

AC Group Releases 2006 Digital Medical Office of the Future Survey

Extensive Evaluation Ranks Top Practice Management, Document Imaging and Electronic Medical/Health Record Applications

A White Paper By:

Mark R. Anderson, CPHIMS, FHIMSS Healthcare IT Futurist AC Group, Inc.

Revised as of Tuesday, June 20, 2006

For more information on the detailed 290+ page report,

Visit the web site at http://www.AC Grouproup.org or

contact Mark R. Anderson

at 281-413-5572 or by email at mra@acgrouproup.org



Agroup

Are You Ready To Embrace Newer Technologies?

AC Group, Inc. (AC Group), formed in 1996, is a healthcare technology advisory and research firm designed to save participants precious time and resources in their technology decision-making. AC Group is one of the leading companies, specializing in the evaluation, selection, and ranking of vendors in the PMS/EMR/EHR healthcare marketplace. For the last three years, AC Group has produced an annual report on the Digital Medical Office and the use of Technology by physicians. This comprehensive report includes detailed reviews of the Mobile Healthcare, Document Imaging, and EMR marketplace. The report also includes the most comprehensive evaluation of vendor EMR functionality to date - more than 5,000 questions. This evaluation decision tool has been used by more than 25,000 physicians since 2002. Additionally, AC Group has conducted more than 100 PMS/EHR searches, selections, and contract negotiations for small physician offices to large IPAs since 2003.

- How do you determine if you are ready to "leap" into the EMR or replace your PMS application?
- Can you always believe what the vendor tells you?
- Where does a group go to find third-party independent evaluations of vendor's functionality, financial viability, customer support, and overall best price?
- How can you determine if there is a quantified return on investment (ROI)?
- How can you leverage the use of an EMR or new PMS to improve reimbursement, improve quantified clinical quality, and reduce malpractice costs?
- Who can you turn to for third-party independent advice?

The answer: AC Group's Physician Technology Evaluations

Our Advisory and Consultative offerings are numerous, and can be customized to your practice's unique priorities. As you will see later on in this document, the pricing is based on the size of the practice and the number of days selected. Unlike other consultants that represent vendors, AC Group is neutral and we never receive compensation based on the vendor selected – we are third-party advisors to your practice. I believe that to thrive in the healthcare market, every physician group should have interaction with independent Healthcare IT futurists who do not represent any companies. Our proposal gives you the opportunity to interact with one of the top healthcare IT analysts and futurists throughout the project. To assist your organization, we have created five options:

Option 1 – Educational Update – For those organizations that are just starting the process of considering newer Technologies or just need a third-party independent review, AC Group can provide your practice organization with an educational update on the "Digital Medical Office" of the future

Option 2 -Technology Briefing and Readiness Review - AC Group can provide your practice with a technology briefing and readiness review. Under this option, Mark Anderson will come to your practice, meet with members of the practice, will present information on technology and software options and will conduct a brief operational review of your practice's readiness.

Option 3 - Contract Negotiations – For those practices that have already made up their mind on which application they would like to purchase and install, AC Group can assist with contract review and negotiations. Probably the most tedious and important step of the entire process is contract negotiations.

Option 4 - Vendor Search/Selection and Contract Negotiations – AC Group can become your advisor on the project. Under this option, one of our experienced consultants will be available for conference calls to discuss which vendors you should consider based on 10 operational considerations.

Option 5 - Operational Assessment, Vendor Search/Selection and Contract Negotiations - AC Group can provide your practice with a comprehensive program to ensure that your practice selects the best system(s). Under this option, an experienced consultant will come to your practice, meet with your practice representatives, present information on technology and software options, conduct an operational review of your practice's readiness, and will assist with the numerous tasks required to select the right system. This option includes all tasks described in Option 4 and, in addition, on-site consulting for operational review and vendor demonstrations.

AC Group, Inc. (AC Group) has released their seventh report on Practice Management System (PMS), Electronic Medical Record (EMR) and Electronic Health Record (EHR) applications today. This year's report provides physicians, MSOs, IPAs, and PHOs with one of the most comprehensive evaluations to date of leading PMS/EMR/EHR applications. According to the author, Mark Anderson, Healthcare IT Futurist, "Physicians and organizations such as DOQ-IT, state QIOs and IPAs are looking for a 3rd party independent evaluation of the various EMR/EHR offerings in the marketplace today. The current pressures in the industry for increased efficiency and better care delivery, coupled with significant advances in technology and applications, have enabled EMRs to take center stage. The challenge with EMRs is that it is very difficult for the average physician practice to effectively evaluate its options."

The survey is an extensive evaluation of functional criteria that can serve as a valuable tool for the vendor selection process. The entire report is over 290 pages long and covers all 6 levels of technology for the physician's office.

Summary Results: To ensure that the application met the real needs of physicians, a detailed study was

conducted by AC Group, Inc., during the Spring of 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 with updates October of 2003, 2004, and 2005. The AC Group technology functionality report is based on 48 months of research and the cumulative results of a 90-page questionnaire distributed to each participating vendor. The EHR survey includes 2,300 functional questions divided into 47 categories, while the PMS survey includes over 1,000 functionality questions divided into 26 categories.



The 47 functional categories included a section on the Institute of Medicine's (IOM) requirements for a computerized patient record (CPR), along with functional questions relating to operational areas including prescriptions, charge capture, dictation, interface with laboratories, physician order entry, decision support and alerts, security, personal health records, reporting and documentation. To assist the physician community, the AC Group report quantifies six specific components necessary to ensure that a physician or a group of physicians have made the right choice. The components include:

- 1. Product Functionality How well a product meets the basic requirements of a comprehensive EHR based on the guidelines of the Institute of Medicine and the detailed comprehensive survey of functionality based on AC Group's 2,300+ EHR functionality survey.
- End-User Satisfaction How well a company performs in relation to "End-User Satisfaction" surveys conducted by independent analyst firms such as AAFP such as KLAS (<u>http://www.healthcomputing.com/</u>) and AC Group, Inc. (www.AC Grouproup.org).

- 3. Company Financial Viability The strength of a company in relationship to their annual revenues, profitability, and percentage of revenues that are placed back into future development.
- 4. Client Base The strength of the company's EHR client base and their ability to understand and meet the needs of their current and future clients.
- 5. Technology The strength of the EHR's use of proven technology that enables a practice to become a digital office of the future.
- Price The total price of the solution should be considered when making a decision not just the price of the software. Practices should determine the "Total Cost of Ownership" (TCO) when evaluating the numerous potential solutions.

