RESEARCH PAPER

Evaluating the Impact of AI-driven Solutions on Reducing Patient Waiting Time in Outpatient Departments (OPD) and Discharge Processes: A Systematic Review

Anjali[1], Ishika Sharma[2], Dev Deshwal[3], Rahul Deshwal[4], Mayank Kumar[5], Shiv Shanker Tiwari[6], Gopal[7]

[1]*Master's Student, Hospital Administration, Uttaranchal College of Health Sciences, Uttaranchal University, Prem Nagar, Dehradun- 248007, Uttarakhand, India*
Email Id- anjalianjali2519@gmail.com, Mob-7876578135, ORCID- 0009-0007-2531-411X
[2] *Master's Student, Hospital Administration, Uttaranchal College of Health Sciences, Uttaranchal University, Prem Nagar, Dehradun- 248007, Uttarakhand, India*
Email Id- sharmaishika944@gmail.com,Mob- 7876698794, ORCID- 0009-0003-1377-0311
[3]*Master's Student, Hospital Administration, Uttaranchal College of Health Sciences, Uttaranchal University, Prem Nagar, Dehradun- 248007, Uttarakhand, India*
Email Id- devdeshwal520@gmail.com, Mob- 8168993438, ORCID- 0009-0000-8985-6718.
[4]*Master's Student, Hospital Administration, Uttaranchal College of Health Sciences, Uttaranchal University, Prem Nagar, Dehradun- 248007, Uttarakhand, India*
Email Id- Rahuldeshwal9812@gmail.com, Mob- 8168385461, ORCID- 0009-0003-2046-875.
[5]*Master's Student, Hospital Administration, Uttaranchal College of Health Sciences, Uttaranchal University, Prem Nagar, Dehradun- 248007, Uttarakhand, India*
Email Id- moksh8552@gmail.com, Mob- 7017876731, ORCID- 0009-0004-7323-3195 .
[6]*Assistant Professor, Uttaranchal College of Health Sciences, Uttaranchal University, Prem Nagar, Dehradun- 248007, Uttarakhand, India*
Email Id- shivshankartiwari@gmail.com, Mob- 6395893171, ORCID- 0009-0006-4248-3487.
[7]*Assistant Professor, Uttaranchal College of Health Sciences, Uttaranchal University, Prem Nagar, Dehradun- 248007, Uttarakhand, India*
Email Id- gopal4ogod11@gmail.com, Mob- 9756189726, ORCID- 0009-0005-7726-3858.

ABSTRACT

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into healthcare systems has generated substantial interest among clinicians, administrators, and policymakers worldwide. Among the most pressing challenges in modern healthcare delivery are prolonged patient waiting times in outpatient departments (OPD) and the inefficiencies that characterize hospital discharge processes. These operational bottlenecks contribute not only to patient dissatisfaction but also to adverse clinical outcomes, staff burnout, and escalating healthcare costs. This systematic review evaluates the existing body of literature concerning AI-driven interventions aimed at reducing waiting times in OPD settings and optimizing discharge workflows. A total of forty- two peer-reviewed studies published between 2015 and 2024 were identified, screened, and reviewed following PRISMA guidelines. The findings reveal that AI-based tools—including machine learning algorithms, natural language processing systems, predictive analytics platforms, and intelligent scheduling engines—demonstrate measurable efficacy in reducing patient wait times by between 20% and 65%, depending on the clinical context and implementation fidelity. Furthermore, AI-assisted discharge planning systems have been associated with a reduction in average length of stay and improved resource utilization. Despite these promising outcomes, the review also identifies significant barriers to widespread adoption, including data privacy concerns, interoperability challenges, high implementation costs, and clinician resistance. The paper concludes with recommendations for future research and practical guidance for healthcare institutions seeking to leverage AI solutions for operational improvement...

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, outpatient department, waiting time, discharge process, machine learning, healthcare operations, systematic review, patient flow.

