The Complementary Role Between Nursing and Health Informatics Technician

Turki Omar Al Otaibi[1], Shaher Mesfer Al Qethami[2], Meshal Hassn Al Qurashi[3], Faliha Nasser Daher Albalawi[4], Abdullah mohsen alharthi[5], Sultan Matar Althobaiti[6], Mosa Hassan Alfifi[7], Abdulmajeed Abdullah Atiyan Al-Thaqafi[8], Majdi Mohammed Alosaymi[9]

[1] Nursing specialist, Saudi Arabia
[2] Patient care Technician, Saudi Arabia
[3] Patient care Technician, Saudi Arabia
[4] Nurse technician, King Salman Armed Forces Hospital, Tabuk, Saudi Arabia
[5] Patient care technician, Tail clinic, Saudi Arabia
[6] Health Information Technician, Taif, althobaitisu203@gmail.com
[7] Health Information Technician, Taif, mo.505084@gmail.com
[8] Health Information Technician, Saudi Arabia
[9] Health Information Technician, King salman Medical City in Taif, Alosaymima@ngha.med.sa

Accepted: 15/8/2025 **Published**: 15/10/2025

ABSTRACT
The growing complexity of modern healthcare delivery has necessitated a convergence between clinical expertise and technological proficiency. As healthcare systems worldwide accelerate their adoption of digital infrastructure — most prominently Electronic Health Records (EHRs) — the distinct yet interdependent roles of nursing professionals and health informatics technicians have come to the forefront of health system reform. This study explores the complementary nature of these two roles, arguing that neither can function optimally without the active engagement of the other. Drawing on evidence from resource-limited settings and high-income contexts alike, the article examines how nurse informaticists and health informatics technicians together form the backbone of successful health information technology (HIT) implementation. Key domains of collaboration discussed include EHR deployment, clinical workflow analysis, vendor engagement, training, content development, quality assurance, and post-implementation support. The article underscores the urgent need to institutionalise this complementary relationship, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) where technological resources are scarce but the demand for improved health information systems is rapidly intensifying.

1. INTRODUCTION

Healthcare in the twenty-first century is fundamentally an information-intensive enterprise. From triage decisions in emergency departments to longitudinal chronic disease management, the timely acquisition, processing, and application of patient data determines the quality, safety, and efficiency of care delivery. Electronic Health Records (EHRs) have emerged as one of the most transformative tools in achieving these goals, serving as digital repositories of patient information that support clinical

decision-making, reduce medical errors, improve coordination of care, and enhance health outcomes across diverse populations (Asif & Khan, 2024).

Yet the mere existence of EHR technology does not guarantee its effective utilisation. The history of health information technology is replete with costly implementations that failed to deliver on their promises — not because the technology was inherently flawed, but because the human systems required to operationalise it were misaligned, under-resourced, or poorly coordinated. In this context, two professional groups have assumed a position of extraordinary strategic importance: nursing professionals with specialised informatics training, commonly referred to as nurse informaticists, and health informatics technicians whose technical expertise underpins the infrastructure of digital health systems. The relationship between these two groups is not one of redundancy or hierarchy, but of deep, structural complementarity — each filling gaps that the other cannot, and together forming a partnership that is greater than the sum of its parts.

This study explores the nature of that complementary relationship in detail. It traces the intellectual and professional origins of both roles, identifies the specific domains in which their skills intersect and reinforce one another, and makes the case that institutionalising this collaboration is a prerequisite for sustainable digital health transformation — particularly in LMICs where implementation challenges are amplified by resource constraints, infrastructure limitations, and workforce shortages.

2. Defining the Roles: Nurse Informaticist and Health Informatics Technician

Before exploring the complementary dynamic between these two professions, it is important to establish a clear understanding of what each role entails and how each has evolved over time.

