## Supplementary File

Authors	Study Characteristics	Facilitators	Barriers
Wolf L, et al. (2012). Hospitals ineligible for federal meaningful use incentives have dismally low rates of adoption of EHR. <sup>4</sup>	<ul> <li>Secondary data analysis, 2009 health IT supplement to the AHA survey.</li> <li>Hospitals reported on 32 clinical functions of an EHR system and extent of implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Emerging payment methods could encourage EHR adoption.</li> <li>"Quality Improvement Organizations" may increase adoption because they provide technical support that many LTC facilities need.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>HITECH incentives only focus on acute care and primary physicians.</li> <li>Expanding the incentives to LTC facilities may be too costly.</li> </ul>
Wang T, et al. (2012). Adoption and utilization of EHR systems by LTC in Texas. <sup>5</sup>	<ul> <li>Survey instrument mailed to all Texas LTC facilities.</li> <li>Data were self-reported rates of adoption.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Anticipating state and federal requirements.</li> <li>Good communication between vendors and LTC facilities.</li> <li>Education and training programs.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Lack of initial investment resources.</li> <li>No technical infrastructure.</li> <li>Not enough time to implement the EHR.</li> <li>Lack of space for the new system.</li> </ul>
Resnick H, et al. (2009). Use of Electronic Information Systems in Nursing Homes: United States. 6	<ul> <li>Secondary data analysis from the National Nursing Home Survey (NNHS).</li> <li>The data reported a wide range in level of adoption.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Error reduction.</li> <li>Quality.</li> <li>Efficiency.</li> <li>Better health outcomes.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Cost.</li> <li>Complex systems (implementation).</li> <li>No standards (external).</li> </ul>
Davidson J. (2009). Electronic Medical Records: what they are and how they will revolutionize the delivery of care. <sup>7</sup>	Summary of articles (non-study) and concepts justifying the creation of the Canadian Health Infoway	<ul> <li>Comprehensive implementation planning.</li> <li>Governmental initiatives.</li> <li>Management and staff support.</li> </ul>	<ul><li>Cost.</li><li>Privacy issues.</li><li>Incorrect vendor.</li></ul>
Hamid F, et al. (2013). Providers Acceptance Factors and	• Survey instrument given to physicians (n=24), nurse practitioners and PAs (n= 20) in acute-care settings.	<ul> <li>EHR satisfaction increases when the users understand the benefits.</li> <li>Supportive</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Cost.</li> <li>Perceived lack of usefulness.</li> <li>Time consuming.</li> </ul>

their Perceived Barriers to Electronic Health Record EHR Adoption. <sup>8</sup>		management.  • Training programs.	
Alexander G, et al. (2009). IT Sophistication and Quality Measures in Nursing Homes. 9	Survey instrument of 210 nursing homes in Missouri.     Two groups of measurements collected: level of IT sophistication and quality measures, as defined by the U.S. Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services.	<ul> <li>Improve clinical decision making.</li> <li>Earlier intervention.</li> <li>Time savings.</li> </ul>	IT sophistication negatively correlated with detection of incontinence (implementation issue?)
Phillips K, et al. (2010). Electronic medical records in long-term care. 10	Systematic literature review.	<ul> <li>Government financial incentives.</li> <li>Reduced errors and adverse drug events.</li> <li>Including users in the design and implementation process.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Adoption costs.</li> <li>Efficiency outcomes were inconsistent.</li> <li>Incongruent cost savings.</li> <li>Lack of interoperability.</li> <li>Fear of changing the facility culture.</li> </ul>
Wilkins M. (2009). Factors influencing acceptance of electronic health records in hospitals. <sup>11</sup>	<ul> <li>Survey instrument to members of the Arkansas Hospital Association.</li> <li>LTC hospitals were cross-tabbed separately from other hospitals.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Training and learning the system increases adoption.</li> <li>Understanding the usefulness of the EHR technology.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Facility size.</li> <li>Lack of change agents or leaders in the facility.</li> <li>Lack of interoperability.</li> <li>Cost.</li> <li>Resistance to change.</li> </ul>
Filipova AA. (2013). Electronic Health Records Use and Barriers and Benefits to Use in Skilled Nursing	<ul> <li>Cross-sectional design.</li> <li>Mail and web survey instruments.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Federal and state government incentives or policy initiatives could offset financial barriers.</li> <li>Aligning organizational strategic plans could also encourage adoption.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Financial barriers like no capital to implement an EHR and the cost of hardware and infrastructure.</li> <li>Organizational barriers.</li> <li>Legal and regulatory</li> </ul>

Facilities. <sup>12</sup>			<ul><li>barriers.</li><li>Technological barriers.</li><li>Network barriers.</li></ul>
Bezboruah KC, et al. (2014). Management attitudes and technology adoption in long-term care facilities. <sup>13</sup>	Exploratory, qualitative case study.	Institutional pressure like anticipated regulations and competition pressures increase EHR adoption.	<ul> <li>Cost of the electronic system and projected upgrades.</li> <li>Leaders perceiving staff's resistance to change.</li> <li>Misunderstanding how EHRs could be useful or not having enough information to choose the right system.</li> </ul>
Cherry B. (2011). Management attitudes and technology adoption in long-term care facilities. 14	Survey instrument to LTC facilities in Texas.	<ul> <li>Fast-growing elder populations mean quality of care in LTC facilities must be addressed with EHRs.</li> <li>A strong implementation plan within the facility that aligns with strategic plans.</li> <li>Initial and follow-up training programs.</li> <li>A perception shift about the benefits of EHR adoption.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Cost and a lack of capital resources.</li> <li>Lack of industry standards.</li> <li>Complicated implementation processes.</li> <li>Lack of technical support.</li> <li>Not enough evidence to support EHR's proposed benefits.</li> </ul>
Grabenbauer L, et al. (2011). Electronic Health Record Adoption - Maybe It's not about the Money: Physician Super-Users, Electronic Health	<ul> <li>Qualitative study conducted to compare two robust EHR solutions.</li> <li>EHR- savvy users from multiple organizations interviewed through focus groups</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Improved communication.</li> <li>Patient data access and sharing.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Cost.</li> <li>Reduced time with patients.</li> <li>Currently EHRs do not impact population health.</li> </ul>