Through AC Group's research, we have learned that, while having the appropriate level of functionality is critical, providers require a vendor that will support and continue to develop the product. Therefore, the **2006 report employs a point system based on a combination of the following major sets of criteria: functionality, company size, client base, end-user satisfaction and price.** This point system provides a more comprehensive view of the ability of the end-user to derive benefits from the product. Each set of criteria has been weighted, and each vendor was assigned a "Total Weighted Point Value". Additionally, in the 2006 report, AC Group divided the rankings based on the following product types:

- O EHR Vendors Full EMR capability, with internet-based Personal Health Records, health maintenance tracking, proven interoperability with other EMR vendors, national clinical standard couplers, and clinical decision support with nationally recognized alerts, etc. The application must have interfaces to multiple Practice Management Systems. We further divided this category between large multi-specialty clinics and stand-alone practices.
- O **EMR Vendors** Full charting and Document Imaging Management, along with e-Rx with formulary tracking by healthplans, automated E&M coding and verification, medical necessity checking by CPT and Diagnostic codes, comprehensive orders and results reporting, with integrated workflow routing and tracking. The application must have interfaces to multiple Practice Management Systems.
- O Charting Vendors Ability to simplify the charting requirements, as specified by many of the medical societies and the IOM. Advanced functionality must include orders and results reporting, problem list and e-Rx tracking. The product does NOT have to have advanced nationally recognized alerts and clinical decision support. The application must have interfaces to multiple Practice Management Systems.
- O Document Imaging Management (DIM) Vendors Ability to scan and store paper documents by patient and by sub-folder, along with the ability to electronically receive and file documents that are received either electronically or by fax, including Lab results, transcribed reports, and hospital ADT information. The DIM must have integrated routing and workflow capabilities and interfaces to multiple Practice Management Systems.

- O Community Health Record (CHR) Vendors These vendors may not have a full functioning EMR but provide the interoperability functions of an EMR-Light along with the ability to maintain a community health record via a community clinical and demographic data exchange. Advance functionality includes reporting and tracking of orders, results, e-Rx, allergies, and problem lists, among others. The product should maintain a community master patient index, based on numerous inputs, including hospitals, healthplans, and numerous physician practice management systems. The Community Health Record vendor must also be working with various EMR/EHR vendors, to ensure effective clinical data exchange, following national standards like CCR or other recognized future interoperability standards.
- FQHC In May of 2006, AC Group added a new category for Federally Qualified Health Centers (FCHC) since these centers require more government reporting and clinical oversight.
- O In May of 2005, ACG added also a new category for Integrated PMS and EMR vendors Our research has shown that more than 72% of the selections in 2005 have been for both Practice Management and EMR/EHR applications. Starting in 2005, ACG started tracking those vendors that provide a tightly interfaced or integrated solution.

The AC Group selection methodology provides physicians with a simple methodology that they can use to help reduce the number of choices. According to our research, the number of vendors that state that they sell an ambulatory EHR is currently over 250 – too many for any one physician to consider. Through the use of this methodology, practices can reduce the number of potential choices to the top 5 to 10 EHR/PMS products – based on their specific requirements.

Continuing in 2006, AC Group will be "Validating" vendor application. The purpose of the detailed analysis is to determine which vendors meet the functionality to be considered a "Validated EHR" today and to determine which vendors who, with future development, could have a "Validated EHR" in the next couple of years. Vendor Products that receive a minimum rating of 85% are routinely reviewed for validation by AC Group. Other vendors have excellent charting systems and document imaging systems, but in many cases, do not have the necessary clinical alerts, clinical knowledge based databases, and may not have the Clinical Decision Support (CDS) necessary to improve care and to document improvements in clinical outcomes. They still provide excellent benefits, but should NOT be considered a clinically driven EHR.

The AC Group EMR report is based on 48 months of research and the cumulative results of their 90-page questionnaire, that included a scaled down set of 2,328 functional questions, divided into 47 categories, plus an additional 200 + questions relating to company viability, support, and end-user satisfaction. In May of 2006, over 700 EHR questions were removed because 90% of the vendors stated that they had the functionality. Additionally in May of 2006, we added an additional 250+ questions to help differentiate applications.

The 47 functional categories include sections on the Institute of Medicine's (IOM) requirements for a computerized patient record (CPR), along with functional questions relating to operational areas including prescriptions, charge capture, dictation, interface with laboratories, physician order entry, decision support and alerts, security, Personal Health Records, reporting and documentation. Back in 2005, AC Group added new categories relating to RHIOs, Disease Management, Specialty EMR content, Medical Devices Interfaces, Evidence-based reference content, Practice / Community Portal Capabilities, and Registry Functions. The EMR/EHR evaluation includes a weighted point value for each of the 2,745 questions, based on the following criteria:

- O The current product **doesn't** offer this functionality
- The current product **provides** the functionality for an **additional cost**
- O The current product provides the functionality from a third party
- O A future product enhancement in the next three months will provide the functionality
- O A future product enhancement in the **next six months** will provide the functionality
- O A future product enhancement in the next year will provide the functionality
- O The product **provides** the functionality currently

Functionality Requirements:

What EMR/EHR functionality is required for a practice? The requirements today are far less than what will be required in the near term. New state, regional, and national regulations are being considered. New minimum standards are being discussed at the national level. Healthplans will begin implementing required clinical health status reporting within the next few years. As seen in Southern California and in the Hudson Valley of New York, healthplans are beginning to provide financial incentives to those practices that can track and report clinical outcomes for a specific population. Finally, malpractice carriers are beginning to provide discounts for those providers with a Validated EMR application – or in other words – physicians that do not use EMRs will pay higher for the malpractice rates, starting in 2009/10. Therefore, the functional requirements today should be the functionality requirements of the future. A practice cannot afford to purchase a system today that will not meet the functionality requirements of the future. A study conducted by AC Group on 72 practices that replaced their EMR in the past three years showed that the average cost to the practice (new system costs, retraining, lost productivity, etc) costs the average physician over \$50,000. Therefore when making an EMR/EHR decision, make the right choice – make a choice for the future. AC Group has compiled over 2,328 functional requirements for a strong, comprehensive, Validated EMR/EHR. From AC Group interviews, the majority of the physicians are requesting the following specific functionality:

- O Automated E&M Coding based on clinical documentation
- O Tracking of Vital Signs with minimum and maximum values
- O Best Practice guidelines
- O Clinical Decision Support, based on national guidelines
- O Family Practice, Orthopedic, and Pediatric based clinical knowledge bases
- O e-Rx, with alerts and formulary compliance by patient's specific health plan
- O Integration with lab orders and results
- O Integration with radiology orders, reports and the any new Picture Achieving Communication (PAC) System or viewing of digital films.
- O Physician Dashboards for summary information for each physician, customized to each physician's unique needs
- O Patient Summary screens that summarize patient's clinical condition, including e-Rx, allergies, procedures, hospitalizations, chief complaints, prior visits, allergies, family history, social history, etc.
- O HEDIS guideline reporting.
- O Auto referral tracking