Nursing informatics, as a formal discipline, has been defined by the American Nurses Association (ANA) as the specialty that "integrates nursing science with multiple information management and analytical sciences to identify, define, manage, and communicate data, information, knowledge, and wisdom in nursing practice" (ANA, 2015). This definition captures the fundamentally integrative character of the nurse informaticist's work — it is not purely clinical, nor purely technical, but occupies a sophisticated middle ground where clinical knowledge and information science converge. Staggers and Thompson (2002), in their critical analysis of nursing informatics definitions, emphasised that the discipline's core purpose is to support patients, nurses, and other healthcare providers in decision-making through information structures, processes, and technologies. The nurse informaticist is therefore someone who understands both the language of bedside nursing and the logic of digital systems — a bilingualism that is extraordinarily valuable in healthcare settings undergoing digital transformation.

The health informatics technician, by contrast, is a professional whose expertise is primarily technical. This role typically encompasses the design, installation, configuration, testing, and maintenance of health information systems. Health informatics technicians possess competencies in database management, network infrastructure, software development or configuration, cybersecurity, and the technical standards that govern health data exchange (such as HL7 and FHIR). They are the architects and builders of the digital environment within which clinical work takes place. McGonigle and Mastrian (2024) characterise the informatics

infrastructure that such technicians manage as the "foundation of knowledge" upon which clinical decision-making and patient care are increasingly dependent.

While both roles are essential to the functioning of a modern health information system, they are not interchangeable. The nurse informaticist brings clinical context, patient-centred thinking, and a deep understanding of nursing workflows. The health informatics technician brings systems architecture expertise, programming capability, and the ability to translate complex technical requirements into functional solutions. It is precisely because these competencies are distinct and non-overlapping that the relationship between the two roles is one of complementarity rather than competition.

3. Historical Evolution of the Complementary Relationship

The complementarity between nursing and health informatics did not emerge fully formed. It developed incrementally, shaped by the expanding role of technology in clinical settings and by growing recognition that technical competence alone was insufficient to ensure that health information systems served the actual needs of clinicians and patients.

Weckman and Janzen (2009) noted that the critical nature of early nursing involvement in the introduction of new technologies had long been underappreciated, resulting in implementations that were technically sound but clinically dysfunctional. Systems designed without adequate nursing input frequently failed to reflect actual care workflows, used terminology that was inconsistent with clinical practice, or created data entry burdens that undermined rather than supported nursing efficiency. These failures highlighted a fundamental insight: technology in healthcare is not a purely technical matter. It is a sociotechnical phenomenon, and any attempt to implement it without engaging clinical expertise — particularly nursing expertise, given nurses' central role in direct patient care — is likely to produce suboptimal results.

Concurrently, as the complexity of health information systems grew, it became equally clear that clinical expertise alone was insufficient. Rossi and colleagues (2023) documented the challenges of capturing nursing knowledge in EHRs, noting that many systems failed to represent the nuanced, relational character of nursing assessments and interventions because the technical architecture was designed without adequate understanding of what nursing documentation actually entails. This insight points to a complementary gap on the technical side: health informatics technicians, however skilled in systems design, require the conceptual and clinical input of nurses to build systems that accurately represent nursing practice.

The emergence of nurse informaticists as a distinct professional category was in many respects a direct response to these twin failures. By creating professionals who were fluent in both clinical nursing and health informatics, the healthcare system developed a new kind of bridge-builder — one who could communicate effectively with both technical and clinical stakeholders and translate between the two domains. Sensmeier and Anderson (2020) tracked the expanding impact of nursing informatics across healthcare settings, documenting how nurse informaticists had come to occupy roles that were increasingly central to the planning, execution, and evaluation of HIT initiatives.

4. Complementary Domains of Collaboration

The complementary relationship between nurse informaticists and health informatics technicians manifests across several key functional domains, each of

which is essential to the successful implementation and sustained use of EHR systems.

4.1 Vendor Selection and System Evaluation

The procurement of an EHR system is one of the most consequential decisions a healthcare organisation can make. It involves substantial financial investment, long-term contractual commitments, and profound implications for clinical workflow and patient safety. Rojas and Seckman (2014) documented the important role of nurse informaticists in EHR usability evaluation, arguing that without structured clinical input, organisations risk selecting systems that are technically sophisticated but clinically impractical.

