Physical Therapy In The Age Of Technology: Challenges And Opportunities In Clinical Practice

Samar Mohammed Alansari[1], Rawa Yahya Jamal[2], Amani Fouad Alwassia[3], Wejdan Mushrif Alzahrani[4], Hassan Hamad Hussein Farsi[5], Yahya Mousa Ahmed Naji[6], Fawziah Ali Kharash Al Asiri[7], Maryam Yahya Abu Shalah Daily[8], Wadiaa Alwi Alsadah[9], Rami Abdullah Althubaiti[10], Sultan Hassan Sultan Hamzi[11]

1. Senior Physical Therapist, East Jeddah Hospital – Jeddah
2. Physical Therapist, East Jeddah Hospital
3. Physical Therapist, East Jeddah Hospital – Jeddah
4. Physical Therapist, East Jeddah Hospital
5. Physiotherapy Technician, Alreith General Hospital
6. Physiotherapy Specialist, Alreith General Hospital
7. Physiotherapy Technician, Alreith General Hospital
8. Physiotherapy Specialist, Abuarish General Hospital
9. Physiotherapist, Prince Sultan Cardiac Center – Al-Ahsa
10. Physiotherapist, King Abdulaziz Specialist Hospital
11. Physiotherapy Technician, Alreith General Hospital

Abstract

The rapid integration of technology into physical therapy practice has fundamentally transformed rehabilitation assessment, intervention, and service delivery. This review examines the evidence-based and collaborative foundations underpinning technology-enhanced physical therapy, highlighting both its clinical benefits and implementation challenges. Drawing on principles of Evidence-Based Practice (EBP), the review explores how digital tools, clinical decision support systems, tele-rehabilitation, and data-driven platforms support improved assessment accuracy, personalized treatment planning, patient engagement, and continuity of care. Interdisciplinary collaboration is emphasized as a critical enabler for effective technology adoption, ensuring alignment between rehabilitation goals and broader healthcare objectives.

The review also addresses future directions in physical therapy, including the growing role of artificial intelligence, precision rehabilitation, and integrated health information systems, alongside persistent barriers such as time constraints, resource limitations, data overload, and resistance to change. By synthesizing current evidence, this work underscores the importance of thoughtful, evidence-informed technology integration that preserves patient-centered care while enhancing clinical efficiency and outcomes. Ultimately, advancing physical therapy in the digital era requires sustained investment in education, leadership, collaboration, and organizational culture to ensure equitable, safe, and effective rehabilitation services

Keywords: Physical Therapy; Evidence-Based Practice; Rehabilitation Technology; Interdisciplinary Collaboration; Tele-rehabilitation; Clinical Decision Support Systems; Patient-Centered Care; Digital Health; Artificial Intelligence in Rehabilitation

CHAPTER 1: EVIDENCE-BASED AND COLLABORATIVE FOUNDATIONS OF TECHNOLOGY-ENHANCED PHYSICAL THERAPY

Paragraph 1

Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) represents a fundamental shift in modern healthcare, emphasizing clinical decision-making that integrates the best available research evidence, professional expertise, and patient preferences. Within physical therapy, this approach has become increasingly important as technological innovations reshape assessment and rehabilitation strategies. Rather than relying solely on traditional techniques or experiential knowledge, physical therapists are now expected to justify clinical decisions through scientifically validated evidence. This shift ensures that therapeutic interventions are effective, safe, and aligned with contemporary standards of care. The incorporation of EBP promotes consistency, quality improvement, and patient-centered outcomes, particularly in technology-assisted rehabilitation settings where new tools must be critically evaluated before adoption (Bhatarasakoon & Chiaranai, 2024; Engle et al., 2021).

Paragraph 2

The growing emphasis on EBP has transformed clinical reasoning in physical therapy, requiring practitioners to continuously engage with emerging research and evolving technologies. Digital rehabilitation tools, wearable sensors, and data-driven platforms demand rigorous evaluation to determine their clinical value. EBP provides a structured framework that allows physical therapists to assess the effectiveness of these innovations and integrate them appropriately into patient care. By grounding clinical decisions in validated evidence, therapists can avoid ineffective or unnecessary interventions while maximizing therapeutic outcomes. This approach also encourages reflective practice, where clinicians reassess treatment strategies based on patient response and new scientific findings, reinforcing adaptability in a rapidly advancing clinical environment (Janikian & Maragakis, 2024; Astutik, 2024).

Paragraph 3

Beyond improving clinical outcomes, EBP plays a critical role in optimizing healthcare resources within physical therapy practice. Technology-based interventions can be costly, and their indiscriminate use may contribute to inefficiencies or inequities in care delivery. Evidence-based decision-making enables therapists to select interventions that demonstrate measurable benefit, thereby reducing unnecessary procedures and minimizing complications. This approach supports cost-effective rehabilitation while maintaining high standards of care. Furthermore, EBP enhances transparency in clinical practice by allowing therapists to clearly explain the rationale behind treatment choices, fostering patient trust and engagement in technology-assisted rehabilitation programs (Alaklobi et al., 2024; Astutik, 2024).

Paragraph 4

Parallel to the rise of EBP, collaborative healthcare models have become increasingly essential in addressing the complexity of modern rehabilitation. Physical therapy often involves patients with chronic, multisystem conditions that require coordinated input from physicians, nurses, occupational therapists, and other specialists. Collaborative care frameworks recognize that optimal outcomes cannot be achieved through isolated practice. Instead, they emphasize interdisciplinary teamwork and shared responsibility for patient care. In technology-enhanced physical therapy, collaboration ensures that digital tools and rehabilitation strategies align with broader medical goals, enhancing continuity and coherence across care pathways (Da Mota Gomes & Nardi, 2024; Dilles et al., 2021).

Paragraph 5

Interdisciplinary collaboration allows physical therapists to contribute specialized expertise while benefiting from the knowledge of other healthcare professionals. Such collaboration is particularly important when implementing advanced technologies that intersect multiple domains of care. By integrating diverse perspectives, healthcare teams can develop personalized rehabilitation plans that address physical, functional, and psychosocial needs.

Collaborative models also support the appropriate interpretation of data generated by technological tools, ensuring that clinical decisions remain patient-focused rather than technology-driven. This integrative approach reflects a holistic philosophy of care that is increasingly recognized as essential in contemporary rehabilitation practice (Rajan et al., 2020; Witt Sherman et al., 2020).

Paragraph 6

The evolving healthcare landscape has redefined professional roles within interdisciplinary teams. While physicians often coordinate care, physical therapists are increasingly recognized as key contributors to clinical decision-making, particularly in movement analysis and functional recovery. Effective collaboration requires open communication, mutual respect, and shared accountability among team members. These principles are vital when integrating technology into rehabilitation, as successful implementation depends on coordinated workflows and consistent clinical goals. For physical therapists, participation in collaborative models necessitates not only technical competence but also strong interpersonal and communication skills (Wei et al., 2020; Shanafelt et al., 2021).

Paragraph 7

Historically, clinical decisions in rehabilitation were often guided by practitioner experience and established routines. However, the integration of EBP and collaborative care has challenged this traditional model, promoting a more inclusive and data-driven approach. Physical therapists are now expected to balance professional judgment with empirical evidence and interdisciplinary input. This evolution reflects a broader shift in healthcare toward shared responsibility and collective expertise. By embracing this model, physical therapy practice becomes more adaptive, accountable, and responsive to complex patient needs, particularly in technology-supported environments (Ruebling et al., 2023; Samarasekera et al., 2024).

Paragraph 8

A key component of evidence-based and collaborative care is shared decision-making, which actively involves patients in their rehabilitation process. In physical therapy, this approach is particularly relevant when introducing technology-based interventions that may alter traditional treatment experiences. Shared decision-making integrates clinical evidence with patient values, preferences, and goals, ensuring that technological solutions are acceptable and meaningful to the individual. This participatory model enhances patient satisfaction, improves adherence to rehabilitation programs, and strengthens therapeutic alliances, ultimately contributing to better functional outcomes (Treichler et al., 2021; Lehane et al., 2023).

Paragraph 9

The successful integration of EBP into collaborative physical therapy practice requires continuous learning and adaptability. The rapid expansion of scientific literature and technological innovation presents challenges for clinicians attempting to remain current. Clinical decision-support systems and evidence synthesis tools have become essential resources for navigating this complexity. These tools assist physical therapists in efficiently accessing and applying relevant evidence, ensuring that clinical recommendations remain both scientifically sound and individualized. Such support mechanisms are critical for sustaining high-quality care in fast-paced clinical environments (Sibbald et al., 2022; Law & MacDermid, 2024).