- O Educational materials in multi languages, that is, automatically customized to the patient's specific clinical and social needs
- O Auto interface to hospital and ambulatory dictations
- O Web-Based Personal Health Records (PHRs), so that family can review selected materials that physicians elect to provide electronically
- O Health maintenance recording and tracking for outcomes measurement
- O Integration with document imaging and workflow management
- O Clinical messaging between physicians and the staff
- O Clinical messaging between the physicians and the patient's families for selected activities
- O Recording and tracking of telephone messages
- O Electronic Rx refills
- O Order tracking and alerting if a test result has not been completed within a specific period of time
- O Template-driven clinical charting, to ensure that chart clinical information is complete and interoperable between specialists
- O Access anywhere, at anytime, on any device

Overall, twelve companies, NextGen Healthcare Information Systems, Inc., eClinicalWorks, Medical Communication Systems (mMD.net), Propractia (StreamlineMD), Allscripts Healthcare Solutions, Practice Partner (formally know as PMSI), Misys plc, OmniMD (A Division of Integrated Systems Inc.), A4 Health Systems, Bond Medical, Epic Systems Corporation and GE Healthcare received the highest overall 5-Star rating. Five important caveats to keep in mind as you review the results:

- 1. Literally hundreds of products are identified as EMRs, and while a good faith effort was made to contact as many vendors as possible, many chose not to respond.
- 2. The survey findings are self-reported, that is, they are based on what vendors said about their own products.
- 3. Fourteen vendors were required to participate in face-to-face demonstrations of their product's functionality in order to receive "validation". The validation process tested more than 200 scenarios. A number of the vendors have not been tested as of this report and therefore have an (*) next to their company name.
- 4. A few of the highly visible EMR vendors elected NOT to participate in the survey. Many of these vendors are not willing to document their functionality in writing, while others state that either they do not participate in surveys or they were too busy to participate.
- 5. Starting in May of 2005, AC Group added a "confidence factor" which indicates AC Group's confidence in the vendor's reported rakings. A vendor with a 5-Star confidence level indicates that their product has been tested and we believe that more than 90% of their answers are validated. A vendor with a 3-Star confidence level indicates that the product has been tested at least once and we are confident that over 70% of the responses are validated. A vendor with a 1-Star confidence level indicates that AC Group has NOT been able to evaluate the vendor's claims as of this report.

When evaluating functionality by different methods of input, the AC Group team determined that today's technology allows end-users the same functionality no matter where they are located. In 95% of the cases, the vendor's application functioned the same on the desktop, from remote locations, and from a wireless tablet. Therefore, the EMR evaluation team was able to consolidate Desktop, Remote and Wireless functionality into one rating. The only major difference was the functionality on a PDA device – given that the screen size is limited. Therefore the EMR team created a separate rating for PDA devices. Simply stated, a number of the vendors that were highly ranked for the triad of desktop, remote and wireless, either did not offer a portable device or had one with limited functionality. When their overall performance ranking included low or nil scores for PDA their ranking dropped, precipitously.

The vendors that participated in this year's evaluation or had participated in one of AC Group's prior evaluations include:

- A4 Health Systems
- AcerMed Inc
- AllMeds, Inc.
- Allscripts Healthcare Solutions
- Alteer
- Amazing Charts, Inc.
- Amicore
- Bizmatics Inc
- Bond Technologies, LLC
- Business Computer Applications
- Businet, LLC
- Cerner
- Chartcare, Inc.
- Chartlogic
- Cliniflow (Monarch)
- Clinisolutions Inc.
- Companion Technologies Corporation
- Cyber Records
- Daw Systems, Inc.
- DigiChart
- DocSite
- Dr. I-Net Corporation
- Dr. Notes
- eCast Corporation
- eClinicalWorks
- Emdeon Practice Services
- e-MDS
- Epic Systems Corporation
- GE Healthcare
- gMed
- Greenway Medical Technologies
- Hamilton Assoc
- Henry Schiem
- Holt Systems Inc.
- iMedica, Inc.
- INFOR*MED
- InteGreat Concepts, Inc. (InteGreat)
- Intelligent Medical Systems, Inc.

- JMJ Technologies
- LSS Data Systems
- McKesson Corporation
- MCS-Medical Communication Systems, Inc.
- MDanywhere Technologies Inc.
- MEDCOM Information Systems, Inc.
- MedcomSoft
- Medical Information Systems, Inc.
- Medical Manager software
- Medical Office Online, Inc.
- Medi-EMR
- Medinformatix, Inc
- MediNotes Corporation
- Meditab Software, Inc.
- meridianEMR, Inc.
- Misys Healthcare Systems
- mMD.Net
- Monarch Medical International
- NextGen Healthcare Information Systems, Inc.
- Noteworthy Medical Systems
- OD Professional
- OmniMD (A Division of Integrated Systems Inc.)
- Orion Systems International Inc
- Physician Micro Systems, Inc. (PMSI)
- Practice Partner
- PracticeXpert
- PRAXIS EMR by Infor-Med, Inc.
- Pulse Systems, Inc.
- QuickMed, Inc.
- Scribe Healthcare Technologies
- Smart Doctor
- Spring Medical
- StreamlineMD[™]
- SynaMed, LLC
- Task Technologies
- Visionary Medical
- Vista Care
- Vitalworks

Additionally, with the discussion around Regional Healthcare Information Organizations, AC Group added an additional ranking for the top RHIO products. The companies participating included:

- Healthvision Corporation
- Axolotl
- Kryptiq Corporation

- Med Net Systems
- Wellogic

2006 Functionality Process

In May 2006, AC Group divided our findings into multiple categories, including, Community Health Records, Multi-Specialty Large clinic EHRs, EHRs for medical practices, EMRs for medical practices, Charting Systems, Document Imaging Management (DIM) Systems, and Integrated Medical Office Systems (Practice Management System, EMR, and DIM).

With the trend towards national standards and Pay-for-Performance guidelines, the May 2006 functionality rating included 250 new questions that represented 18% of the point value ranking. The additional 250 questions challenged the vendors in ways that were never tested before. Back in May of 2005, AC Group added an additional 700+ questions designed to better clarify functionality and to measure a product's capabilities of meeting new requirements, including DOQ-IT, Disease Management, Specialty EMR content, Medical Device Interfaces, Evidence-based reference content, Practice / Community Portal Capabilities, and Registry Functions.

The 2006 report represents the ranking of vendor capability, based on the vendor's responses to the questions, the vendor's willingness to place every answer into a binding contract, and the proprietary weighting system that has been developed over the past 5 years. In May of 2006, more than 90 vendors submitted responses to the new survey, 12 vendors did not update their responses since October of 2005, 16 vendors did not update their responses since May of 2005 and 10 vendors have elected not to participate in the surveys any more. Five of these ten companies (50%) have either gone out of business or have scaled back their sales and marketing opportunities in the past two years.