In the complementary framework being described here, the nurse informaticist engages with vendor selection from a clinical and usability perspective — assessing whether proposed systems align with actual nursing workflows, whether documentation interfaces are intuitive for bedside nurses, and whether the system's information architecture supports rather than disrupts the nursing process. The health informatics technician, meanwhile, evaluates the system from a technical standpoint: examining interoperability standards, data security protocols, scalability, and compatibility with existing infrastructure. Asif and Khan (2024) specifically highlighted vendor selection as one of the multifaceted responsibilities of nurse informaticists in LMICs, noting that the clinical-technical partnership is particularly critical in resource-limited environments where the cost of a poor procurement decision can be devastating.

The complementary nature of these evaluative perspectives means that neither role can adequately substitute for the other in the vendor selection process. A technically superior system that clinicians find difficult to use will generate workarounds, documentation errors, and eventual abandonment. Conversely, a system that is highly intuitive from a clinical standpoint but technically fragile — prone to downtime, data breaches, or interoperability failures — creates its own set of risks. Only by combining both perspectives can an organisation make a genuinely informed procurement decision.

4.2 Workflow Analysis and System Configuration

Clinical workflow analysis is perhaps the most vivid illustration of the complementary dynamic between nurse informaticists and health informatics technicians. Rogers and colleagues (2013) used a human factors approach to uncover the informatics needs of nurses in care documentation, finding that nurses' actual documentation practices were often significantly different from the idealised workflows assumed by system designers. These discrepancies — between how care was actually delivered and how it was theorised to be delivered — were a major source of EHR implementation failure.

Nurse informaticists are uniquely positioned to conduct rigorous clinical workflow analysis because they possess both the observational tools of clinical nursing and the analytical frameworks of informatics. They can identify inefficiencies in current paper-based or legacy digital processes, map the informational requirements of clinical workflows, and articulate these requirements in terms that are actionable for system developers and configurers. Schoenbaum and Carroll (2020) described nursing informatics as a key role in defining clinical workflow, increasing efficiency, and improving quality — a characterisation that underlines the centrality of clinical expertise in workflow design.

The health informatics technician translates these workflow requirements into system configurations, custom fields, alert mechanisms, order sets, and decision-

support rules. This translation is not straightforward: it requires not only technical skill but also a genuine understanding of what the clinical requirements mean in practice. A misinterpreted requirement at this stage can produce a system that technically fulfils the specification but fails to support the intended clinical purpose. The ongoing dialogue between nurse informaticist and health informatics technician during the configuration phase is therefore not merely procedurally useful — it is epistemologically essential, ensuring that clinical intent is faithfully represented in technical architecture.

4.3 Content Development

EHR content — the structured data fields, clinical documentation templates, order sets, clinical decision support rules, and patient education materials embedded within the system — is the medium through which nursing knowledge is captured and communicated. Rossi and colleagues (2023) argued compellingly that the quality of nursing knowledge captured in EHRs is directly dependent on the quality of the content frameworks used to structure that knowledge. Poorly designed templates lead to documentation that is voluminous but clinically uninformative; well-designed templates enable concise, meaningful, and actionable nursing records.

Nurse informaticists bring the clinical expertise necessary to determine what content should be captured, in what sequence, at what level of granularity, and using what terminology. They apply frameworks such as standardised nursing terminologies (for example, NANDA-I, NIC, and NOC) to ensure that nursing documentation is both clinically meaningful and amenable to subsequent analysis and research. Verma and Gupta (2017) highlighted the role of nursing informatics in software development for nursing, emphasising that the translation of nursing knowledge into digital form requires a nuanced understanding of both the knowledge itself and the technical medium.

Health informatics technicians operationalise the content frameworks developed through this clinical input, building them into the system's database architecture, user interface, and reporting functions. They ensure that content is coded correctly, linked appropriately to clinical decision-support rules, and structured in ways that support data integrity and downstream analytics. The complementary exchange in content development is iterative: nurse informaticists develop clinical requirements; health informatics technicians translate these into technical specifications; the technical implementations are reviewed by nurse informaticists for clinical accuracy; adjustments are made; and the cycle continues until a satisfactory result is achieved.

4.4 End-User Device Assessment

In resource-limited settings, the question of which devices will be used to access EHR systems is far from trivial. Asif and Khan (2024) identified end-user device assessment as one of the critical responsibilities of nurse informaticists in LMICs, noting that decisions about device type — whether desktop computers, laptops, tablets, or handheld devices — have profound implications for clinical usability and workflow integration. A system that functions beautifully on a large desktop monitor may be cumbersome and error-prone on a small tablet screen, particularly for nurses who are simultaneously managing multiple patients and performing clinical tasks.