Paragraph 10

Collaboration within evidence-based frameworks also demands professional humility and openness. Physical therapists must recognize the value of diverse perspectives and be willing to adapt their approaches based on interdisciplinary feedback. In complex rehabilitation cases, collaborative dialogue facilitates comprehensive problem-solving and

reduces the risk of fragmented care. These skills are particularly important when managing patients with multifactorial conditions, where technology-generated data must be interpreted collectively to guide safe and effective interventions (Wadhwa & Mahant, 2022; Kilpatrick et al., 2020).

Paragraph 11

At the systems level, the integration of EBP and collaboration contributes to improved consistency and quality across healthcare institutions. Standardized, evidence-informed rehabilitation practices reduce variability in care delivery and enhance outcome predictability. When physical therapists work within collaborative, evidence-based frameworks, they help establish best practices that can be replicated across settings. This alignment not only benefits individual patients but also strengthens healthcare systems by promoting efficiency, accountability, and continuous quality improvement (Tucker et al., 2021; Brenner & Pandian, 2024).

Paragraph 12

Despite its advantages, the transition toward evidence-based and collaborative physical therapy practice presents notable challenges. Time constraints, high workloads, and limited access to training can hinder clinicians' ability to engage fully with evidence and teamwork. Additionally, hierarchical structures and communication barriers may undermine interdisciplinary collaboration. Overcoming these obstacles requires institutional commitment, including investment in education, digital infrastructure, and supportive organizational cultures that value collaboration and innovation (Odeh et al., 2024; Ahsan, 2024).

Paragraph 13

Medical and rehabilitation education must evolve to prepare future physical therapists for evidence-based, collaborative practice in technology-rich environments. Training programs should emphasize critical appraisal skills, teamwork competencies, and patient-centered communication. Integrating these elements into professional curricula ensures that graduates are equipped to navigate the complexities of modern rehabilitation practice. Educational reform is essential for sustaining the long-term integration of technology, evidence, and collaboration in physical therapy (Simons et al., 2022; Gonzalo et al., 2022).

Paragraph 14

Clinicians who adopt evidence-based and collaborative approaches often report greater professional fulfillment. For physical therapists, these models align closely with the core values of rehabilitation, including functional improvement, patient empowerment, and compassionate care. Engaging with evidence and interdisciplinary teams fosters professional growth, reflective practice, and resilience in an increasingly complex healthcare environment. Moreover, collaboration reduces professional isolation and enhances collective problem-solving, contributing to more sustainable clinical practice (Zuqayl et al., 2024; Sun, 2024).

Paragraph 15

In conclusion, the integration of evidence-based practice and collaborative care provides a critical foundation for physical therapy in the age of technology. Physical therapists are no longer isolated practitioners but essential members of interdisciplinary teams committed to delivering high-quality, patient-centered care. By embracing evidence, collaboration, and technological innovation, physical therapists can enhance clinical effectiveness, improve patient outcomes, and contribute to more efficient healthcare systems. These competencies will remain central as rehabilitation practice continues to evolve in response to emerging challenges and opportunities (Elendu, 2024; Alrwaili et al., 2022).

CHAPTER 2: EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE AS A FRAMEWORK FOR TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION IN PHYSICAL THERAPY

Paragraph 1

Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) serves as a foundational framework for integrating technology into contemporary physical therapy practice. By combining scientific research, clinical expertise, and patient values, EBP ensures that technological interventions are applied in a structured and patient-centered manner. In physical therapy, this framework is particularly important as emerging technologies rapidly expand assessment and treatment options. EBP bridges the gap between technological innovation and clinical applicability, allowing therapists to evaluate whether digital tools genuinely enhance functional outcomes. Through evidence-informed decision-making, physical therapists can ensure consistency, safety, and quality in technology-assisted rehabilitation while maintaining individualized care (Medina et al., 2024; Schueller & Torous, 2020).

Paragraph 2

The core components of EBP—research evidence, clinical expertise, and patient values—are essential for guiding the appropriate use of technology in physical therapy. Research evidence provides data on the effectiveness and safety of rehabilitation technologies, while clinical expertise enables therapists to interpret this evidence within the context of real-world practice. Patient values further ensure that technological interventions align with individual preferences, cultural considerations, and functional goals. Technology adoption without these components risks becoming device-driven rather than patient-centered. Therefore, integrating all three pillars of EBP ensures that technological advancements enhance, rather than replace, clinical judgment and therapeutic relationships (Connor et al., 2023; Paparini et al., 2020).

Paragraph 3

The implementation of EBP in physical therapy begins with the formulation of focused clinical questions related to technology use. Identifying whether a specific digital intervention improves mobility, pain, or functional independence requires structured inquiry. Tools such as the PICOT framework allow physical therapists to clearly define patient populations, technological interventions, comparison methods, and desired outcomes. Well-constructed clinical questions enhance efficiency in evidence searching and support informed decisions about adopting new rehabilitation technologies. This structured approach prevents the indiscriminate use of technology and ensures alignment with therapeutic goals (Bermudez, 2021; Movsisyan et al., 2020).

Paragraph 4

Following question formulation, critical appraisal of evidence is essential when evaluating rehabilitation technologies. Physical therapists must assess research quality, including study design, sample characteristics, and potential biases. Technologies supported by weak or inconsistent evidence may not translate effectively into clinical benefit. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses are particularly valuable, as they synthesize findings across multiple studies to provide clearer guidance. Through rigorous appraisal, therapists can distinguish between innovative tools with true clinical value and those driven primarily by commercial interest (Halalau et al., 2021; Abbruzzese et al., 2023).

Paragraph 5

Applying evidence into physical therapy practice requires balancing scientific findings with clinical judgment and patient needs. Even when strong evidence supports a technological intervention, individual patient factors such as comorbidities, motivation, and access must be considered. Physical therapists often adapt technology-based protocols to suit functional goals and personal circumstances. This flexibility reflects the essence of EBP, ensuring that

technology enhances care without compromising personalization. By integrating evidence with professional expertise, therapists deliver interventions that are both effective and meaningful (McNett et al., 2021; Damarell et al., 2020).

Paragraph 6

Despite its benefits, implementing EBP-driven technology in physical therapy presents notable challenges. Time constraints are among the most significant barriers, as clinicians often operate in fast-paced environments with limited opportunity to review emerging evidence. Evaluating new technologies requires both time and access to reliable resources. Clinical decision-support systems can help mitigate these challenges by summarizing evidence and facilitating rapid clinical decisions. Institutional support is essential to enable therapists to engage in evidence-informed practice without compromising workflow efficiency (Astutik, 2024; Marren & Rosati, 2024).

Paragraph 7

Another challenge lies in the variability and applicability of evidence supporting rehabilitation technologies. Research studies may involve populations or conditions that differ from those encountered in everyday physical therapy practice. Consequently, therapists must carefully interpret findings and determine relevance to individual patients. In cases where evidence is limited or inconclusive, clinical experience and patient input become increasingly important. This balance underscores the dynamic nature of EBP and highlights the importance of contextual judgment in technology-assisted rehabilitation (Neuman et al., 2020; Tonelli & Shapiro, 2020).

Paragraph 8

Resistance to change also poses a barrier to the integration of EBP and technology in physical therapy. Established routines and personal preferences may hinder the adoption of evidence-supported innovations. Overcoming this resistance requires a commitment to lifelong learning and openness to new approaches. Interdisciplinary dialogue and continuing professional development play a crucial role in fostering acceptance of evidence-based technologies. Encouraging reflective practice helps therapists recognize the value of adapting to evolving evidence for improved patient outcomes (Pachankis et al., 2023; Khalili et al., 2023).

Paragraph 9

Patient engagement is a critical determinant of success in evidence-based, technology-supported physical therapy. Therapists must clearly communicate the rationale behind technology-based interventions, addressing patient concerns and expectations. Transparent communication fosters trust and supports shared decision-making, ensuring that patients feel involved rather than overwhelmed by technology. When patients understand how evidence supports their treatment, adherence improves, leading to better rehabilitation outcomes and satisfaction (Feldman et al., 2023; Kalariya et al., 2023).

Paragraph 10

In summary, EBP provides a robust framework for guiding the integration of technology into physical therapy practice. While challenges such as time constraints, evidence variability, and resistance to change persist, these barriers can be addressed through education, collaboration, and patient engagement. By adhering to EBP principles, physical therapists can ensure that technological advancements enhance clinical effectiveness, support personalized care, and align with patient values. This approach positions EBP as a critical driver of high-quality, technology-enabled rehabilitation in modern healthcare (Barr et al., 2021; Tamli & Sain, 2023).