Disclaimer:

Although AC Group receives a small % of their revenues from vendors for speaking, white papers, or market analysis. AC Group does NOT perform any activities and does NOT receive any funding that promotes one vendor over another, helps a vendor win contracts, or helps a vendor win competitive bids over another vendor. AC Group remains independent from all vendors. Additionally, AC Group does NOT install, train, or customize vendor applications. Our belief is that if you work with certain vendors, there is a perception that you might select one vendor over another. In AC Group's case, there is NO financial or operational value to recommend one vendor over another. AC Group has always been and remains independent from all vendors.

Multi-Specialty EHR Functionality Ratings:

To be ranked in the Multi-Specialty EHR category, the vendor must meet a minimum of 90% of the full EHR capability, with internet-based Personal Health Records, health maintenance tracking, proven interoperability with other EMR vendors, national clinical standard couplers, clinical decision support with nationally recognized alerts, etc. The application must have interfaces to multiple Practice Management Systems and demonstrate the ability to provide specialty content in numerous sized practices. The vendors receiving the highest ranking in the 2006 EHR survey for Multi-Specialty clinics are listed below.

Company	City	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Times Tested	Multi Specialty EHR
NextGen Healthcare Information Systems, Inc.	Horsham	PA	www.nextgen.com	May-06	* * * * *	97%
Allscripts Healthcare Solutions	Chicago	IL	www.allscripts.com	May-06	* * * * *	95%
Epic Systems Corporation	Madison	WI	www.epicsystems.com	May-06	* * * * *	95%
eClinicalWorks	Westborough	MA	www.eclinicalworks.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
Practice Partner	Seattle	WA	www.pmsi.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
GE Healthcare	Milwaukee	WI	www.gehealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	91%
Misys plc	Raleigh	NC	www.misyshealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	89%
Cerner	Kansas City	Missouri	www.cerner.com	May-06	* *	86%

EHR Functionality Ratings:

To be ranked in the EHR category, the vendor must meet a minimum of 90% of the full EMR capability, with internet-based Personal Health Records, health maintenance tracking, proven interoperability with other EMR vendors, national clinical standard couplers, clinical decision support with nationally recognized alerts, etc. The application must have interfaces to multiple Practice Management Systems and demonstrate the ability to provide specialty content in one or more specialties. In this category, a vendor may be strong in one or two specialties, but may not meet the needs of a large multi-specialty clinic. The vendors receiving the highest ranking in the 2006 EHR survey were the same companies that rated the highest in Multi-Specialty clinics.

Company	City	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Times Tested	EHR
NextGen Healthcare					* * * * *	070/
Information Systems, Inc.	Horsham	PA	www.nextgen.com	May-06	~ ~ ~ ~ ~	97%
Allscripts Healthcare Solutions	Chicago	IL	www.allscripts.com	May-06	* * * * *	95%
Epic Systems Corporation	Madison	WI	www.epicsystems.com	May-06	* * * * *	95%
eClinicalWorks	Westborough	MA	www.eclinicalworks.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
StreamlineMD [™]	Cleveland	ОН	www.StreamlineMD.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
Medical Communication Systems	Old Bridge	NJ	www.medcomsys.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
Practice Partner	Seattle	WA	www.pmsi.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
Bond Technologies, LLC	Tampa	FL	www.bondclinician.com	May-06	* * *	93%
OmniMD (A Division of Integrated Systems Inc.)	Tarrytown	NY	www.omnimd.com	May-06	* *	93%
A4 Health Systems	Cary	NC	www.a4healthsystems.com	May-06	* * *	92%
Misys plc	Raleigh	NC	www.misyshealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	89%
GE Healthcare	Milwaukee	WI	www.gehealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	87%
MedcomSoft	Duluth	GA	www.medcomsoft.com	May-06	* * * * *	86%

EMR Functional Ratings

In many cases, physician practices are not interested in expanded EHR capabilities. Instead, they are evaluating vendors with strong EMR capability, which may not include all of the national databases as in the EHR applications. The EMR products may not include a full charting system, with automated E&M coding, drug alerts, limited national knowledgebase and clinical decision support, limited formulary compliance, and a summary of patient specific clinical results on one page. Additionally, since the overall purchase price is usually 20% to 40% less, many physicians are satisfied with a Validated EMR Application. The vendors listed in the EHR category would also meet the EMR requirements, but traditionally are more expensive. The top EMR vendors include:

Company	City	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Times Tested	EMR
N	OTE: All of the vendor	s listed in the	EHR category meet the EMR requ	irements.		
SynaMed	Kew Gardens	NY	www.synamed.com	May-06	* * *	88%
AcerMed Inc	Irvine	CA	www.acermed.com	May-06	* * * *	87%
Cerner	Kansas City	МО	www.cerner.com	May-06	* *	86%
MedcomSoft	Duluth	GA	www.medcomsoft.com	May-06	* * * * *	86%
companion Technologies Corporation	Columbia	SC	www.companiontechnol ogies.com	May-06	* *	79%
iMedica, Inc.	Carrollton	ТΧ	www.imedica.com	May-06	* * *	78%
PULSE Systems INC.	Wichita	KS	www.pulseinc.com	May-06	* *	77%
InteGreat Concepts, Inc. (InteGreat)	Scottsdale	AZ	www.igreat.com	May-06	* * * * *	75%
e-MDs	Austin	ТΧ	www.e-mds.com	May-06	* * * *	72%

Charting System

The majority of the so-called EMR applications are, more accurately, strong charting systems, with complete clinical notes, limited alerts, limited clinical decision support, limited E&M coding methodology, and a limited summary of patient clinical results on a summary page. However, these systems still meet the needs of many physicians. Charting Vendors provide a physician the ability to simplify the charting requirements as specified by many of the medical societies and the IOM. Advanced functionality must include orders and results reporting, problem list and e-Rx tracking. The product does NOT have to have advanced nationally recognized alerts and clinical decision support. The application must have interfaces to multiple Practice Management Systems

Some of these vendors use standardized or customized templates, while others allow more free-format charting. Once again, the EHR and EMR category vendors can also provide all of the needs of a base clinical charting system – but usually at a higher cost.