Nurse informaticists assess device suitability from a clinical usability perspective, considering factors such as the physical demands of bedside nursing, the types of data that need to be entered or retrieved at the point of care, and the practical constraints of clinical environments. Health informatics technicians assess device suitability from a technical perspective, evaluating processing power, network

connectivity, battery life, device management capabilities, and compatibility with EHR software. Kumar and Mostafa (2019) noted that infrastructure constraints — including unreliable internet connectivity and limited electricity supply — are among the most significant barriers to EHR implementation in LMICs, a context in which the technical expertise of the health informatics technician is indispensable.

The complementary assessment of end-user devices by nurse informaticists and health informatics technicians produces outcomes that neither group could achieve independently, ensuring that device selections are both clinically workable and technically sound.

4.5 Training and Education

The success of any EHR implementation ultimately depends on the ability and willingness of end-users — primarily nurses, physicians, and allied health professionals — to use the system competently and consistently. Training is therefore one of the most strategically important investments in any EHR implementation programme. Greer (2012) identified nursing informatics competencies as having significant implications for safe and effective practice, arguing that inadequate training was a major source of implementation-related errors and inefficiencies.

Nurse informaticists are natural leaders of clinical training programmes for EHR systems. Their clinical credibility enables them to communicate with end-users in terms that resonate with clinical experience. They understand the anxieties and resistance that clinicians often feel toward new technologies, and they can frame EHR training in ways that emphasise clinical relevance rather than technical mechanics. They are also positioned to identify training gaps among specific user groups and tailor educational content accordingly.

Health informatics technicians contribute to training from a different angle, providing technical instruction on system navigation, troubleshooting common technical problems, and explaining the logic of system functions in ways that help users understand why the system behaves as it does. They also design and maintain the technical training environment — sandboxed practice systems, e-learning platforms, and training databases — that enable clinicians to learn without risk to live patient data. Murphy (2011) described the nursing informatics workforce as occupying diverse roles across health information technology implementations, with training and education consistently identified as one of the most impactful domains of nurse informaticist activity.

The complementarity of nurse informaticist and health informatics technician in training delivery produces a comprehensive educational experience that addresses both the clinical rationale for EHR use and the technical mechanics of system operation. Users who receive only clinical training may struggle with technical issues; users who receive only technical training may fail to integrate EHR use meaningfully into their clinical practice. Only the combination of both perspectives fully prepares clinicians for competent EHR use.

4.6 Quality Assurance and Testing

Before any EHR system goes live in a clinical environment, it must be rigorously tested to ensure that it performs as intended and does not introduce new risks to patient safety. Tuteja and Dubey (2012) emphasised the critical importance of testing and quality assurance in the software development lifecycle, noting that defects identified late in implementation are exponentially more costly to correct than those identified during early testing phases.

Health informatics technicians lead the technical aspects of quality assurance, conducting system testing at multiple levels — unit testing of individual functions, integration testing of system components, performance testing under load, and security testing against potential vulnerabilities. These activities require specialised technical knowledge and familiarity with formal testing methodologies.

Nurse informaticists conduct clinical quality assurance, reviewing the system from a clinical perspective to identify scenarios in which technical functions do not support clinical needs, in which clinical decision-support rules are clinically inappropriate, or in which documentation templates fail to capture relevant clinical information. McBride and Tietze (2016) identified patient safety as a core concern of nursing informatics, and clinical quality assurance is one of the primary mechanisms through which nurse informaticists protect patient safety during EHR implementation.

The complementary quality assurance activities of these two professional groups together provide a comprehensive assessment of system readiness that neither group could achieve alone. Technical testing without clinical review may miss safety-critical clinical scenarios; clinical review without technical testing may overlook systemic vulnerabilities that manifest only under specific technical conditions.