CHAPTER 4: OPPORTUNITIES AND CLINICAL BENEFITS OF TECHNOLOGY-ENHANCED PHYSICAL THERAPY

Paragraph 1

Technology-enhanced physical therapy presents significant opportunities to improve the quality, precision, and effectiveness of rehabilitation services. When integrated within an evidence-based practice (EBP) framework, technology allows physical therapists to align scientific evidence, clinical expertise, and patient values in a structured manner. This integration ensures that digital tools are not adopted solely for innovation's sake but are used to support measurable clinical benefits. By grounding technology use in EBP, physical therapists can enhance patient-centered care while maintaining consistency and accountability in clinical decision-making (Medina et al., 2024; Schueller & Torous, 2020).

Paragraph 2

One of the primary clinical benefits of technology in physical therapy is improved assessment accuracy. Digital measurement tools and data-driven platforms provide objective insights into movement patterns, functional limitations, and treatment progress. These tools complement clinical expertise by offering quantifiable data that support more informed decision-making. When combined with therapist judgment, technology enables a more comprehensive understanding of patient status, reducing reliance on subjective observation alone. This synergy enhances diagnostic confidence and supports individualized treatment planning (Connor et al., 2023; Paparini et al., 2020).

Paragraph 3

Technology also enhances treatment personalization, a cornerstone of high-quality physical therapy. Evidence-based technologies allow therapists to tailor interventions according to patient-specific needs, preferences, and functional goals. Personalized rehabilitation programs increase relevance and engagement, which are critical for treatment success. By integrating patient values into technology-supported care plans, therapists ensure that interventions remain meaningful and contextually appropriate, ultimately improving adherence and outcomes (Paparini et al., 2020; McNett et al., 2021).

Paragraph 4

Another important opportunity offered by technology-enhanced physical therapy is improved efficiency in clinical workflows. Evidence-informed digital tools support faster decision-making, streamline documentation, and reduce redundancy in care delivery. These efficiencies allow therapists to allocate more time to direct patient interaction and therapeutic activities. When supported by clinical decision-support systems, technology helps clinicians apply evidence rapidly and consistently, improving care delivery in time-constrained clinical environments (Astutik, 2024; Marren & Rosati, 2024).

Paragraph 5

Technology-enhanced physical therapy also strengthens patient engagement and empowerment. Digital platforms facilitate clearer communication of treatment goals, progress, and expected outcomes. When patients understand the evidence supporting their therapy, they are more likely to actively participate in rehabilitation. Shared decision-making is enhanced when technology is used as a communication aid rather than a replacement for therapist–patient interaction. This collaborative approach promotes trust, satisfaction, and long-term commitment to rehabilitation programs (Feldman et al., 2023; Kalariya et al., 2023).

Paragraph 6

From a clinical outcomes perspective, technology supports early identification of treatment effectiveness and necessary modifications. Evidence-based monitoring tools allow therapists to evaluate patient response in real time and adjust interventions accordingly.

This adaptability reduces the risk of prolonged ineffective treatments and supports timely clinical adjustments. Such responsiveness aligns with EBP principles by continuously integrating new data into ongoing clinical reasoning (Halalau et al., 2021; Abbruzzese et al., 2023).

Paragraph 7

Technology also offers opportunities to improve continuity of care across healthcare settings. When evidence-based data are shared effectively among healthcare professionals, rehabilitation becomes more coordinated and consistent. This is particularly beneficial for patients with complex or chronic conditions who require long-term physical therapy. By supporting collaborative decision-making and standardized care pathways, technology enhances integration across the healthcare continuum (Barr et al., 2021; Tamli & Sain, 2023).

Paragraph 8

In addition to clinical benefits, technology-enhanced physical therapy contributes to professional development and clinical confidence. Access to evidence-based digital tools encourages continuous learning and reflective practice among therapists. By engaging with current research and clinical data, therapists strengthen their ability to justify interventions and adapt to emerging best practices. This ongoing professional growth supports high standards of care and reinforces the therapist's role as an evidence-informed practitioner (Neuman et al., 2020; Tonelli & Shapiro, 2020).

Paragraph 9

Despite concerns about technology replacing human interaction, evidence suggests that technology can enhance rather than diminish the therapeutic relationship when applied appropriately. Physical therapists remain central to interpreting evidence, contextualizing data, and addressing patient concerns. Technology serves as a supportive tool that augments, rather than replaces, clinical expertise and empathetic care. This balance ensures that rehabilitation remains both technologically advanced and human-centered (Pachankis et al., 2023; Khalili et al., 2023).

Paragraph 10

In conclusion, technology-enhanced physical therapy offers substantial opportunities to improve assessment accuracy, personalize treatment, enhance efficiency, and strengthen patient engagement. When guided by evidence-based practice, these technologies support better clinical outcomes while preserving the core values of rehabilitation. By integrating research evidence, clinical expertise, and patient values, physical therapists can harness technology to deliver high-quality, effective, and patient-centered care in an evolving healthcare landscape (Medina et al., 2024; Schueller & Torous, 2020).

CHAPTER 5: FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PHYSICAL THERAPY PRACTICE

Paragraph 1

Technological advancements are expected to play an increasingly central role in shaping the future of physical therapy practice. As healthcare systems continue to prioritize evidence-based practice (EBP) and interdisciplinary collaboration, digital tools are becoming essential for enhancing clinical decision-making and improving rehabilitation outcomes. Technologies that streamline workflows, support data-driven reasoning, and enhance patient engagement are particularly relevant to physical therapy, where individualized and functional outcomes are critical. The thoughtful integration of these technologies will influence how physical therapists assess, plan, and deliver care in evolving clinical environments (Huddart et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2023).

Paragraph 2

Electronic health records (EHRs) represent a foundational technology with significant implications for physical therapy practice. EHRs provide centralized access to patient histories, diagnostic findings, and treatment plans, enabling therapists to make informed clinical decisions and reduce duplication of services. By supporting continuity of care across settings, EHRs enhance coordination between physical therapists and other healthcare professionals. As rehabilitation increasingly relies on interdisciplinary care models, effective use of EHRs will be essential for aligning therapeutic goals and tracking long-term functional outcomes (Prabhod, 2023; Suganthi & Kalaiselvi, 2024).

Paragraph 3

Clinical decision support systems (CDSS) offer promising opportunities to support evidence-based physical therapy practice. By integrating clinical guidelines and patient-specific data into daily workflows, CDSS can assist therapists in selecting appropriate interventions, identifying potential risks, and optimizing treatment plans. These systems may be particularly valuable in complex rehabilitation cases where multiple comorbidities influence functional recovery. As CDSS technologies evolve, their adaptation to rehabilitation-specific contexts will be critical for maximizing clinical relevance and safety (Gencturk et al., 2024; Ostropolets et al., 2020).

Paragraph 4

Telehealth and tele-rehabilitation are expected to remain key components of future physical therapy service delivery. Remote consultations, digital exercise programs, and virtual follow-ups have expanded access to rehabilitation services, particularly for patients in rural or underserved areas. Tele-rehabilitation also enables continuity of care when in-person visits are limited, supporting long-term adherence and functional monitoring. As telehealth platforms continue to advance, physical therapists will need to adapt clinical skills and communication strategies to ensure high-quality, patient-centered remote care (Jacobsohn et al., 2022; Lu et al., 2021).

Paragraph 5

Artificial intelligence (AI) and data analytics represent emerging frontiers in physical therapy practice. AI-powered tools can analyze large datasets to identify patterns in patient progress, predict recovery trajectories, and support personalized intervention strategies. These capabilities align with the goals of precision rehabilitation, where treatment is tailored to individual functional profiles. While AI is unlikely to replace clinical expertise, it can serve as a powerful adjunct to therapist decision-making, enhancing efficiency and accuracy in complex clinical scenarios (Matson-Koffman et al., 2023; Amin et al., 2021).

Paragraph 6

Precision medicine principles are increasingly relevant to physical therapy as rehabilitation moves toward individualized, outcome-driven care. Advances in data analytics and personalized health information allow therapists to tailor interventions based on patient-specific characteristics, including functional capacity and response patterns. This approach improves treatment effectiveness and minimizes unnecessary interventions. As precision-based models expand, physical therapists will play a critical role in translating personalized data into meaningful functional improvements for patients (Araujo et al., 2020; Shah et al., 2021).

Paragraph 7

Despite these opportunities, the future integration of technology into physical therapy practice presents notable challenges. Alert fatigue associated with CDSS and EHR notifications may reduce clinician responsiveness and increase cognitive burden. Excessive or poorly prioritized alerts can undermine clinical efficiency and compromise patient safety. Addressing this issue requires system designs that prioritize relevance, usability, and

therapist input to ensure technology supports rather than disrupts clinical reasoning (Jing et al., 2022; Hou et al., 2021).