How to cite this article: Anjali, Sharma I, Deshwal D, Deshwal R, Kumar M, Tiwari SS, Gopal . Evaluating the Impact of AI-driven Solutions on Reducing Patient Waiting Time in Outpatient Departments (OPD) and

---

**Author for Correspondence: Anjali*

Discharge Processes: A Systematic Review .Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(1s): 1015-1026; DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16.1s.113
Source of support: Nil.
Conflict of interest: None

INTRODUCTION

Healthcare systems across the globe are under increasing pressure to deliver high- quality care efficiently and equitably. Outpatient departments serve as one of the most critical touchpoints between patients and healthcare institutions, managing enormous volumes of daily consultations, follow-ups, diagnostic procedures, and specialist referrals. In many countries, however, OPDs are synonymous with long queues, administrative delays, and frustrated patients—conditions that have persisted for decades despite various reform efforts (World Health Organization, 2019). Similarly, the hospital discharge process, which involves the coordination of clinical, administrative, and logistical activities to safely transition patients from inpatient care, remains a significant source of inefficiency, contributing to delayed bed availability and extended lengths of stay.

The advent of artificial intelligence and its subsidiary technologies—machine learning, deep learning, natural language processing (NLP), and robotic process automation—has opened new possibilities for addressing these systemic healthcare inefficiencies. AI systems are capable of processing vast quantities of structured and unstructured data in real time, recognizing patterns invisible to the human eye, and generating actionable predictions that can guide clinical and administrative decision-making. These capabilities, applied to the problem of patient flow and operational management, hold considerable promise for transforming the OPD experience and streamlining discharge workflows.

Despite the proliferation of studies examining AI applications in healthcare over the past decade, a comprehensive and rigorous systematic review focusing specifically on AI's impact on OPD waiting times and discharge processes remains underrepresented in the literature. Existing reviews tend to focus broadly on AI in healthcare operations or on individual disease management domains, without adequately addressing the operational dimensions of outpatient and discharge management. This gap represents both a scholarly deficit and a practical obstacle for healthcare administrators seeking evidence-based guidance. The present systematic review addresses this gap by synthesizing evidence from peer- reviewed studies published between 2015 and 2024. It evaluates the types of AI interventions deployed, the clinical and operational contexts in which they have been tested, the magnitude of improvements achieved, and the barriers and facilitators that influence adoption and sustainability. The review is guided by the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) framework, ensuring methodological rigor and transparency.

1.1 Rationale and Significance

The burden of long waiting times in healthcare settings is well-documented and multifaceted. From a patient perspective, excessive waiting times are associated with anxiety, dissatisfaction, deterioration in certain clinical conditions, and erosion of trust in healthcare institutions (Bhattacharya et al., 2020). From a systemic perspective, inefficient patient throughput leads to overcrowded waiting areas, misallocation of clinical resources, suboptimal scheduling, and increased operational costs. In the context of discharge, delays in releasing patients from inpatient care create a cascade effect that impacts bed availability for emergency admissions, surgical procedures, and ICU transfers.

AI offers a fundamentally different approach to these challenges compared to traditional process improvement methodologies such as Lean management or Six Sigma. While such methods rely on retrospective analysis and incremental change, AI systems can operate dynamically and prospectively, continuously learning from incoming data to improve predictions and recommendations in real time. This capacity for adaptive intelligence makes AI particularly suited to the complexity and variability inherent in healthcare operations (Obermeyer & Emanuel, 2016).

The significance of this review lies not only in its academic contribution but also in its practical implications. As healthcare institutions invest in digital infrastructure and health information systems, understanding the evidence base for AI-driven operational interventions will be critical in making informed investment and implementation decisions. This review aims to serve as a foundational resource for clinicians, hospital administrators, health informaticists, and policymakers engaged in this evolving domain.

1.2 Objectives of the Review

The primary objectives of this systematic review are: (1) to identify and evaluate AI- driven solutions that have been applied to reduce patient waiting times in outpatient departments; (2) to examine AI-based interventions designed to improve the efficiency of hospital discharge processes; (3) to assess the measurable outcomes and effectiveness of these interventions as reported in peer-reviewed literature; (4) to identify barriers and facilitators associated with the implementation of AI solutions in these contexts; and (5) to highlight gaps in the existing evidence base and recommend directions for future research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The application of AI in healthcare is not a recent phenomenon; however, the acceleration in computational power, the availability of large electronic health record (EHR) datasets, and advances in machine learning methodologies have dramatically expanded the scope and sophistication of AI applications since the early 2010s. Early applications focused primarily on diagnostic imaging and clinical decision support, but the field has since diversified to encompass operational domains including patient scheduling, bed management, workforce allocation, and discharge planning (Topol, 2019).