4.7 Post-Implementation Support and Stability

The go-live date of an EHR system is not the end of the implementation journey — it is in many respects the beginning of the most demanding phase. Bird (2017) described a day in the life of a nurse informaticist during implementation support, capturing the intensity and breadth of activities that nurse informaticists undertake in the immediate post-go-live period: responding to clinical user queries, identifying workflow disruptions, escalating technical issues, providing real-time coaching, and documenting lessons learned.

Asif and Khan (2024) specifically highlighted post-implementation stability support as one of the multifaceted responsibilities of nurse informaticists in resource-limited settings, noting that the post-go-live period is characterised by high stress, rapid problem-identification, and the need for agile decision-making. In this environment, the complementary partnership between nurse informaticist and health informatics technician is tested most acutely: clinical issues identified by nurse informaticists must be rapidly communicated to health informatics technicians for technical resolution; technical interventions proposed by health informatics technicians must be evaluated by nurse informaticists for clinical implications before implementation.

Boonstra and colleagues (2014), in their systematic literature review of EHR implementation in hospitals, identified post-implementation support as one of the critical success factors distinguishing successful from unsuccessful implementations. Their findings underscore the importance of sustained, structured collaboration between clinical and technical teams throughout the post-go-live period and beyond.

5. Special Considerations in Resource-Limited Settings

The complementary relationship between nurse informaticists and health informatics technicians is important in all healthcare settings, but it assumes particular urgency and complexity in resource-limited environments. Kumar and Mostafa (2019) documented that EHR integration in LMICs faces a distinctive set of challenges, including inadequate infrastructure, limited technical expertise,

insufficient funding, language and cultural barriers, high staff turnover, and inconsistent electricity and internet connectivity. These challenges amplify the importance of strategic collaboration between clinical and technical expertise.

Ali and colleagues (2023), reporting on lessons learned from an EHR system implementation in a resource-limited country, emphasised that successful implementation required careful attention to both technical and clinical dimensions of the implementation challenge. Their findings resonated with those of Asif and Khan (2024), who argued that nurse informaticists in LMICs must develop tailored strategies for EHR implementation that account for the unique constraints of their operating environments, rather than simply adapting approaches developed in high-income country contexts.

In resource-limited settings, the scarcity of specialised expertise means that nurse informaticists and health informatics technicians often must perform roles that in high-income countries would be fulfilled by multiple specialists. This intensification of role demands makes the complementary partnership even more critical: neither professional can afford to operate in isolation when the breadth of implementation challenges exceeds the capacity of any single individual or discipline. Effective collaboration enables the pooling of diverse expertise in ways that multiply the impact of limited human resources.

Furthermore, the cultural and contextual dimensions of EHR implementation in LMICs require that both nurse informaticists and health informatics technicians develop a sophisticated understanding of the local healthcare environment. Nurse informaticists bring insider knowledge of local clinical culture, patient demographics, disease burden, and care delivery models. Health informatics technicians bring knowledge of local technical infrastructure, available vendor ecosystems, and the practical constraints of system deployment in low-resource environments. The intersection of these contextual knowledge bases is essential for generating implementation strategies that are genuinely fit for purpose in LMIC settings.

6. Challenges in Realising the Complementary Partnership

Despite the compelling logic of the complementary relationship between nurse informaticists and health informatics technicians, significant structural and cultural challenges impede its realisation in practice. Understanding these challenges is essential to addressing them effectively.

One of the most pervasive challenges is disciplinary silo thinking. In many healthcare organisations, clinical and technical departments operate largely independently of one another, with limited mechanisms for structured collaboration. Nurse informaticists may find themselves marginalised in technically-dominated implementation projects, while health informatics technicians may struggle to access the clinical knowledge they need to make informed technical decisions. Overcoming silo thinking requires deliberate organisational interventions — structural changes to governance frameworks, investment in interprofessional training, and cultural change initiatives that value collaborative working.

A related challenge is the persistent undervaluation of nursing expertise in health technology initiatives. Despite the ANA's articulation of nursing informatics as a fully-fledged specialty (ANA, 2015), nurse informaticists in many settings continue to be treated as peripheral stakeholders rather than core contributors to digital health transformation. This undervaluation leads to their late or inadequate involvement in implementation projects, with predictably negative consequences.

Weckman and Janzen (2009) identified this pattern of late nursing involvement as a recurring source of implementation failure, arguing that early and sustained nursing engagement is a non-negotiable prerequisite for successful technology introduction.