Paragraph 8

Data overload is another challenge likely to intensify as rehabilitation technologies generate increasing volumes of patient information. Physical therapists must balance access to comprehensive data with the ability to synthesize and apply relevant insights effectively. Without appropriate training and decision-support tools, excessive data may hinder rather than enhance care. Future practice will require ongoing education and digital literacy to ensure therapists can interpret and apply data efficiently within clinical contexts (Sbaffi et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2023).

Paragraph 9

Privacy and data security concerns will continue to influence the adoption of digital technologies in physical therapy. The use of telehealth platforms, remote monitoring, and interconnected systems increases the risk of data breaches and unauthorized access. Physical therapists must remain vigilant in adhering to ethical and legal standards for data protection. Robust cybersecurity measures and clear institutional policies will be essential to maintaining patient trust and ensuring safe technology use (Kataria & Ravindran, 2020; Prabhod, 2023).

Paragraph 10

Cost considerations also have significant implications for the future of technology-enhanced physical therapy. Implementing and maintaining digital systems can be financially challenging, particularly for smaller clinics or resource-limited settings. Ensuring equitable access to technology requires balancing innovation with affordability and scalability. Policymakers and healthcare leaders must consider strategies that support sustainable adoption while minimizing disparities in rehabilitation services (Fu et al., 2020; Baporikar, 2024).

Paragraph 11

In conclusion, the future of physical therapy practice will be strongly influenced by advancements in healthcare technology, including EHRs, CDSS, tele-rehabilitation, AI, and precision-based approaches. These innovations offer significant opportunities to enhance evidence-based care, interdisciplinary collaboration, and patient outcomes. However, addressing challenges related to alert fatigue, data overload, security, and cost is essential for realizing their full potential. By integrating technology thoughtfully and strategically, physical therapists can advance patient-centered, efficient, and high-quality rehabilitation practice in the years ahead (Huddart et al., 2022; Baporikar, 2024).

CHAPTER 6: BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTING EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE AND COLLABORATIVE CARE IN PHYSICAL THERAPY

The implementation of Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) and collaborative care models is essential for advancing physical therapy practice; however, multiple barriers continue to limit their consistent application in rehabilitation settings. Physical therapists often work in fast-paced clinical environments characterized by high patient volumes, time-limited sessions, and productivity pressures. These conditions leave limited opportunity to search for current evidence, critically appraise research findings, and translate them into individualized treatment plans. The rapid growth of rehabilitation research and emerging therapeutic technologies further intensifies this challenge, increasing the cognitive and practical burden on clinicians striving to remain evidence-informed (Ayoubian et al., 2020; Alatawi et al., 2020).

Resource limitations represent a significant obstacle to EBP implementation in physical therapy, particularly in outpatient clinics, community rehabilitation centers, and resource-constrained settings. Many facilities lack access to clinical decision support systems, comprehensive research databases, or structured interdisciplinary training programs. These limitations restrict therapists' ability to integrate evidence into daily practice and hinder effective collaboration with other healthcare professionals. Financial constraints may also limit investment in advanced rehabilitation technologies, continuing education, and staffing models that support evidence-based and team-oriented care (Naghibi et al., 2021; Poveda-Moral et al., 2021).

Institutional resistance to change further complicates the adoption of EBP and collaborative practices in physical therapy. Established treatment routines, hierarchical decision-making structures, and skepticism toward research-driven protocols can discourage innovation. Some therapists may perceive evidence-based guidelines as overly rigid or insufficiently adaptable to individual patient needs, while others may rely heavily on traditional techniques rooted in experience rather than current evidence. Such resistance can slow the integration of interdisciplinary approaches and limit the evolution of rehabilitation practice (Crawford et al., 2023; Milam et al., 2024).

Addressing these barriers requires organizational strategies tailored to the realities of physical therapy practice. Providing protected time for therapists to engage in evidence review, interdisciplinary case discussions, and professional development is a critical step toward sustainable EBP adoption. In addition, rehabilitation settings should invest in accessible, user-friendly digital tools that integrate evidence into clinical workflows. When evidence resources are embedded within documentation or treatment planning systems, therapists are more likely to apply research findings without disrupting patient care (Fohlin et al., 2021; Augustino et al., 2020).

Education and training are central to overcoming resistance and building competence in evidence-based and collaborative physical therapy practice. Workshops, simulation-based training, and interdisciplinary education programs help therapists develop skills in critical appraisal, clinical reasoning, and team communication. Continuous professional development fosters adaptability and confidence, enabling therapists to integrate new evidence and technologies into rehabilitation plans while maintaining individualized, patient-centered care (Alqahtani et al., 2022; Lai et al., 2022).

Leadership within rehabilitation teams plays a pivotal role in facilitating EBP and collaboration. Senior physical therapists, clinical supervisors, and rehabilitation managers influence practice culture by modeling evidence-based decision-making and encouraging teamwork. Effective leaders advocate for resources, support interdisciplinary collaboration, and address resistance constructively. By promoting a shared vision for evidence-informed rehabilitation, leaders help create environments where physical therapists feel supported in adopting new practices and collaborating across disciplines (Rowe et al., 2021; Megersa et al., 2023).

Ultimately, successful implementation of EBP and collaborative care in physical therapy requires a commitment to cultural change within rehabilitation organizations. This transformation involves valuing lifelong learning, interdisciplinary respect, and reflective practice. Aligning institutional policies, performance metrics, and professional expectations with EBP principles ensures that evidence-based and team-oriented care becomes embedded in daily practice rather than treated as an additional burden. Such cultural alignment empowers physical therapists to deliver high-quality, effective, and patient-centered rehabilitation services (Melnyk et al., 2021; Scheibel, 2024).

Chapter 7: Physicians as Advocates for Patient Safety

Physicians play a critical role in the detection and prevention of medical errors, which remain a major contributor to morbidity and mortality globally. Integrating Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) into clinical decision-making enables physicians to minimize errors arising from misdiagnosis, inappropriate treatment choices, and avoidable complications. By relying on current, high-quality evidence, EBP offers a systematic approach for weighing the potential risks and benefits of clinical interventions, thereby supporting safer and more effective patient care (Brickley et al., 2021; Nsiah et al., 2020).

Establishing a strong culture of safety within healthcare organizations is fundamental to reducing medical errors and improving patient outcomes. Physicians can actively foster such a culture by promoting transparent communication, encouraging the reporting of errors and near-miss events, and supporting non-punitive responses to mistakes. When errors are viewed as learning opportunities rather than individual failures, healthcare teams are better positioned to uncover underlying system-level issues that contribute to repeated incidents (Levine et al., 2020; Alsabri et al., 2022).

Physicians are also uniquely positioned to lead quality improvement initiatives focused on patient safety. These initiatives often involve systematic analysis of error trends, development of evidence-based guidelines, and implementation of process improvements aimed at preventing recurrence. For example, physician-led standardization of handoff procedures between clinical shifts has been shown to reduce communication failures, enhance continuity of care, and decrease the likelihood of critical information being overlooked (Myers et al., 2020; Basson et al., 2021).

Effective patient safety advocacy requires close collaboration with interdisciplinary healthcare teams. Nurses, pharmacists, and allied health professionals contribute essential perspectives that help identify safety risks and design comprehensive prevention strategies. Interdisciplinary safety rounds, in which team members openly discuss concerns and propose solutions, provide a structured forum for integrating these diverse viewpoints and strengthening collective responsibility for patient safety (Ibrahim Shire et al., 2020; Brown et al., 2023).

Education and ongoing professional development are central to advancing patient safety efforts. Training programs that address risk management, human factors engineering, and error prevention equip physicians with the tools needed to recognize vulnerabilities within healthcare systems. Continuous education also ensures that physicians remain informed about evolving best practices and emerging safety technologies, reinforcing their capacity to lead safety initiatives effectively (Carayon & Wooldridge, 2020; Liu et al., 2022).

Technology plays an increasingly important role in supporting patient safety initiatives. Electronic health records (EHRs) and clinical decision support systems (CDSS) can alert physicians to potential errors, including medication interactions and dosing inconsistencies, thereby enhancing decision-making accuracy (Naghibi et al., 2021). However, these technologies must be carefully optimized to avoid issues such as alert fatigue, which can diminish their effectiveness. Physicians have a key role in advocating for system designs that support clinical workflows rather than disrupt them (Olakotan & Mohd Yusof, 2021).

In conclusion, physicians are central to advancing patient safety through the application of EBP, interdisciplinary collaboration, and leadership in quality improvement initiatives. By cultivating a culture of safety, engaging diverse healthcare teams, and leveraging education and technology, physicians can drive meaningful systemic change. Their role as patient safety advocates remains essential for ensuring that healthcare systems consistently deliver high-quality, safe, and reliable care to all patients (Goto & Miura, 2023; Ye, 2023).