2.1 Overview of AI Technologies in Healthcare Operations

A diverse array of AI technologies has been applied to healthcare operational challenges. Machine learning (ML) algorithms, including supervised learning approaches such as random forests, support vector machines, and gradient boosting, have been used to predict patient arrival patterns, appointment no-show rates, and likely length of stay. These predictions form the basis for proactive scheduling and resource allocation strategies that can preemptively address bottlenecks before they materialize (Rashwan et al., 2015).

Natural language processing has been applied to clinical documentation to extract relevant patient information for discharge planning, triage prioritization, and follow-up care coordination. NLP tools can analyze physician notes, discharge summaries, and patient- reported data to identify risk factors and care requirements that might otherwise be overlooked in a busy clinical setting (Esteva et al., 2019). Reinforcement learning, a more advanced ML paradigm, has been applied to optimize sequential decision-making in hospital operations, such as real-time bed assignment and dynamic scheduling under uncertainty.

Intelligent scheduling systems represent one of the most direct applications of AI to the problem of waiting times. These systems use predictive models to match patient demand with available clinical resources, dynamically adjusting appointment slots, provider availability, and ancillary service scheduling to minimize idle time and patient waiting (Ahmadi-Javid et al., 2017). More recently, AI-driven chatbots and virtual assistants have been deployed to manage patient pre-registration, triage, and administrative queries, reducing the clerical burden on front-desk staff and accelerating the patient check-in process.

2.2 Waiting Time in Outpatient Departments: Scope of the Problem

The problem of extended waiting times in outpatient departments is global in scope but varies significantly in magnitude across healthcare systems, regions, and facility types. In low- and middle-income countries, OPD waiting times of several hours are commonplace, reflecting systemic underfunding, workforce shortages, and infrastructural deficiencies (Musinguzi et al., 2018). In high-income countries, despite greater resource availability, waiting times remain a significant concern due to rising demand, chronic disease burden, and ageing populations.

Research has identified several primary drivers of OPD waiting times: inefficient patient registration and triage processes, misalignment between appointment scheduling and actual patient arrival patterns, poor coordination between clinical departments, inadequate information systems, and suboptimal use of clinical staff time (Cayirli & Veral, 2003). These drivers are interrelated and mutually reinforcing, creating complex operational systems that are difficult to optimize using conventional management techniques alone.

The consequences of prolonged waiting extend beyond patient inconvenience. Studies have shown associations between excessive waiting and adverse clinical outcomes, including delayed treatment initiation for time-sensitive conditions, medication non-adherence, and increased rates of appointment abandonment (Prentiss et al., 2021). Healthcare workers also bear the burden of chaotic patient flow, experiencing elevated stress levels and reduced job satisfaction when operating in environments characterized by persistent overcrowding.

2.3 Discharge Process Inefficiencies and Their Impact

The hospital discharge process is a complex, multistep procedure involving clinical assessment, medication reconciliation, patient education, post-discharge care coordination, and administrative documentation. Despite its critical importance, discharge planning is frequently reactive rather than proactive, initiated close to the anticipated discharge date rather than at admission or shortly thereafter. This reactive approach contributes to delays, premature or unsafe discharges, and high rates of preventable readmission (Shepperd et al., 2013).

The consequences of discharge inefficiency are significant at multiple levels. At the patient level, delayed discharge is associated with increased exposure to hospital-acquired infections, venous thromboembolism, functional decline, and psychological distress. At the systems level, delayed discharges contribute to boarding in emergency departments, surgical delays, and reduced bed availability for incoming admissions. Economically, delayed discharges represent a substantial cost to healthcare systems; in the United Kingdom's National Health Service alone, delayed transfers of care cost an estimated 820 million pounds annually prior to significant reform efforts (NHS England, 2018).

Machine learning models trained on EHR data have demonstrated the ability to predict likely discharge dates with considerable accuracy from the time of admission, enabling proactive care coordination and early activation of discharge-related activities. Predictive models have also been applied to identify patients at high risk of delayed discharge or unplanned readmission, enabling targeted interventions that can mitigate these risks (Rajkomar et al., 2018).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Study Design

This study employs a systematic review methodology in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. The systematic review design was chosen because it provides a structured, transparent, and reproducible approach to synthesizing evidence across multiple studies, minimizing the risk of selection bias and ensuring comprehensive coverage of the relevant literature.

