software* 2019;**90**:1–30. doi:10.18637/jss.v090.i02
27 Lorenzetti DL, Quan H, Lucyk K, *et al.* Strategies for improving physician documentation in the emergency department: a systematic review. *BMC Emergency Medicine* 2018;**18**:36. doi:10.1186/s12873-018-0188-z

28 Yoon J, Sonneveld M. Anxiety of patients in the waiting room of the emergency department. 2010. 279–86. doi:10.1145/1709886.1709946
29 Burström L, Starrin B, Engström M-L, *et al.* Waiting management at the emergency department – a grounded theory study. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2013;**13**:95. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-13-95
30 Coster JE, Turner JK, Bradbury D, *et al.* Why Do People Choose Emergency and Urgent Care Services? A Rapid Review Utilizing a Systematic Literature Search and Narrative Synthesis. *Acad Emerg Med* 2017;**24**:1137–49. doi:10.1111/acem.13220
31 Rui P, Kang K. National Hospital Ambulatory Medical Care Survey: 2017 emergency department summary tables. *National Center for Health Statistics Available from:*https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhamcs/web_tables/2017_ed_web_tables-508.pdf
32 Greenhalgh T, Wherton J, Papoutsi C, *et al.* Analysing the role of complexity in explaining the fortunes of technology programmes: empirical application of the NASSS framework. *BMC medicine* 2018;**16**:66.
33 Cresswell K, Sheikh A. Organizational issues in the implementation and adoption of health information technology innovations: an interpretative review. *Int J Med Inform* 2013;**82**:e73-86. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2012.10.007
34 Sabin J, Khan W, Subbe CP, *et al.* 'The time it takes…' How doctors spend their time admitting a patient during the acute medical take. *Clin Med (Lond)* 2016;**16**:320–4. doi:10.7861/clinmedicine.16-4-320
35 Lai FW, Kant JA, Dombagolla MH, *et al.* Variables associated with completeness of medical record documentation in the emergency department. *Emerg Med Australas* 2019;**31**:632–8. doi:10.1111/1742-6723.13229
36 Zavala AM, Day GE, Plummer D, *et al.* Decision-making under pressure: medical errors in uncertain and dynamic environments. *Aust Health Rev* 2018;**42**:395–402. doi:10.1071/AH16088
37 Edwards M, Moczygemba J. Reducing medical errors through better documentation. *Health Care Manag (Frederick)* 2004;**23**:329–33. doi:10.1097/00126450-200410000-00007
38 Huffman KC. The Effects of a Targeted History Question on Patient-Triage Nurse Communication. *Nurs Clin North Am* 2019;**54**:33–51. doi:10.1016/j.cnur.2018.10.002
39 Tipping MD, Forth VE, Magill DB, *et al.* Systematic review of time studies evaluating physicians in the hospital setting. *J Hosp Med* 2010;**5**:353–9. doi:10.1002/jhm.647
40 Chrusciel J, Fontaine X, Devillard A, *et al.* Impact of the implementation of a fast-track on emergency department length of stay and quality of care indicators in the Champagne-Ardenne region: a before–after study. *BMJ Open* 2019;**9**:e026200. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-026200
41 Arora S, Goldberg AD, Menchine M. Patient Impression and Satisfaction of a Self-administered, Automated Medical History-taking Device in the Emergency Department. *West J Emerg Med* 2014;**15**:35–40. doi:10.5811/westjem.2013.2.11498