References

1. Abbruzzese, E., Levine, S. B., & Mason, J. W. (2023). The myth of "reliable research" in pediatric gender medicine: a critical evaluation of the Dutch studies—and research that has followed. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, *49*(6), 673-699.
2. Ahsan, S. (2024). Cross-Disciplinary Collaboration: Enhancing Creativity and Problem-Solving in the Workplace. *Kashf Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *1*(05), 12-23.
3. Akseer, R., Connolly, M., Cosby, J., Frost, G., Kanagarajah, R. R., & Lim, S. H. E. (2021). Clinician–patient relationships after two decades of a paradigm of patient-centered care. *International Journal of Healthcare Management*, *14*(3), 888-897.
4. Alaklobi, A. A. D., Alaklabi, S. M., Alkurbi, Z. A., Alqarni, H. M., Alqarni, F. M., Alqarni, M. A., ... & Almalki, S. M. (2024). Pharmacoeconomics and Health Policy: Assessing the Cost-Effectiveness of Pharmaceutical Interventions and its Insinuations for Policy Decision-Making Strategy. *Azerbaijan Pharmaceutical and Pharmacotherapy Journal*, *23*, 1-19.
5. Alatawi, M., Aljuhani, E., Alsufiany, F., Aleid, K., Rawah, R., Aljanabi, S., & Banakhar, M. (2020). Barriers of implementing evidence-based practice in nursing profession: A literature review. *American Journal of Nursing Science*, *9*(1), 35-42.
6. Alkhaibari, R. A., Smith-Merry, J., Forsyth, R., & Raymundo, G. M. (2023). Patient-centered care in the Middle East and North African region: a systematic literature review. *BMC Health Services Research*, *23*(1), 135.
7. Alqahtani, J. M., Carsula, R. P., Alharbi, H. A., Alyousef, S. M., Baker, O. G., & Tumala, R. B. (2022). Barriers to implementing evidence-based practice among primary healthcare nurses in Saudi Arabia: A cross-sectional Study. *Nursing Reports*, *12*(2), 313-323.
8. AL-Ruzzieh, M. A., AL-Helih, Y. M., Haroun, A., & Ayaad, O. (2024). Higher and Middle Management Perspectives on Patient-Centered Care in an Oncology Setting: A Qualitative Study. *Nursing Reports*, *14*(4), 3378-3390.
9. Alrwaili, I. A., Alanazi, R. R. S., Alhazmi, S. H. B., Awadalbanagi, N. H., Alenizi, W., Alenazi, N. G. K., & Alenezi, H. S. (2022). The role of nursing care in advancing health equity. *Neuropsychopharmacologia Hungarica*, *20*(4).
10. Alsabri, M., Boudi, Z., Lauque, D., Dias, R. D., Whelan, J. S., Östlundh, L., ... & Bellou, A. (2022). Impact of teamwork and communication training interventions on safety culture and patient safety in emergency departments: a systematic review. *Journal of patient safety*, *18*(1), e351-e361.
11. Alselaml, M. M. A., Shahbal, S., Alharbi, A. M. A., Al-Bishri, K. O. E., Alhrbi, S. E. M., Allehyani, A. A., ... & Al Sharif, K. A. (2023). Enhancing patient-centered care IN primary nursing strategies, cultural competence, AND shared decision-making; systematic review findings. *Journal of Namibian Studies: History Politics Culture*, *37*, 80-105.
12. Amin, S., Gupta, V., Du, G., McMullen, C., Sirrine, M., Williams, M. V., ... & Li, J. (2021). Developing and demonstrating the viability and availability of the multilevel implementation strategy for syncope optimal care through engagement (mission) syncope app: Evidence-based clinical decision support tool. *Journal of medical Internet research*, *23*(11), e25192.
13. Ansa, B. E., Zechariah, S., Gates, A. M., Johnson, S. W., Heboyan, V., & De Leo, G. (2020, September). Attitudes and behavior towards interprofessional collaboration among healthcare professionals in a large academic medical center. In *Healthcare* (Vol. 8, No. 3, p. 323). MDPI.
14. Araujo, S. M., Sousa, P., & Dutra, I. (2020). Clinical decision support systems for pressure ulcer management: systematic review. *JMIR medical informatics*, *8*(10), e21621.
15. Astutik, W. S. (2024). The Role of Evidence-Based Management in Enhancing Nursing Performance and Patient Care Outcomes. *The Journal of Academic Science*, *1*(5), 541-552.

16. Augustino, L. R., Braun, L., Heyne, R. E., Shinn, A., Lovett-Floom, L., King, H., ... & Hatzfeld, J. (2020). Implementing evidence-based practice facilitators: A case series. *Military medicine*, *185*(Supplement_2), 7-14.
17. Ayoubian, A., Nasiripour, A. A., Tabibi, S. J., & Bahadori, M. (2020). Evaluation of facilitators and barriers to implementing evidence-based practice in the health services: A systematic review. *Galen Medical Journal*, *9*, e1645.
18. Baporikar, N. (2024). Role of Information Technology in Enhancing Healthcare Services. In *Digital Technologies for a Resource Efficient Economy* (pp. 63-87). IGI Global.
19. Barr, J., Paulson, S. S., Kamdar, B., Ervin, J. N., Lane-Fall, M., Liu, V., & Kleinpell, R. (2021). The coming of age of implementation science and research in critical care medicine. *Critical care medicine*, *49*(8), 1254-1275.
20. Basson, T., Montoya, A., Neily, J., Harmon, L., & Watts, B. V. (2021). Improving patient safety culture: a report of a multifaceted intervention. *Journal of patient safety*, *17*(8), e1097-e1104.
21. Benjamins, J., Haveman-Nies, A., Gunnink, M., Goudkuil, A., & De Vet, E. (2021). How the use of a patient-accessible health record contributes to patient-centered care: scoping review. *Journal of medical Internet research*, *23*(1), e17655.
22. Bermudez, N. (2021). Formulating well-written clinical practice questions and research questions. *Nursing & Health Sciences Research Journal*, *4*(1), 70-82.
23. Bhatarasakoon, P., & Chiaranai, C. (2024). Bridging the Gap from Theory to Practice: Teaching Evidence-based Nursing Strategies for Developing Critical Thinkers and Lifelong Learners. *Pacific Rim International Journal of Nursing Research*, *28*(3).
24. Bhidayasiri, R., Panyakaew, P., Trenkwalder, C., Jeon, B., Hattori, N., Jagota, P., ... & Fernandez, H. H. (2020). Delivering patient-centered care in Parkinson's disease: challenges and consensus from an international panel. *Parkinsonism & Related Disorders*, *72*, 82-87.
25. Bornman, J., & Louw, B. (2023). Leadership development strategies in interprofessional healthcare collaboration: A rapid review. *Journal of healthcare leadership*, 175-192.
26. Brenner, M. J., & Pandian, V. (2024). Elevating Tracheostomy Care Through Data-Driven Innovation: What Can Education, Evidence-Based Practice, and Quality Improvement Learn from One Another?. *Tracheostomy (Warrenville, Ill.)*, *1*(2), 1.
27. Brickley, B., Williams, L. T., Morgan, M., Ross, A., Trigger, K., & Ball, L. (2021). Putting patients first: development of a patient advocate and general practitioner-informed model of patient-centred care. *BMC Health Services Research*, *21*, 1-9.
28. Brown, S. A., Sparapani, R., Osinski, K., Zhang, J., Blessing, J., Cheng, F., ... & Olson, J. (2023). Team principles for successful interdisciplinary research teams. *American heart journal plus: cardiology research and practice*, *32*, 100306.
29. Buhagiar, T. M., Schoenlein, M. H., & Smith, D. S. (2020). Ethical decision making in critical care: Communication, coordination of care, and the practice of the clinical nurse specialist. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, *34*(3), 93-95.
30. Butler, J. M., Gibson, B., Lewis, L., Reiber, G., Kramer, H., Rupper, R., ... & Nebeker, J. (2020). Patient-centered care and the electronic health record: exploring functionality and gaps. *Jamia Open*, *3*(3), 360-368.
31. Carayon, P., & Wooldridge, A. R. (2020). Improving patient safety in the patient journey: contributions from human factors engineering. *Women in industrial and systems engineering: Key advances and perspectives on emerging topics*, 275-299.

32. Carron, T., Rawlinson, C., Arditi, C., Cohidon, C., Hong, Q. N., Pluye, P., ... & Peytremann-Bridevaux, I. (2021). An overview of reviews on interprofessional collaboration in primary care: effectiveness. *International journal of integrated care*, *21*(2).