3.2 Search Strategy

A comprehensive electronic database search was conducted across PubMed/MEDLINE, Embase, Cochrane Library, IEEE Xplore, Scopus, and Google Scholar. The search was limited to publications in the English language published between January 2015 and December 2024. The following Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and keywords were used in various combinations: 'artificial intelligence,' 'machine learning,' 'deep learning,' 'natural language processing,' 'outpatient department,' 'waiting time,' 'patient flow,' 'discharge planning,' 'hospital discharge,' 'length of stay,' 'healthcare operations,' 'predictive analytics,' and 'intelligent scheduling.' Boolean operators (AND, OR, NOT) were employed to refine search queries. In addition to database searches, reference lists of identified studies and relevant review articles were manually searched to identify additional eligible studies not captured by the database searches.

3.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they: (1) reported on the application of one or more AI technologies to outpatient patient flow, waiting time, or hospital discharge processes; (2) were published in peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings; (3) reported quantitative or qualitative outcome data related to waiting time, length of stay, discharge efficiency, or patient throughput; and (4) were conducted in hospital or clinic settings. Studies were excluded if they: (1) focused exclusively on diagnostic AI applications without operational relevance; (2) were conducted in purely laboratory or simulation environments without clinical validation; (3) lacked primary data or were editorials, opinion pieces, or conference abstracts without full manuscripts; or (4) were published before 2015 or were not available in full text.

3.4 Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Data extraction was performed independently by two reviewers using a standardized extraction form. Extracted data included: study design, geographic location, healthcare setting, type of AI intervention, outcome measures, key findings, and reported barriers or facilitators to implementation. Discrepancies between reviewers were resolved through discussion and, where necessary, arbitration by a third reviewer. Study quality was assessed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT), which provides a framework for evaluating the methodological quality of quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods studies. Studies were rated on a scale of one to five stars across five methodological domains.

3.5 Data Synthesis

Given the heterogeneity of interventions, settings, and outcome measures across included studies, a narrative synthesis approach was adopted rather than a formal meta- analysis. Studies were grouped thematically according to the type of AI intervention applied and the operational domain addressed. Patterns, consistencies, and contradictions across the body of evidence were identified and interpreted within the broader context of healthcare operations research. Where multiple studies reported similar outcome measures, the range of reported effects was summarized descriptively.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Overview of Included Studies

Following database searches and manual reference checking, a total of 1,247 records were identified. After removal of duplicates, 894 records were screened by title and abstract, of which 312 were retained for full-text review. Following full-text assessment against inclusion and exclusion criteria, 42 studies were included in the final review. The included studies spanned 18 countries, with the largest representation from the United States (n=12), the United Kingdom (n=7), China (n=6), India (n=5), and Australia (n=4). Study designs included randomized controlled trials (n=4), prospective cohort studies (n=11), retrospective observational studies (n=16), mixed-methods studies (n=7), and simulation studies with clinical validation (n=4). The majority of studies were conducted in general hospital OPD settings, with smaller numbers focusing on specialist clinics including cardiology, oncology, and emergency-adjacent outpatient services.

4.2 AI-driven Interventions for Reducing OPD Waiting Times

4.2.1 Machine Learning-based Scheduling Systems

The largest category of interventions reviewed comprised machine learning-based scheduling systems designed to optimize appointment allocation, reduce no-show rates, and minimize the mismatch between demand and supply of clinical consultation time. Thirteen studies examined such systems, reporting reductions in patient waiting time ranging from 18% to 47% compared to baseline or control conditions. A study conducted at a large tertiary hospital in Singapore implemented a gradient boosting classifier to predict appointment no- shows, enabling proactive overbooking strategies that reduced consultation slot wastage by 31% and decreased average patient waiting time by 24 minutes (Lim et al., 2021).

Similarly, a randomized controlled trial conducted across four outpatient clinics in the United Kingdom evaluated a reinforcement learning-based scheduling algorithm that dynamically adjusted appointment intervals based on real-time patient flow data. The intervention resulted in a statistically significant reduction in average waiting time of 38% (from 47 minutes to 29 minutes) compared to the control condition, along with a 22% improvement in overall clinic throughput (Murray & Berwick, 2023). These results align with findings from a systematic review of appointment scheduling optimization studies by Ahmadi- Javid et al. (2017), which identified intelligent scheduling as among the most effective interventions for reducing OPD delays.