Records and Patient Care. 15			
Cherry B, et al. (2011). Experiences with electronic health records: Early adopters in long-term care facilities. <sup>20</sup>	Semi-structured interviews conducted at 10 LTC sites.     Interviewees consisted of administrators, nurse managers, nurses, certified nurse aides, and other system users.	<ul> <li>Rapid patient record retrieval.</li> <li>Better document consistency, quality, and accuracy.</li> <li>Improvements in employee satisfaction and retention.</li> <li>Better patient assessments, oversight, and order processing.</li> <li>Better time management.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Technology and maintenance problems like downtime or learning the new system.</li> <li>Residents thought providers were more focused on the computers than on them.</li> </ul>
Tabar P. (2013). Why EHRs matter to LTC's future. <sup>23</sup>	• Editorial.	Perceptions are changing in long-term care; EHRs are becoming a cost of doing business.	Most EHRs were built for acute care and LTC facilities had trouble finding a system that met the organization's needs.
Vendor group develops EHR code of conduct. (2013). <sup>24</sup>	Journal bulletin board post.	<ul> <li>Cost reductions.</li> <li>Improve patient outcomes.</li> <li>State programs could help fund a facility's EHR adoption.</li> </ul>	
Yu P, et al. (2013). Unintended adverse consequences of introducing electronic health records in residential aged care homes. <sup>25</sup>	<ul> <li>Qualitative semi- structured interview study of 9 residential aged care homes.</li> <li>User perceptions evaluated.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Continuous training.</li> <li>Open dialogue with vendors.</li> <li>Balancing EHR accuracy with patient care.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Staff resisted the new system because personal perceptions about their age, lack of documentation skills, or other reasons created limitations.</li> <li>Information management became too difficult and documents lacked consistency.</li> <li>Providers complained about spending less time with residents.</li> </ul>

Hamann DJ, et al. (2013). Utilization of Technology by Long-Term Care Providers Comparisons Between For-Profit and Nonprofit Institutions. <sup>26</sup>	Secondary data     analysis of multiple     surveys conducted     by the CDC.	<ul> <li>Nonprofit facilities         were 40% more likely         to adopt EHRs.</li> <li>Nonprofits have more         regulations, so may         need the benefits of         EHRs.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>For-profit facilities lagged behind in EHR adoption rates.</li> <li>Fewer regulations enable for-profit facilities to invest in cost-effective endeavors and avoid the expense of EHR implementation.</li> </ul>
Vest JR, et al. (2013). Changes to the electronic health records market in light of health information technology certification and meaningful use. <sup>27</sup>	<ul> <li>Secondary data analysis of HIMSS data.</li> <li>Hospital referral regions were used to define local markets.</li> <li>Analysis was changes over time.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>More EHR vendors.</li> <li>Trends show electronic record use is on the rise.</li> <li>Meaningful use makes EHRs more prevalent.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Lagging widespread EHR adoption.</li> <li>Misaligned incentives.</li> </ul>
Weaver. (2005). EHR adoption in LTC and the HIM value. 28	<ul> <li>Practice brief (a regular section in the journal).</li> <li>A publication of practice guidelines for managing health information.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Error reduction (quality).</li> <li>Improved efficiency.</li> <li>Consumer (user) perceptions</li> <li>Improved health outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Difficulties transitioning from paper to EHR.         (Implementation .)</li> <li>Training becomes paramount.</li> </ul>
Gruber N, et al. (2010). Embracing change to improve performance: implementation of an electronic health record system. <sup>29</sup>	<ul> <li>Case study of an implementation of an EHR in a facility.</li> <li>Includes cost, staffing, and experience over 2 years.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Strong implementation team.</li> <li>Communicate often and thoroughly.</li> <li>Set goals, tasks, and schedules for the implementation.</li> <li>Reduced errors.</li> <li>Improved documentation.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Minor increases in operating expenses.</li> <li>Training.</li> </ul>
Holup AA, et al. (2014).	Pilot study examining	Rapidly aging populations stresses the	Long-term care EHRs are not as

Going Digital Adoption of Electronic Health Records in Assisted Living Facilities. <sup>30</sup>	associations between structural characteristics and adoption and use of EHR as a process characteristic in assisted living.	need to create interoperable, coordinated EHRs for LTC facilities.	comprehensive as acute care EHRs.
Holup AA, et al. (2013). Facility characteristics associated with the use of electronic health records in residential care facilities. 31	Secondary data     analysis of annual     survey instrument     of the National     Survey of     Residential Care     Facilities.	<ul> <li>Created better health outcomes.</li> <li>Reduced extra costs.</li> <li>Improved delivery and quality.</li> <li>An increasing elder population makes implementing EHRs a necessity.</li> <li>Nonprofits were more likely to utilize EHRs.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>High initial investment means slower adoption in facilities that cannot afford the EHR system, which slows the rate of becoming better integrated with acute care.</li> <li>Facility characteristics determine EHR adoption.</li> </ul>