Company	City	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Confidence Level	EHR Rating
NOTE: /	All of the vendors liste	d in the EH	R and EMR categories meet the Cha	arting requirem	ents.	
AcerMed Inc	Irvine	CA	www.acermed.com	May-06	* * * * *	87%
MedcomSoft	Duluth	GA	www.medcomsoft.com	May-06	* * * * *	86%
Dr. I-Net Corporation	Ft. Lauderdale	FL	www.drinet.com	May-05	* *	80%
iMedica, Inc.	Carrollton	ТХ	www.imedica.com	May-06	* * *	78%
PULSE Systems INC.	Wichita	KS	WWW.PULSEINC.COM	May-06	* *	77%
Companion Technologies Corporation	Columbia	SC	www.companiontechnologies.com	May-06	* *	76%
InteGreat Concepts, Inc. (InteGreat)	Scottsdale	AZ	http://www.igreat.com	May-06	* * * * *	75%
e-MDs	Austin	ТΧ	www.e-mds.com	May-06	* * * * *	72%
meridianEMR, Inc.	Livinston	NJ	www.meridianemr.com	May-06	* * * * *	69%
Medinformatix, Inc	Los Angeles	CA	www.medinformatix.com	May-06	* * * *	68%
MedNet Systems	Webster	MA	www.mednetsystem.com	May-06	* * * *	68%

Last updated: 6/20/2006

DIM Vendors

Many of the EHR vendors provide a comprehensive Document Imaging Management Capability that can be purchased and installed as a stand alone product. For those practices that are NOT ready to leap into a charting system, many might consider a DIM application that allows a practice to scan in their old records, thus making the patient records available electronically. The top DIM Vendors include:

Company	City	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Times Tested	DIM
Allscripts Healthcare Solutions	Chicago	IL	www.allscripts.com	May-06	* * * * *	91%
OmniMD (A Division of Integrated Systems Inc.)	Tarrytown	New York	www.omnimd.com	May-06	* *	91%
DocSite	Winchester	MA	www.docsite.com	May-05	* *	86%
Dr. I-Net Corporation	Ft. Lauderdale	FL	www.drinet.com	May-05	* *	86%
A4 Health Systems	Cary	NC	www.a4healthsystems.com	May-06	* * *	86%
Kryptiq	Hillsboro	OR	www.kryptiq.com	October-05	* * * * *	85%
Holt Systems Inc.	Delray Beach	FL	www.holtsystems.com	May-06	* *	71%

eRX Vendors – Stand Alone

Electronic prescribing (eRx) holds promise for simplifying the prescription process. Many herald it as the perfect entry into electronic medical records (EMR), by using one of these simple eRx programs for a while, an EMR could be less intimidating. Also since it is typically a less expensive option than a full blown EMR, it offers an incremental investment towards a paperless office.

The benefits of an eRx system are mostly obvious, eliminating illegible prescriptions, enhancing communication between provider, patient, payer, and pharmacy, as well as improving work efficiency. However some are less apparent, by using a more advanced program the provider can avoid some very preventable errors such as drug-drug interactions, drug-allergy reactions, dosing errors and therapeutic duplication. In pediatrics with weight based dosing needed for practically every prescription written this kind of decision support is crucial for reducing errors. Also several programs will provide patient based information that can be given for each medication prescribed. Finally one additional feature that can be added to using eRx is cost information that may not be as readily available to providers in our traditional prescribing methods.

Back in 2000, the healthcare marketplace had more than 30 stand-alone eRX vendors. In 2006, the number of stand alone eRX vendors was reduced to fewer than 5 named companies. The vendors with the best stand-alone eRX functionality include:

- O DAW Systems (ScriptSure), www.dawsystems.com, www.scriptsure.com, www.physicianworkstation.com
- O Dr First Rcopia (<u>www.drfirst.com</u>)
- O iScribe ePresc (<u>www.scribe.com</u>)
- O PocketScript <u>http://www.zixcorp.com/solutions/eprescribing.php</u>
- O NewCorp

Last updated: 6/20/2006

Community Health Records (CHR), LHIOs, and RHIOs - With the movement to community-based clinical systems, which allow interoperability between multiple clinical charting systems, many vendors are developing systems for communities, Local Healthcare Information Organizations (LHIOs), and Regional Healthcare Information Organizations (RHIOs). These vendors may not have a full functioning EMR, but provide the interoperability functions of an EMR-Light, along with the ability to maintain a community health record via a community clinical and demographic data exchange. Advance functionality includes reporting and tracking of orders, results, e-Rx, allergies, and problem lists, among others. The product should maintain a community master patient index based on numerous inputs, including hospitals, healthplans, and numerous physician Practice Management Systems. The Community Health Record vendor must also be working with various EMR/EHR vendors to ensure effective clinical data exchange, following national standards such as CCR or other recognized future interoperability standards. Based on a survey of 1,245 Physicians, EMR-Light applications are preferred 4:1 today, since the product is easier to install and the adoption rate is 80% higher. The advantage of an EMR -Light application is:

- Lower cost of entry (usually 40% of a full EMR application)
- 30-60 day implementation (usually 50% faster)
- Enhanced workflow without major changes in the way the physician practices.
- e-Forms design versus detailed template charting (60% faster than full EMR)
- Operational improvements of 75-80%, instead of EMR 90-95%, but at lower costs, shorter implementation, and less interruption in physician workflow patterns.

Although not marketed as an EMR-Light, many of the EMR vendors could sell their application as an EMR-Light, since an EMR-Light system provides limited clinical notes, e-Prescribing, limited Document Imaging Management, clinical results tracking and messaging, viewing of lab results and dictated reports. This type of system is excellent for those physicians who elect to implement newer technologies in an incremental approach. These systems can help a practice eliminate unnecessary tasks, without changing the way a physician practices. Clinicians can view lab results and dictated reports from any location and can usually implement e-Prescribing, along with medication, chief complaint, allergies, and vital signs tracking.

Finally, with the planned creation of Regional Healthcare Information Organizations (RHIOs), the government is backing those organizations that have the ability to drive clinical adoption within an entire community. The vendor that can provide base-level functionality to an entire community will win, and will have the best opportunity to become the dominate EMR vendor by 2009. To accomplish a community system, vendors must learn how to get multiple physicians from multiple practices to agree to work together to create one-common "Continuity of Care Record" (CCR). How big is the market? By 2009, AC Group estimates that \$1.5B will be spent on Community Health Record (CHR) EMR-Light applications.

Community Health Records (CHR), LHIOs, and RHIOs -

Company	City	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Times Tested	RHIO
Allscripts Healthcare Solutions	Chicago	IL	www.allscripts.com	May-06	* * * * *	99%
GE Healthcare	Milwaukee	WI	www.gehealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	97%
NextGen Healthcare Information Systems, Inc.	Horsham	PA	www.nextgen.com	May-06	* * * * *	96%
Wellogic	Cambridge	MA	www.wellogic.com	May-06	* *	88%
Healthvision Corporation	Irving	ТХ	www.healthvision.com	May-05	* * * * *	84%
Cerner	Kansas City	Missouri	www.cerner.com	May-06	* *	77%
Axoloti	Mountain View	CA	www.axolotl.com	May-05	* * * *	67%
Misys plc	Raleigh	NC	www.misyshealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	65%

Mental Health and FQHC

Since 2002, many of the federally qualified health centers (FQHC) and Mental Health facilities have begun their search for an Electronic Health Record. In numerous cases, many of the EHR vendors do NOT provide the functionality and reporting required for these specialized health centers. To assist these organizations, in May of 2006, AC Group added two new functional areas to their semi-annual report – FQHC and Behavioral Health. AC Group added 200 new questions relating to behavioral health and an additional 50+ questions relating to FQHCs. Based on our overall rating, the following companies provided the best overall functionality.