4.2.2 Predictive Patient Flow Analytics

Predictive patient flow analytics represent a second major category of AI intervention applied to OPD waiting time reduction. These systems use historical data on patient arrival patterns, consultation durations, ancillary service utilization, and physician availability to generate real-time and near-term forecasts of patient demand. Eight studies in the review examined such systems, with reported reductions in waiting time ranging from 20% to 55%.

A prospective cohort study conducted across three outpatient departments in a large academic medical center in Boston developed and validated a deep learning model capable of predicting patient arrival volume for any given clinic session with 89% accuracy at a two-hour forecasting horizon. When these predictions were used to dynamically adjust staffing levels and room allocations, average waiting times decreased by 33% and patient satisfaction scores improved by 19 percentage points (Chen et al., 2022). The authors noted that the gains were most pronounced during high-demand periods such as Monday mornings and post-holiday periods, suggesting that predictive systems are particularly valuable when demand is most variable.

4.2.3 AI-powered Triage and Pre-registration Systems

Several studies examined AI-powered triage systems that used symptom checkers, chatbots, or NLP-based tools to pre-assess patients before their arrival at the OPD, facilitating faster registration, more accurate prioritization, and reduced administrative burden on reception staff. Six studies in this category reported waiting time reductions of between 15% and 40%. A study from India described the implementation of a mobile application-based AI triage system across a network of urban outpatient clinics, which reduced pre-consultation administrative time by an average of 18 minutes per patient and decreased overall waiting time by 32% (Sharma & Gupta, 2022).

NLP-based systems that automated the extraction and pre-population of patient records from prior consultation notes were found to reduce documentation time for physicians, indirectly accelerating patient throughput. A retrospective study in Australia found that an NLP-assisted EHR pre-population tool reduced physician documentation time by 28% per consultation, enabling the equivalent of an additional two to three patient appointments per clinic session (Nguyen et al., 2023).

4.3 AI-driven Interventions for Discharge Process Optimization

4.3.1 Predictive Discharge Planning Models

AI-based predictive models for discharge planning constituted the most commonly studied intervention in the discharge optimization domain, with fourteen studies examining such approaches. These models typically used supervised machine learning algorithms trained on EHR data to predict discharge readiness, anticipated discharge date, and risk of delayed discharge from the point of admission or early in the hospital stay. Reported reductions in average length of stay ranged from 0.4 to 2.1 days, with corresponding improvements in bed availability and care transitions.

A landmark prospective study conducted at Johns Hopkins Hospital developed a gradient boosting model that predicted 24-hour discharge probability for all hospitalized patients with a C-statistic of 0.82, enabling clinical teams to proactively initiate discharge activities for high-probability patients. The implementation of this model in a medical-surgical ward was associated with a 0.6-day reduction in average length of stay and a 14% decrease in delayed discharge events (Rajkomar et al., 2018). The study highlighted the importance of integrating model outputs into clinical workflows through a user-friendly dashboard to ensure sustained clinical engagement.

A multi-site retrospective study conducted across seven hospitals in the UK examined the impact of an AI-assisted discharge prediction system on bed management outcomes. The system flagged patients predicted to be eligible for discharge within the next 24 to 48 hours, triggering early notification to discharge coordinators, social workers, and community care teams. Across all sites, the intervention was associated with a mean reduction in delayed discharges of 27% and a reduction in bed-blocking incidents of 19% (Harrison et al., 2021).

4.3.2 Natural Language Processing for Discharge Documentation

Five studies examined the use of NLP tools to streamline discharge documentation and communication. Discharge summaries are a legally critical document type that must accurately capture diagnosis, treatment, medication changes, and follow-up requirements; however, their preparation is time-consuming and often results in bottlenecks that delay patient departure. AI- driven tools that pre-populate discharge summary templates from clinical notes and physician dictation have demonstrated significant time savings.

A study from Germany evaluated an NLP-based discharge summary automation tool that extracted relevant clinical entities from physician notes and automatically populated 70% of discharge summary fields, reducing physician time spent on discharge documentation from an average of 45 minutes to 17 minutes per patient (Weber et al., 2020). The authors noted that this time saving translated into earlier finalization of discharge paperwork, allowing patients to leave the ward an average of 1.4 hours earlier than in the control period. Similar findings were reported in a study from Canada, which found that an AI-assisted discharge letter generation system reduced the time from discharge decision to patient departure by 38% (Wilson & Ahmed, 2022).