The shortage of qualified nurse informaticists, particularly in LMICs, represents another significant challenge. Developing the dual competencies of clinical nursing and health informatics requires substantial educational investment, and in many low-resource settings, the pathways for such development are inadequate or entirely absent. Asif and Khan (2024) acknowledged this workforce challenge in their discussion of EHR implementation in LMICs, calling for targeted strategies to develop nurse informatics capacity in these settings. The health informatics technician faces analogous workforce challenges in LMICs, where the availability of technically qualified personnel for health information systems is limited by both educational capacity and the competitive pull of other industries.

7. Strategies for Strengthening the Complementary Partnership

Given the challenges identified above, it is worth considering what specific strategies might be employed to strengthen the complementary partnership between nurse informaticists and health informatics technicians in practice.

At the organisational level, establishing joint governance structures for EHR implementation projects — in which both clinical and technical stakeholders share decision-making authority — is a powerful mechanism for institutionalising collaboration. McBride and Tietze (2016) advocated for interprofessional approaches to nursing informatics that embed clinical and technical expertise within shared structures. Formal role definitions that specify the responsibilities of each professional in collaborative implementation activities reduce ambiguity and create accountability.

At the educational level, investing in cross-disciplinary training programmes that expose nurse informaticists to technical concepts and health informatics technicians to clinical practice can significantly improve mutual understanding and communication. Greer (2012) emphasised the importance of nursing informatics competencies that extend beyond purely clinical knowledge, encompassing an understanding of information systems and technology. Reciprocally, health informatics training programmes that include exposure to clinical environments and healthcare workflows can produce technicians who are better equipped to collaborate effectively with clinical partners.

At the policy level, national digital health strategies in LMICs should explicitly recognise the dual workforce of clinical informaticists and technical informaticists as a strategic priority, and should include provisions for developing both cadres of professionals. Kumar and Mostafa (2019) identified workforce development as one of the most important enabling strategies for EHR integration in LMICs, a finding that aligns with the broader argument made in this article.

8. The Future Landscape

The future of healthcare is one in which the boundary between clinical practice and information technology will become increasingly blurred. Emerging technologies — including artificial intelligence, machine learning, predictive analytics, remote monitoring, and genomic medicine — are creating new informatics challenges that will require even more sophisticated forms of clinical-technical collaboration than those discussed in this article.

In this future landscape, the complementary relationship between nurse informaticists and health informatics technicians will not diminish in importance — it will intensify. As EHR systems evolve from passive documentation repositories to active clinical decision-support platforms, the clinical and technical dimensions of their design and implementation will become ever more tightly intertwined. Nurse informaticists will be called upon to evaluate and govern AI-driven clinical decision-support tools, ensuring that algorithmic recommendations are clinically appropriate, equitable, and safe. Health informatics technicians will be required to implement these tools with technical precision while remaining responsive to the clinical quality concerns raised by their nursing partners.

Sensmeier and Anderson (2020) tracked the expanding impact of nursing informatics across healthcare settings, noting that the discipline was increasingly engaged with strategic health system transformation rather than purely operational implementation. This strategic role places nurse informaticists at the table for the highest-level conversations about digital health policy and investment — conversations in which their partnership with health informatics technicians provides the technical credibility and operational grounding necessary for clinical recommendations to be practically actionable.

9. CONCLUSION

The complementary relationship between nurse informaticists and health informatics technicians is not a luxury or a nicety of well-resourced healthcare systems — it is a structural necessity for any health system seeking to harness the full potential of digital health technologies for patient benefit. The evidence reviewed in this article demonstrates consistently that neither role can achieve optimal results in isolation. Clinical expertise without technical partnership produces systems that are well-intentioned but technically fragile; technical expertise without clinical partnership produces systems that are technically sound but clinically unusable.

Asif and Khan (2024) have made an important contribution to the literature by documenting the multifaceted roles of nurse informaticists in EHR implementation in resource-limited settings, providing a detailed account of the specific activities through which nurse informatics expertise contributes to implementation success. This article has built on that contribution by situating nurse informaticist roles within the broader complementary framework of clinical-technical partnership, arguing that the full realisation of nurse informaticist impact depends on the quality of the collaborative relationship with health informatics technicians.