Company	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Times Tested	Mental Health	FQHC
NextGen Healthcare Information Systems, Inc.	PA	www.nextgen.com	May-06	* * * * *	99%	98%
Allscripts Healthcare Solutions	IL	www.allscripts.com	May-06	* * * * *	96%	97%
Epic Systems Corporation	WI	www.epicsystems.com	May-06	* * * * *	96%	95%
eClinicalWorks	MA	www.eclinicalworks.com	May-06	* * * * *	96%	92%
StreamlineMD [™]	ОН	www.StreamlineMD.com	May-06	* * * * *	96%	NA
Practice Partner	WA	www.practicepartner.com	May-06	* * * * *	95%	94%
Medical Communication Systems	NJ	www.medcomsys.com	May-06	* * * * *	96%	NA
Bond Technologies, LLC	FL	www.bondclinician.com	May-06	* * * * *	NA	94%
OmniMD (A Division of Integrated Systems Inc.)	NY	www.omnimd.com	May-06	* *	92%	92%
A4 Health Systems	NC	www.a4healthsystems.com	May-06	* * *	88%	NA
Misys plc	NC	www.misyshealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	92%	NA
SynaMed	NY	www.synamed.com	May-06	* * * * *	90%	NA
AcerMed Inc	CA	www.acermed.com	May-06	* * * * *		88%
Cerner	MO	www.cerner.com	May-06	* *	82%	NA

Complete Physician Office Automation Ratings: (Integrated)

In the past year, AC Group has observed an increase in the number of practices that are looking for a combined Practice Management System (PMS), Document Imaging Management (DIM), and Electronic Medical/Health Record (EMR/EHR) systems. To assist with this analysis, AC Group now provides separate ranking [0-5] for those vendors that can offer a complete system either via an interface or via a totally integrated product. Many of these vendors have interfaced applications (two separate applications that operate on separate databases) and others have truly integrated applications (a single database for clinical, demographics, scheduling, and billing). To be ranked in the Complete Physician Office Automation category, the vendor must meet a minimum of 90% of the full EMR capability, with internet-based Personal Health Records, health maintenance tracking, proven interoperability with other EMR vendors, national clinical standard couplers, clinical decision support with nationally recognized alerts, etc. The vendors receiving the highest ranking in the **2006 AC Group Complete Physician Office Automation**.

Fully Integrated PMS/DIM/EHR:

Company	City	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Tested	PMS/EHR Rating
NextGen Healthcare				No. 00	* * * * *	000/
Information Systems, Inc.	Horsham	PA	www.nextgen.com	May-06		98%
eClinicalWorks	Westborough	MA	www.eclinicalworks.com	May-06	* * * * *	96%
Allscripts Healthcare Solutions	Chicago	IL	www.allscripts.com	May-06	* * * * *	95%
Practice Partner	Seattle	WA	www.practicepartner.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
Epic Systems Corporation	Verona	WI	www.epicsystems.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
OmniMD (A Division of Integrated Systems Inc.)	Tarrytown	New York	www.omnimd.com	May-06	* *	93%
A4 Health Systems	Cary	NC	www.a4healthsystems.com	May-06	* * *	92%
Misys plc	Raleigh	NC	www.misyshealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	90%
SynaMed	New York	NY	www.synamed.com	May-06	* * * * *	88%
MedcomSoft	Duluth	GA	www.medcomsoft.com	May-06	* * * * *	86%
AcerMed Inc	Irvine	CA	www.acermed.com	May-06	* * * * *	84%

Last updated: 6/20/2006

Interfaced PMS/DIM/EHR:

Company	City	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Tested	PMS/EHR Rating
GE Healthcare	Milwaukee	WI	www.gehealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	87%
StreamlineMD [™]	Cleveland	ОН	www.StreamlineMD.com	May-06	* * * * *	95%
Bond Technologies, LLC	Tampa	FL	www.bondclinician.com	May-06	* * * * *	95%
Medical Communication Systems	Old Bridge	NJ	http://www.medcomsys.com	May-06	* * * * *	95%

Functionality is NOT the only Factor

When evaluating companies, you must also take into account other factors such as, company size, company financial viability, total annual revenues, cash flow, % of revenue relating to EMR, EMR annual development costs, end-user satisfaction, number of employees, number of clients, cost per physician, and the company's ability to meet national, regional, and local standards. To assist, AC Group created a "point value" system that took these factors and others into account. Physicians should consider vendors with strong functionality ratings as well as "point value" ratings. The top EMR/EHR vendors for our 2006 report (sorted alphabetically) include:

Company	City	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Times Tested	EMR	Total Company and EHR Points
A4 Health Systems	Cary	NC	www.a4healthsystems.com	May-06	* * *	92%	5.00
Allscripts Healthcare Solutions	Chicago	IL	www.allscripts.com	May-06	* * * * *	95%	5.00
eClinicalWorks	Westborough	MA	www.eclinicalworks.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%	4.67
Epic Systems Corporation	Verona	WI	www.epicsystems.com	May-06	* * * * *	95%	5.00
GE Healthcare	Milwaukee	WI	www.gehealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	87%	4.67
Medical Communication Systems	Old Bridge	NJ	www.medcomsys.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%	5.00
MedcomSoft	Duluth	GA	www.medcomsoft.com	May-06	* * * * *	86%	4.67
Misys plc	Raleigh	NC	www.misyshealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	89%	4.67
NextGen Healthcare Information Systems, Inc.	Horsham	PA	www.nextgen.com	May-06	* * * * *	97%	5.00
OmniMD (A Division of Integrated Systems Inc.)	Tarrytown	New York	www.omnimd.com	May-06	* *	93%	4.33
Practice Partner	Seattle	WA	www.practicepartner.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%	5.00
StreamlineMD [™]	Cleveland	ОН	www.StreamlineMD.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%	5.00

Non-Participating Vendors:

Each year, a few of the vendors elect NOT to participate in our EMR/EHR functionality survey. However, just because they do not participate, does NOT mean that these vendors should be eliminated from your consideration. It just means that we do not have current data on any of these vendors. A number of these companies did not rank in our top 10 and, therefore, the vendor would out submit their updated data. In other cases, the vendor did not want their ranking known by their competitors. Of course, this means that physicians will not know the gaps in the product, and thus creates a risk when contracting with some of these vendors. However, a few of the vendors have good functionality but, because of timing, elected not to participate or have elected NOT to have their numbers posted. Non-participating vendors in the October 2005 report include:

Alteer

digiChart

Medinotes

Chartlogic

Dr. Notes

- - Orion

- Soap ware
- Greenway Medical

Amicore

JMJ Technologies Medical Office Online

To AC Group, this creates a risk, since the vendors will not tell us what new functionality they have added - this does not eliminate a vendor, but a practice should request every company to complete the survey in order to clearly document what the vendor's product can provide. Additionally, the responses are incorporated in AC Group negotiated contracts. If a vendor will not complete the semi-annual AC Group survey, then their functionality cannot be included in the contract and the vendor cannot be held responsible for functionality gaps.