33. Chen, Z., Liang, N., Zhang, H., Li, H., Yang, Y., Zong, X., ... & Shi, N. (2023). Harnessing the power of clinical decision support systems: challenges and opportunities. *Open Heart*, *10*(2), e002432.
34. Connor, L., Dean, J., McNett, M., Tydings, D. M., Shrout, A., Gorsuch, P. F., ... & Gallagher-Ford, L. (2023). Evidence-based practice improves patient outcomes and healthcare system return on investment: Findings from a scoping review. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, *20*(1), 6-15.
35. Crawford, C. L., Rondinelli, J., Zuniga, S., Valdez, R. M., Tze-Polo, L., & Titler, M. G. (2023). Barriers and facilitators influencing EBP readiness: Building organizational and nurse capacity. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, *20*(1), 27-36.
36. Da Mota Gomes, M., & Nardi, A. E. (2024). Integrating Neuroscience and Humanities in Healthcare Evolution: A Multidisciplinary Perspective. *Rev. Bras. Neurol*, *60*(1), 25-28.
37. Damarell, R. A., Morgan, D. D., & Tieman, J. J. (2020). General practitioner strategies for managing patients with multimorbidity: a systematic review and thematic synthesis of qualitative research. *BMC Family Practice*, *21*, 1-23.
38. Didier, A., Dzemaili, S., Perrenoud, B., Campbell, J., Gachoud, D., Serex, M., ... & Maya, Z. S. (2020). Patients' perspectives on interprofessional collaboration between health care professionals during hospitalization: a qualitative systematic review. *JBI Evidence Synthesis*, *18*(6), 1208-1270.
39. Dilles, T., Heczkova, J., Tziaferi, S., Helgesen, A. K., Grøndahl, V. A., Van Rompaey, B., & Jordan, S. (2021). Nurses and pharmaceutical care: interprofessional, evidence-based working to improve patient care and outcomes. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *18*(11), 5973.
40. El-Awaisi, A., Awaisu, A., Aboelbaha, S., Abedini, Z., Johnson, J., & Al-Abdulla, S. A. (2021). Perspectives of healthcare professionals toward interprofessional collaboration in primary care settings in a Middle Eastern Country. *Journal of multidisciplinary healthcare*, 363-379.
41. Elendu, C. (2024). The evolution of ancient healing practices: From shamanism to Hippocratic medicine: A review. *Medicine*, *103*(28), e39005.
42. Engle, R. L., Mohr, D. C., Holmes, S. K., Seibert, M. N., Afable, M., Leyson, J., & Meterko, M. (2021). Evidence-based practice and patient-centered care: doing both well. *Health care management review*, *46*(3), 174-184.
43. Feldman, R., Haleva-Amir, S., Pincus, T., & Ben Ami, N. (2023). Physiotherapists' perceptions of implementing evidence-based practice for patients with low back pain through the Enhanced Transtheoretical Model Intervention: A qualitative study. *Physiotherapy Theory and Practice*, *39*(9), 1952-1963.
44. Fohlin, L., Sedem, M., & Allodi, M. W. (2021, April). Teachers' experiences of facilitators and barriers to implement theme-based cooperative learning in a Swedish context. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 6, p. 663846). Frontiers Media SA.
45. Fu, S., Li, H., Liu, Y., Pirkkalainen, H., & Salo, M. (2020). Social media overload, exhaustion, and use discontinuance: Examining the effects of information overload, system feature overload, and social overload. *Information Processing & Management*, *57*(6), 102307.
46. Gantayet-Mathur, A., Chan, K., & Kalluri, M. (2022). Patient-centered care and interprofessional collaboration in medical resident education: Where we stand and where we need to go. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *9*(1), 1-24.
47. Geese, F., & Schmitt, K. U. (2023, January). Interprofessional collaboration in complex patient care transition: A qualitative multi-perspective analysis. In *Healthcare* (Vol. 11, No. 3, p. 359). MDPI.

48. Gencturk, M., Laleci Erturkmen, G. B., Akpinar, A. E., Pournik, O., Ahmad, B., Arvanitis, T. N., ... & Abizanda, P. (2024). Transforming evidence-based clinical guidelines into implementable clinical decision support services: the CAREPATH study for multimorbidity management. *Frontiers in Medicine*, *11*, 1386689.
49. Goldwater, D., & Wenger, N. K. (2023). Patient-centered care in geriatric cardiology. *Trends in Cardiovascular Medicine*, *33*(1), 13-20.
50. Gonzalo, J. D., Wolpaw, D. R., Cooney, R., Mazotti, L., Reilly, J. B., & Wolpaw, T. (2022). Evolving the systems-based practice competency in graduate medical education to meet patient needs in the 21st-century health care system. *Academic Medicine*, *97*(5), 655-661.
51. Goto, Y., & Miura, H. (2023, May). Evaluation of an advanced care planning training program incorporating online skills in shared decision making: A preintervention and postintervention comparative study. In *Healthcare* (Vol. 11, No. 9, p. 1356). MDPI.
52. Halalau, A., Holmes, B., Rogers-Snyr, A., Donisan, T., Nielsen, E., Cerqueira, T. L., & Guyatt, G. (2021). Evidence-based medicine curricula and barriers for physicians in training: a scoping review. *International journal of medical education*, *12*, 101.
53. Ho, J. T., See, M. T. A., Tan, A. J. Q., Levett-Jones, T., Lau, T. C., Zhou, W., & Liaw, S. Y. (2023). Healthcare professionals' experiences of interprofessional collaboration in patient education: a systematic review. *Patient Education and Counseling*, *116*, 107965.
54. Hou, B., Zhang, H., Ladizhinsky, G., Yang, S., Kuleshov, V., Wang, F., & Yang, Q. (2021). Clinical evidence engine: proof-of-concept for a clinical-domain-agnostic decision support infrastructure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.00621*.
55. Huddart, J. E., Crawford, A. J., Luna-Tapia, A. L., Restrepo, S., & Di Palma, F. (2022). EBP-Colombia and the bioeconomy: Genomics in the service of biodiversity conservation and sustainable development. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *119*(4), e2115641119.
56. Hussaini, N., & Varon, J. (2023). Fostering trust in critical care medicine: A comprehensive analysis of patient-provider relationships. *Critical Care & Shock*, *26*(6).
57. Ibrahim Shire, M., Jun, G. T., & Robinson, S. (2020). Healthcare workers' perspectives on participatory system dynamics modelling and simulation: designing safe and efficient hospital pharmacy dispensing systems together. *Ergonomics*, *63*(8), 1044-1056.
58. Jacobsohn, G. C., Leaf, M., Liao, F., Maru, A. P., Engstrom, C. J., Salwei, M. E., ... & Patterson, B. W. (2022, March). Collaborative design and implementation of a clinical decision support system for automated fall-risk identification and referrals in emergency departments. In *Healthcare* (Vol. 10, No. 1, p. 100598). Elsevier.
59. Janikian, M., & Maragakis, A. (2024). History and Key Concepts of Evidence-Based Practices. In *Evidence-Based Behavioral Health Practices in Pediatric Specialty Settings* (pp. 1-14). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
60. Jing, X., Min, H., Gong, Y., Sittig, D. F., Biondich, P., Robinson, D., ... & Gimbel, R. (2022). A systematic review of ontology-based clinical decision support system rules: usage, management, and interoperability. *medRxiv*, 2022-05.
61. Kalariya, Y., Kumar, A., Ullah, A., Umair, A., Neha, F. N. U., Madhurita, F. N. U., ... & Khatri, M. (2023). Integrative medicine approaches: bridging the gap between conventional and renal complementary therapies. *Cureus*, *15*(9).
62. Kataria, S., & Ravindran, V. (2020). Electronic health records: a critical appraisal of strengths and limitations. *Journal of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh*, *50*(3), 262-268.
63. Khalili, H., Pandey, J., Langlois, S., Park, V., Brown, R., El-Awaisi, A., ... & Breitbach, A. P. (2023). Forward thinking and adaptability to sustain and advance IPECP in healthcare transformation following the COVID-19 pandemic. *Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences and Practice*, *22*(1), 18.