In an era of accelerating digital transformation — in which the opportunities for improving health outcomes through information technology are greater than ever, but so too are the risks of poorly executed implementation — investing in the complementary partnership between nursing and health informatics expertise is among the most strategically important actions that healthcare organisations, policymakers, and educators can take. The patients who depend on these systems deserve nothing less than the full, coordinated deployment of both the clinical wisdom and the technical expertise that these two professional communities can together provide.

REFERENCES

1. American Nurses Association. *Nursing informatics: Scope and standards of practice.* 2nd ed. Silver Spring, MD, USA: Nursesbooks.org; 2015.
2. Asif KB, Khan H. Role of nurse informaticists in the implementation of Electronic Health Records (EHRs) at resource-limited settings. *Pak J Med Sci.* 2024;40(9):2156–2159. https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.40.9.9686
3. Ali SK, Khan H, Shah J, Nadeem Ahmed K. An electronic health record system implementation in a resource-limited country—lessons learned. *Digit Health.* 2023;9:20552076231203660. https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076231203660
4. Bird P. A day in the life of a nurse informaticist: Implementation support. *J Inform Nurs.* 2017;2(2):27.
5. Boonstra A, Versluis A, Vos JF. Implementing electronic health records in hospitals: a systematic literature review. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2014;14:370. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-14-370
6. Greer H. Nursing informatics competencies: implications for safe and effective practice. [honors thesis] Kalamazoo (MI): Western Michigan University, ScholarWorks at WMU, Lee Honors College; 2012.
7. Kumar M, Mostafa J. Research evidence on strategies enabling integration of electronic health records in the health care systems of low- and middle-income countries: A literature review. *Int J Health Plann Manage.* 2019;34(2). https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.2754
8. McBride S, Tietze M. *Nursing informatics for the advanced practice nurse: Patient safety, quality, outcomes, and interprofessionalism.* New York, NY, USA: Springer Publishing Company; 2016.
9. McGonigle D, Mastrian K. *Nursing informatics and the foundation of knowledge.* Burlington (MA): Jones & Bartlett Learning; 2024.
10. Murphy J. The nursing informatics workforce: who are they and what do they do? *Nurs Econ.* 2011;29(3):150–153.
11. Rogers ML, Sockolow PS, Bowles KH, Hand KE, George J. Use of a human factors approach to uncover informatics needs of nurses in documentation of care. *Int J Med Inform.* 2013;82(11):1068–1074.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2013.08.007
12. Rojas CL, Seckman CA. The informatics nurse specialist role in electronic health record usability evaluation. *Comput Inform Nurs.* 2014;32(5):214–220.
13. https://doi.org/10.1097/cin.0000000000000042
14. Rossi L, Butler S, Coakley A, Flanagan J. Nursing knowledge captured in electronic health records. *Int J Nurs Knowl.* 2023;34(1):72–84.
15. https://doi.org/10.1111/2047-3095.12365
16. Schoenbaum A, Carroll W. Nursing informatics key role in defining clinical workflow, increasing efficiency & improving quality. *HIMSS Resource Center: Informatics.* 2020.
17. Sensmeier J, Anderson C. Tracking the impact of nursing informatics. *Nursing Management (Springhouse).* 2020;51(9):50–53.
https://doi.org/10.1097/01.NUMA.0000694880.86685.c1
18. Staggers N, Thompson CB. The evolution of definitions for nursing informatics: a critical analysis and revised definition. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2002;9(3):255–261. https://doi.org/10.1197/jamia.M0946

19. Tuteja M, Dubey G. A research study on importance of testing and quality assurance in software development life cycle (SDLC) models. *Int J Soft Comput Eng (IJSCE).* 2012;2(3):251–257.
20. Verma MP, Gupta S. Software development for nursing: Role of nursing informatics. *Int J Nurs Educ Res.* 2017;5(2):203–207.
21. Weckman HN, Janzen SK. The critical nature of early nursing involvement for introducing new technologies. *Online J Issues Nurs.* 2009;14(2):1C. https://doi.org/10.3912/OJIN.Vol14No02Man02