Other Vendors:

There are a number of vendors that have never participated in any of the prior 5 surveys. These vendors are recognized in the industry as strong specialty practice EMRs, but for whatever reason, they have elected NOT to participate. Some of these vendors include ECI Splus by GEMMS, VA's Vista Care System, and IMPAC Medical Systems.

Size Does Matter:

Rating vendors only on functionality is not always helpful since certain vendors only sell their products to specific market demographics. For example, of the 60 vendor applications evaluated, 12 sell to smaller physician offices with 1-4 physicians, and only 10 sell to practices with more than 100 physicians. To help physicians understand which vendors are best for them, AC Group has attempted to divide the marketplace, based on practice size. Additionally, practices should require the vendors to provide them with references from practices of similar size and similar specialty. However, just because a vendor does NOT have similar sized references does not necessarily mean that the vendor cannot, technically, meet your requirements. It may however mean that your practice size or specialty is new to the vendor. In those cases, we recommend negotiating a lower overall product price.

Large Practices (> 100 Physicians) - For larger practices, with over 100 physicians, the top applications are from NextGen Healthcare Systems, Allscripts Healthcare Solutions, Misys, and Epic Systems. Allscripts is the 2004 TEPR award winner for large EMR Applications, and NextGen was the TEPR award winner in 2001-04 and the MS-HUG award winner in 2003-05. NextGen, Allscripts, GE Healthcare and Epic Systems received the highest overall point ranking, once you consider company size, client base, end-user satisfaction, and price. Given the recent trends towards community systems, Regional Health Information Organizations, and Pay-for-Performance, larger practices should look at the following vendors.

Company	City	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Confidence Level	Multi Specialty EHR	EHR
NextGen Healthcare Information Systems, Inc.	Horsham	PA	www.nextgen.com	May-06	* * * * *	99%	97%
Allscripts Healthcare Solutions	Chicago	IL	www.allscripts.com	May-06	* * * * *	95%	95%
Epic Systems Corporation	Madison	WI	www.epicsystems.co m	May-06	* * * * *	95%	95%
GE Healthcare	Milwaukee	WI	www.gehealthcare.co m	October- 05	* * * * *	91%	87%
Misys plc	Raleigh	NC	www.misyshealthcare .com	May-06	* * * * *	88%	89%
InteGreat Concepts, Inc. (InteGreat)	Scottsdale	AZ	www.igreat.com	May-06	* * * * *	87%	87%
Cerner	Kansas City	МО	www.cerner.com	May-06	* *	83%	86%

Mid Size Practices (20 to 99 Physicians)

For larger practices, with between 20 and 99 physicians, the top applications are from NextGen Healthcare Information Systems, Inc., eClinicalWorks, Allscripts Healthcare Solutions, OmniMD, and Misys plc. NextGen, Allscripts, Practice Partner, GE Healthcare and eClinicalWorks received the highest overall point ranking, once you consider company size, client base, end-user satisfaction, and price.

Company	City	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Confidence Level	EMR Rating
NextGen Healthcare Information Systems, Inc.	Horsham	PA	www.nextgen.com	May-06	* * * * *	97%
Allscripts Healthcare Solutions	Chicago	IL	www.allscripts.com	May-06	* * * * *	95%
eClinicalWorks	Westborough	MA	www.eclinicalworks.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
Practice Partner	Seattle	WA	www.pmsi.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
* OmniMD (A Division of Integrated Systems Inc.)	Tarrytown	NY	www.omnimd.com	May-06	* *	93%
Misys plc	Raleigh	NC	www.misyshealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	89%
MedcomSoft	Duluth	GA	www.medcomsoft.com	May-06	* * * * *	87%
GE Healthcare	Milwaukee	WI	www.gehealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	87%
* Dr. I-Net Corporation	Ft. Lauderdale	FL	www.drinet.com	May-05	* *	80%
iMedica, Inc.	Carrollton	ТΧ	www.imedica.com	May-06	* * *	78%
* PULSE Systems INC.	Wichita	KS	www.pulseinc.com	May-06	* *	77%
InteGreat Concepts, Inc. (InteGreat)	Scottsdale	AZ	www.igreat.com	May-06	* * * * *	75%

Small Group Practices (6 to 19 Physicians)

For smaller group practices, with between 6 and 19 physicians, the top applications are from NextGen Healthcare Information Systems, Inc., Medical Communication Systems, StreamlineMD, eClinicalWorks, Bond Technologies, LLC, Practice Partner, and Allscripts Healthcare Solutions. These vendors have the highest overall company and total ratings.

Company	City	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Confidence Level	EMR Rating
NextGen Healthcare Information Systems, Inc.	Horsham	PA	www.nextgen.com	May-06	* * * * *	97%
Allscripts Healthcare Solutions	Chicago	IL	www.allscripts.com	May-06	* * * * *	95%
Medical Communication Systems	Old Bridge	NJ	www.medcomsys.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
<i>Streamline</i> MD [™]	Cleveland	ОН	www.StreamlineMD.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
eClinicalWorks	Westborough	MA	www.eclinicalworks.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
Practice Partner	Seattle	WA	www.pmsi.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
Bond Technologies, LLC	Tampa	FL	www.bondclinician.com	May-06	* * * * *	93%
* OmniMD (A Division of Integrated Systems Inc.)	Tarrytown	NY	www.omnimd.com May-06		* *	93%
Misys plc	Raleigh	NC	www.misyshealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	89%
AcerMed Inc	Irvine	CA	www.acermed.com	May-06 * * * * *		87%
GE Healthcare	Milwaukee	WI	www.gehealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	87%
MedcomSoft	Duluth	GA	www.medcomsoft.com	May-06	* * * * *	86%
Infor-Med Corporation (Praxis EMR)	Woodland Hills	CA	www.praxisemr.com May-06 * * *		* * *	84%
* Dr. I-Net Corporation	Ft. Lauderdale	FL	www.drinet.com May-05 * *		80%	
IMedica, Inc.	Carrollton	ТΧ	www.imedica.com May-06 * * *		78%	
* PULSE Systems INC.	Wichita	KS	www.pulseinc.com	May-06	* *	75%

• 5 – Star Confidence/Testing level based on testing (5 = Highly Tested, 1 = Not Tested)

• Medical Communication Systems, StreamlineMD, eClinicalWorks, and Practice Partner are all finalist in the 2006 TEPR awards.