64. Khemai, C., Meijers, J. M., Mujezinovic, I., Bolt, S. R., Pieters, S., Moser, A., ... & Janssen, D. J. (2022). Interprofessional collaboration in palliative dementia care through the eyes of informal caregivers. *Dementia*, *21*(6), 1890-1913.
65. Kilpatrick, K., Paquette, L., Jabbour, M., Tchouaket, E., Fernandez, N., Al Hakim, G., ... & Dubois, C. A. (2020). Systematic review of the characteristics of brief team interventions to clarify roles and improve functioning in healthcare teams. *PLoS One*, *15*(6), e0234416.
66. Kurniasih, D. A. A., Setiawati, E. P., Pradipta, I. S., & Subarnas, A. (2022). Interprofessional collaboration in the breast cancer unit: how do healthcare workers see it?. *BMC Women's Health*, *22*(1), 227.
67. Lai, J., Brettle, A., Zhang, Y., Zhou, C., Li, C., Fu, J., & Wu, Y. (2022). Barriers to implementing evidence-based nursing practice from the hospitals' point of view in China: A regional cross-sectional study. *Nurse Education Today*, *116*, 105436.
68. Law, M., & MacDermid, J. C. (2024). Introduction to evidence-based practice. In *Evidence-based rehabilitation* (pp. 1-14). Routledge.
69. Lehane, E., Curtin, C., & Corrigan, M. (2023). Teaching strategies for shared decision-making within the context of evidence-based healthcare practice: a scoping review. *Patient Education and Counseling*, *109*, 107630.
70. Levine, K. J., Carmody, M., & Silk, K. J. (2020). The influence of organizational culture, climate and commitment on speaking up about medical errors. *Journal of nursing management*, *28*(1), 130-138.
71. Li, K. N. (2024). The Role of the ICE Model in Doctor-Patient Shared Decision Making. *JURNAL KESMAS DAN GIZI (JKG)*, *6*(2), 311-317.
72. Liu, C., Chen, H., Cao, X., Sun, Y., Liu, C. Y., Wu, K., ... & Chiou, W. K. (2022). Effects of mindfulness meditation on doctors' mindfulness, patient safety culture, patient safety competency and adverse event. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *19*(6), 3282.
73. Liu, P. L., Yeo, T. E. D., & Ye, J. F. (2024). Examining the intervening roles of patient-centered care and patient activation in the health impacts of offline healthcare obstacles and online health consultations among deaf and hard-of-hearing patients. *Health Communication*, *39*(11), 2366-2375.
74. Lu, S. C., Brown, R. J., & Michalowski, M. (2021). A clinical decision support system design framework for nursing practice. *ACI Open*, *5*(02), e84-e93.
75. Mapes, M. V., DePergola, P. A., & McGee, W. T. (2020). Patient-centered care and autonomy: shared decision-making in practice and a suggestion for practical application in the critically ill. *Journal of intensive care medicine*, *35*(11), 1352-1355.
76. Marques, M. D. C., Pires, R., Perdigao, M., Sousa, L., Fonseca, C., Pinho, L. G., & Lopes, M. (2021). Patient-centered care for patients with cardiometabolic diseases: An integrative review. *Journal of Personalized Medicine*, *11*(12), 1289.
77. Marren, J. M., & Rosati, R. J. (2024). Evidence-Based Practice Improvement in 10 Years: Challenges and Opportunities, a Business Perspective. *Evidence-Based Practice Improvement: Merging Evidence-Based Practice and Quality Improvement*, 417.
78. Matson-Koffman, D. M., Robinson, S. J., Jakhmola, P., Fochtmann, L. J., Willett, D., Lubin, I. M., ... & Michaels, M. (2023). An integrated process for co-developing and implementing written and computable clinical practice guidelines. *American Journal of Medical Quality*, *38*(5S), S12-S34.
79. McNaughton, S. M., Flood, B., Morgan, C. J., & Saravanakumar, P. (2021). Existing models of interprofessional collaborative practice in primary healthcare: a scoping review. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, *35*(6), 940-952.

80. McNett, M., Masciola, R., Sievert, D., & Tucker, S. (2021). Advancing evidence-based practice through implementation science: Critical contributions of doctor of nursing practice-and doctor of philosophy-prepared nurses. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, *18*(2), 93-101.
81. Medina, L. S., Blackmore, C. C., Applegate, K. E., Alvarado, E., & MacKenzie, S. (2024). Principles of evidence-based imaging. In *Evidence-Based Imaging in Pediatrics: Clinical Decision Support for Optimized Imaging in Pediatric Care* (pp. 1-16). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
82. Megersa, Y., Dechasa, A., Shibru, A., Mideksa, L., & Tura, M. R. (2023). Evidence-based practice utilisation and its associated factors among nurses working at public hospitals in West Shoa zone, central Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ open*, *13*(1), e063651.
83. Melnyk, B. M., Tan, A., Hsieh, A. P., & Gallagher-Ford, L. (2021). Evidence-based practice culture and mentorship predict EBP implementation, nurse job satisfaction, and intent to stay: Support for the ARCC© model. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, *18*(4), 272-281.
84. Milam, A. J., Bonner, T., Burton, B. N., Williams, B., Youssef, M. R., Smith, R. N., ... & Pittet, J. F. (2024). The difficulty implementing evidence-based practice in the perioperative setting. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, *139*(4), 874-880.
85. Moumjid, N., Durand, M. A., Carretier, J., Charuel, E., Daumer, J., Haesebaert, J., ... & Blot, F. (2022). Implementation of shared decision-making and patient-centered care in France: Towards a wider uptake in 2022. *Zeitschrift für Evidenz, Fortbildung und Qualität im Gesundheitswesen*, *171*, 42-48.
86. Movsisyan, A., Rehfuess, E., & Norris, S. L. (2020). When complexity matters: a step-by-step guide to incorporating a complexity perspective in guideline development for public health and health system interventions. *BMC medical research methodology*, *20*, 1-13.
87. Myers, J. S., Lane-Fall, M. B., Perfetti, R. H., Humphrey, K., Sato, L., Shaw, K. N., ... & Tess, A. (2020). Demonstrating the value of postgraduate fellowships for physicians in quality improvement and patient safety. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, *29*(8), 645-654.
88. Naghibi, D., Mohammadzadeh, S., & Azami-Aghdash, S. (2021). Barriers to evidence-based practice in health system: a systematic review. *Evidence Based Care*, *11*(2), 74-82.
89. Neuman, M. D., Kappelman, M. D., Israel, E., Ellenberg, S. S., Girman, C., Robb, J., ... & Trontell, A. (2020). Real-world experiences with generating real-world evidence: Case Studies from PCORI's pragmatic clinical Studies program. *Contemporary Clinical Trials*, *98*, 106171.
90. Nsiah, C., Siakwa, M., & Ninnoni, J. P. (2020). Barriers to practicing patient advocacy in healthcare setting. *Nursing Open*, *7*(2), 650-659.
91. Odeh, Y., Al-Ruzzieh, M., Al Rifai, A., Mustafa, H., & Odeh, M. (2024). Towards digital readiness of evidence-based practice in a regional cancer center using role-based business process and data modeling. *Digital Health*, *10*, 20552076241281193.
92. Olakotan, O. O., & Mohd Yusof, M. (2021). The appropriateness of clinical decision support systems alerts in supporting clinical workflows: a systematic review. *Health Informatics Journal*, *27*(2), 14604582211007536.
93. Ostropolets, A., Zhang, L., & Hripcsak, G. (2020). A scoping review of clinical decision support tools that generate new knowledge to support decision making in real time. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, *27*(12), 1968-1976.
94. Pachankis, J. E., Soulliard, Z. A., Morris, F., & van Dyk, I. S. (2023). A model for adapting evidence-based interventions to be LGBQ-affirmative: Putting minority stress principles and case conceptualization into clinical research and practice. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, *30*(1), 1-17.