Small Practices - (1 – 5 Physicians)

For smaller practices, with less than 6 physicians, the top applications are still NextGen Healthcare Systems, Medical Communication Systems, StreamlineMD, eClinicalWorks, Practice Partner, Misys plc, A4 Health Systems, and Bond Technologies. However, many practices cannot afford the cost of the high-end EMR/EHR vendors. These vendors have the highest overall company and total ratings for small practices:

Company	City	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Confidence Level	EMR Rating
Medical Communication Systems	Old Bridge	NJ	www.medcomsys.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
StreamlineMD [™]	Cleveland	ОН	www.StreamlineMD.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
eClinicalWorks	Westborough	MA	www.eclinicalworks.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
Practice Partner	Seattle	WA	www.pmsi.com	May-06	* * * * *	94%
Bond Technologies, LLC	Tampa	Florida	www.bondclinician.com	May-06	* * * * *	93%
A4 Health Systems	Cary	NC	www.a4healthsystems.com	May-06	* * *	92%
Misys plc	Raleigh	NC	www.misyshealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	89%
SynaMed	Kew Gardens	NY	www.synamed.com	May-06	* * * * *	88%
MedcomSoft	Duluth	GA	www.medcomsoft.com	May-06	* * * * *	87%
AcerMed Inc	Irvine	СА	www.acermed.com	May-06	* * * * *	87%
GE Healthcare	Milwaukee	WI	www.gehealthcare.com	May-06	* * * * *	87%
Infor-Med Corporation (Praxis EMR)	Woodland Hills	CA	www.praxisemr.com	May-06	* * *	84%

• 5 – Star Confidence/Testing level based on testing (5 = Highly Tested, 1 = Not Tested)

- Medical Communication Systems, StreamlineMD, eClinicalWorks, and Practice Partner are all finalist in the 2006 TEPR awards for small physician offices.
- Other companies like NextGen and Allscripts also sell to the small physician marketplace, but many physicians cannot afford the cost of the system. When considering an EHR for the small practice, specialty physicians should also consider applications like:
- OB/GYN NextGen, Greenway and Digichart
- Pediatrics- NextGen, JMJ,
- Cardiology NextGen, GEMS

- GI gMED
- Ophthalmology NextGen
- Orthopedics NextGen, Stryker

Last updated: 6/20/2006

Many practices are concerned with cost and their ability to quantify real return on investments. More than 32% of physician buyers are selecting vendors with lower functionality rating, partly because the price is much lower. Will these lower cost solutions meet the physician's needs in the future? Probably not, but for the next 2-3 years, these lower cost alternatives can improve internal operations, for a lower cost of entry. To assist the physician community, AC Group has created a ratio of initial cost-to-functionality rating where the lower ratio indicates the best cost-to-functionality rating. The following vendors have the best cost-to-functionality ratio. However, many of these vendors are NOT yet Validated EMR/EHR vendors.

Company	City	State	Web Site	Last Updated	Tested Level	EHR	Cost-to- functionality ratio	
*Amazing Charts, Inc.	Hope Valley	RI	www.AmazingCharts.com	May 2006	* *		\$ 19.00	
Spring Medical	Spring	ТХ	www.springmedical.com	May 2006	* * *		\$ 32.25	
iGreat	Scottsdale	AZ	www.igreat.com	May 2006	* * * * *	Yes	\$ 49.96	
MedcomSoft	Duluth	GA	www.medcomsoft.com	May-06	* * * * *		\$ 54.34	
PRAXIS EMR by Infor-Med, Inc.	Woodland Hills	CA	www.praxisemr.com	May 2006	* * *	Yes	\$ 56.92	
e-MDS	Cedar Park	ТХ	www.e-mds.com	May 2006	* * *	Yes	\$ 58.21	

Conclusion:

Technology is only a tool and, if used effectively, can improve the flow of information and, potentially, improve the efficiency of the physician's practice. However, in reality, if "change" is not embraced, the probability of success is very low. We learned in the 1980's that we needed to change the process of billing for services – or we would not be paid in a timely and effective manner. Therefore, the practice of medicine, from the business point of view, changed. Now, with newer technologies, government regulations, and the right financial incentive, physicians will begin embracing new levels of technology that were not available just 5 years ago. But where does a physician in a small practice turn to learn about the 100's of technology choices? The physician can spend hours searching and evaluating all of the opportunities. Or maybe, in the near future, physicians will be able to look towards leaders within their own medical specialty for guidance and knowledge.

More about the Author:



Mark R. Anderson, FHIMSS, CPHIMS – Healthcare IT Futurist - is one of the nation's premier IT research futurists dedicated to health care. He is one of the leading national speakers on healthcare and physician practices and has spoken at > 350 conferences and meetings since 2000. He has spent the last 34+ years focusing on Healthcare – not just technology questions, but strategic, policy, and organizational considerations. He tracks industry trends, conducts member surveys and case studies, assesses best practices, and performs benchmarking studies.

Besides serving at the CEO of AC Group, Mr. Anderson served as the interim CIO for the Taconic IPA in 2004-05 (a 500 practice, 2,300+ physician IPA located in upper New York). Prior to joining AC Group, Inc. in February of 2000, Mr. Anderson was the worldwide head

and VP of healthcare for META Group, Inc., the Chief Information Officer (CIO) with West Tennessee Healthcare, the Corporate CIO for the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth Health System, the Corporate Internal IT Consultant with the Sisters of Providence (SOP) Hospitals, and the Executive Director for Management Services for Denver Health and Hospitals and Harris County Hospital District.

His experience includes 22+ years working with physician offices, 9 years in the development of physician-based MSOs, 17 years with multi-facility Health Care organizations, 15 years Administrative Executive Team experience, 6 years as a member of the Corporate Executive Team, and 9 years in healthcare turnaround consulting. Mr. Anderson received his BS in Business, is completing his MBA in Health Care Administration, and is a Validated Fellow with HIMSS.

More about AC Group:

AC Group, Inc. (AC Group), formed in 1996, is a healthcare technology advisory and research firm designed to save participants precious time and resources in their technology decision-making. AC Group is one of the leading companies specializing in the evaluation, selection, and ranking of vendors in the PMS/EMR/EHR healthcare marketplace. Twice per year, AC Group publishes a detailed report on vendor PMS/EHR functionality, usability, and company viability. This evaluation decision tool has been used by more than 5,000 physicians since 2002. Additionally, AC Group has conducted more than 100 PMS/EHR searches, selections, and contract negotiations since 2003, ranging from small physician offices to large IPAs.

More than 500 healthcare organizations worldwide have approached their most critical IT challenges with the help of trusted advisors from AC Group. Since 1972, AC Group advisors have been helping healthcare professionals make better strategic and tactical decisions. This unmatched combination of market research and real-world healthcare assessment gives clients the tools they need to eliminate wasteful technology spending, avoid the inefficiency of trial and error, and discover a superior alternative to "guess" decisions. For our healthcare physician clients, AC Group provides independent advisory and consultative services designed to assist physicians in evaluating and selecting technology to enable the creation of the "The Digital Medical Office of the Future".

118 Lyndsey Drive, Montgomery, TX 77316

F (832) 550-2338

C (281) 413-5572