95. Paparini, S., Green, J., Papoutsi, C., Murdoch, J., Petticrew, M., Greenhalgh, T., ... & Shaw, S. (2020). Case study research for better evaluations of complex interventions: rationale and challenges. *BMC medicine*, *18*, 1-6.
96. Peltonen, J., Leino-Kilpi, H., Heikkilä, H., Rautava, P., Tuomela, K., Siekkinen, M., ... & Stolt, M. (2020). Instruments measuring interprofessional collaboration in healthcare–a scoping review. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, *34*(2), 147-161.
97. Poveda-Moral, S., Falcó-Pegueroles, A., Ballesteros-Silva, M. P., & Bosch-Alcaraz, A. (2021). Barriers to advance care planning implementation in health care: An umbrella review with implications for evidence-based practice. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, *18*(5), 254-263.
98. Prabhod, K. J. (2023). Integrating Large Language Models for Enhanced Clinical Decision Support Systems in Modern Healthcare. *Journal of Machine Learning for Healthcare Decision Support*, *3*(1), 18-62.
99. Rajan, R., Brennan, L., Bloem, B. R., Dahodwala, N., Gardner, J., Goldman, J. G., ... & Eggers, C. (2020). Integrated care in Parkinson's disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Movement Disorders*, *35*(9), 1509-1531.
100. Ramala Jr, S. R., Chandak, S., Chandak, M. S., & Annareddy, S. (2023). A comprehensive review of breast fibroadenoma: correlating clinical and pathological findings. *Cureus*, *15*(12).
101. Rawlinson, C., Carron, T., Cohidon, C., Arditi, C., Hong, Q. N., Pluye, P., ... & Gilles, I. (2021). An overview of reviews on interprofessional collaboration in primary care: barriers and facilitators. *International Journal of Integrated Care*, *21*(2).
102. Rowe, D. A., Collier-Meek, M. A., Kittelman, A., & Pierce, J. (2021). Ensuring effective implementation of evidence-based practices. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, *53*(6), 396-399.
103. Ruebling, I., Eggenberger, T., Frost, J. S., Gazenfried, E., Greer, A., Khalili, H., ... & Stein, S. M. (2023). Interprofessional collaboration: a public policy healthcare transformation call for action. *Journal of Interprofessional Education & Practice*, *33*, 100675.
104. Samarasekera, D. D., Chong, Y. S., Ban, K., Lau, L. S. T., Gallagher, P. J., Zhi Xiong, C., ... & Lee, S. S. (2024). Transforming healthcare with integrated inter-professional education in a research-driven medical school. *Medical Teacher*, 1-8.
105. Sbaffi, L., Walton, J., Blenkinsopp, J., & Walton, G. (2020). Information overload in emergency medicine physicians: a multisite case study exploring the causes, impact, and solutions in Four North England national health service trusts. *Journal of medical Internet research*, *22*(7), e19126.
106. Scheibel, G. (2024). Addressing barriers to evidence-based practice: Using evidence-based decision making and high-leverage practices to meet student needs. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, *56*(6), 492-501.
107. Schmid, F., Rogan, S., & Glässel, A. (2021). A swiss health care professionals' perspective on the meaning of interprofessional collaboration in health care of people with ms—a focus group study. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *18*(12), 6537.
108. Schot, E., Tummers, L., & Noordegraaf, M. (2020). Working on working together. A systematic review on how healthcare professionals contribute to interprofessional collaboration. *Journal of interprofessional care*, *34*(3), 332-342.
109. Schueller, S. M., & Torous, J. (2020). Scaling evidence-based treatments through digital mental health. *American Psychologist*, *75*(8), 1093.
110. Schuttner, L., Hockett Sherlock, S., Simons, C. E., Johnson, N. L., Wirtz, E., Ralston, J. D., ... & Sayre, G. (2022). My goals are not their goals: barriers and facilitators to delivery

of patient-centered care for patients with multimorbidity. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, *37*(16), 4189-4196.
111. Seaton, J., Jones, A., Johnston, C., & Francis, K. (2021). Allied health professionals' perceptions of interprofessional collaboration in primary health care: an integrative review. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, *35*(2), 217-228.
112. Shah, S., Switzer, S., Shippee, N. D., Wogensen, P., Kosednar, K., Jones, E., ... & Tignanelli, C. J. (2021). Implementation of an anticoagulation practice guideline for COVID-19 via a clinical decision support system in a large academic health system and its evaluation: Observational study. *JMIR Medical Informatics*, *9*(11), e30743.
113. Shanafelt, T., Trockel, M., Rodriguez, A., & Logan, D. (2021). Wellness-centered leadership: equipping health care leaders to cultivate physician well-being and professional fulfillment. *Academic Medicine*, *96*(5), 641-651.
114. Sheeran, N., Jones, L., Pines, R., Jin, B., Pamoso, A., Eigeland, J., & Benedetti, M. (2023). How culture influences patient preferences for patient-centered care with their doctors. *Journal of Communication in Healthcare*, *16*(2), 186-196.
115. Sibbald, S. L., Misra, V., DaSilva, M., & Licskai, C. (2022). A framework to support the progressive implementation of integrated team-based care for the management of COPD: a collective case study. *BMC health services research*, *22*(1), 420.
116. Sibbald, S. L., Misra, V., DaSilva, M., & Licskai, C. (2022). A framework to support the progressive implementation of integrated team-based care for the management of COPD: a collective case study. *BMC health services research*, *22*(1), 420.
117. Siddiqui, S., Zhang, W. W., Platzbecker, K., Douglas, M. J., Rock, L. K., & Eikermann, M. (2021). Ethical, legal, and communication challenges in managing goals-of-care discussions in chronically critically ill patients. *Journal of Critical Care*, *63*, 231-237.
118. Simons, M., Rapport, F., Zurynski, Y., Stoodley, M., Cullis, J., & Davidson, A. S. (2022). Links between evidence-based medicine and shared decision-making in courses for doctors in training: a scoping review. *BMJ open*, *12*(4), e057335.
119. Spaulding, E. M., Marvel, F. A., Jacob, E., Rahman, A., Hansen, B. R., Hanyok, L. A., ... & Han, H. R. (2021). Interprofessional education and collaboration among healthcare students and professionals: a systematic review and call for action. *Journal of interprofessional care*, *35*(4), 612-621.
120. Suganthi, V., & Kalaiselvi, K. (2024). Decision Support System in Healthcare Monitoring. *Artificial Intelligence-Based System Models in Healthcare*, 55-78.
121. Sun, J. (2024). Development of Medical Leadership in Primary Health Care: A Core Skill for General Practitioners. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE)*, *1*(5), 464-470.
122. Tamli, N., & Sain, M. (2023). Exploring Innovative Strategies For Patient-Centered Care In The Nursing Profession. *A Bi-annual South Asian Journal of Research & Innovation*, *10*(1), 19-30.
123. Timmermans, S. (2020). The engaged patient: The relevance of patient–physician communication for twenty-first-century health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *61*(3), 259-273.
124. Tonelli, M. R., & Shapiro, D. (2020). Experiential knowledge in clinical medicine: use and justification. *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*, *41*, 67-82.
125. Treichler, E. B., Rabin, B. A., Cohen, A. N., & Light, G. A. (2021). How shared is shared decision making? Reaching the full potential of patient-clinician collaboration in mental health. *Harvard review of psychiatry*, *29*(5), 361-369.
126. Tucker, S., McNett, M., Mazurek Melnyk, B., Hanrahan, K., Hunter, S. C., Kim, B., ... & Kitson, A. (2021). Implementation science: Application of evidence-based practice models to improve healthcare quality. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, *18*(2), 76-84.

127. Vaseghi, F., Yarmohammadian, M. H., & Raeisi, A. (2022). Interprofessional collaboration competencies in the health system: A systematic review. *Iranian journal of nursing and midwifery research*, *27*(6), 496-504.
128. Wadhwa, A., & Mahant, S. (2022). Humility in medical practice: a qualitative study of peer-nominated excellent clinicians. *BMC medical education*, *22*(1), 88.
129. Wang, D., Liu, C., & Zhang, X. (2020). Do physicians' attitudes towards patient-centered communication promote physicians' intention and behavior of involving patients in medical decisions?. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *17*(17), 6393.
130. Wei, H., Corbett, R. W., Ray, J., & Wei, T. L. (2020). A culture of caring: the essence of healthcare interprofessional collaboration. *Journal of interprofessional care*, *34*(3), 324-331.
131. Wei, H., Corbett, R. W., Ray, J., & Wei, T. L. (2020). A culture of caring: the essence of healthcare interprofessional collaboration. *Journal of interprofessional care*, *34*(3), 324-331.
132. Wei, H., Horns, P., Sears, S. F., Huang, K., Smith, C. M., & Wei, T. L. (2022). A systematic meta-review of systematic reviews about interprofessional collaboration: facilitators, barriers, and outcomes. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, *36*(5), 735-749.
133. Witt Sherman, D., Flowers, M., Rodriguez Alfano, A., Alfonso, F., De Los Santos, M., Evans, H., ... & Walsh, S. (2020, October). An integrative review of interprofessional collaboration in health care: building the case for university support and resources and faculty engagement. In *Healthcare* (Vol. 8, No. 4, p. 418). MDPI.
134. Ye, J. (2023). Patient safety of perioperative medication through the lens of digital health and artificial intelligence. *JMIR Perioperative Medicine*, *6*, e34453.
135. Zegarra-Parodi, R., Baroni, F., Lunghi, C., & Dupuis, D. (2022, December). Historical osteopathic principles and practices in contemporary care: An anthropological perspective to foster evidence-informed and culturally sensitive patient-centered care: A commentary. In *Healthcare* (Vol. 11, No. 1, p. 10). MDPI.
136. Zuqayl, E. M. Y., Agdi, J. Z. Y., Jalal, A. A. M., Moh'd Oriji, A., Ogdi, W. Z. Y., Alharbi, B. N. H., & Zuqayl, A. M. (2024). Nurse Managers Role in Promoting a Positive Work Environment: Scoping Review. *Journal of International Crisis and Risk Communication Research*, *7*(2), 91-109.