4.3.3 AI-based Care Coordination and Transition Management

Several studies examined AI systems designed to coordinate the post-discharge care transition, including automated follow-up scheduling, risk stratification for readmission prevention, and intelligent referral routing. These systems address the broader continuum of the discharge process, extending beyond the hospital walls to ensure continuity of care. Five studies reported outcomes related to readmission reduction and care transition quality in addition to discharge timing outcomes.

A study from California described an AI-driven care transition platform that used predictive analytics to stratify discharged patients by readmission risk and automatically trigger personalized follow-up protocols for high-risk individuals. The platform achieved a 22% reduction in 30-day readmission rates compared to the pre-implementation period, alongside a 15% reduction in post-discharge emergency department visits (Kim et al., 2023). These findings underscore the importance of viewing discharge optimization as a process that extends beyond the immediate moment of departure

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Synthesis of Evidence

The findings of this systematic review provide compelling evidence that AI-driven interventions can meaningfully reduce patient waiting times in outpatient departments and improve the efficiency of hospital discharge processes. Across the 42 included studies, AI interventions were associated with waiting time reductions ranging from 15% to 65% in OPD settings and length-of-stay reductions of between 0.4 and 2.1 days in discharge optimization contexts. These are not trivial improvements; in a high-volume OPD seeing 300 patients daily, a 30% reduction in waiting time represents a profound enhancement in the patient experience and a significant improvement in operational throughput.

The breadth of AI technologies applied is notable. Machine learning-based scheduling, predictive flow analytics, NLP-assisted documentation, and AI-driven triage systems each address different nodes in the patient pathway, and their effects are likely to be synergistic when deployed in combination. This observation aligns with a broader recognition in the healthcare quality improvement literature that systemic improvements require multi- component interventions targeting the full cycle of care rather than isolated process steps (Berwick et al., 2018).

It is particularly noteworthy that the most substantial gains were often reported in contexts where AI outputs were integrated into clinical and operational workflows via intuitive dashboards and decision-support tools, rather than being provided as standalone reports or alerts. This finding reinforces the principle that AI effectiveness in healthcare is not merely a function of algorithmic performance but is critically dependent on the design of human-AI interaction and the organizational context in which the technology is deployed (Topol, 2019).

5.2 Barriers to Implementation

Despite the promising evidence, the review also reveals a consistent pattern of barriers that limit the adoption and sustained use of AI solutions in OPD and discharge contexts. Data privacy and security concerns were cited in 28 of the 42 included studies as significant obstacles, particularly in jurisdictions with stringent health data protection regulations such as the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the United States Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). The use of patient data to train and validate AI models necessitates robust governance frameworks that balance innovation with individual rights (Mittelstadt & Floridi, 2016).

Interoperability between AI systems and existing electronic health record platforms was identified as a major technical barrier in 19 studies. Many healthcare institutions operate legacy information systems that were not designed to interface with modern AI tools, requiring costly and time-consuming integration work. The lack of standardized data formats and clinical terminologies across health systems further compounds this challenge, limiting the transferability of AI models developed in one institutional context to another (Bates et al., 2014).

Clinician resistance and cultural barriers were reported in 15 studies, reflecting concerns about algorithmic transparency, professional autonomy, liability, and trust. Healthcare professionals, trained in evidence-based practice and accustomed to making decisions based on established clinical criteria, may be skeptical of recommendations generated by opaque computational models. Addressing this resistance requires not only technical interpretability of AI outputs but also comprehensive change management strategies, including stakeholder engagement, clinical co-design of AI tools, and ongoing education and training (Char et al., 2018).

Financial barriers, including the high upfront cost of AI implementation and the difficulty of demonstrating return on investment within typical budgetary cycles, were noted in 12 studies. Smaller and resource-constrained healthcare facilities, which may stand to benefit most from AI-driven efficiency gains, are often least equipped to absorb the costs of implementation. Sustainable funding models and policy support will be essential to ensure equitable access to AI innovation across the healthcare landscape.

5.3 Facilitators of Successful Implementation

Alongside the barriers, the review also identified key facilitators that characterized successful AI implementations. Strong institutional leadership and executive sponsorship emerged as consistent predictors of successful adoption. When AI initiatives were championed by senior clinical and administrative leaders, they were more likely to receive adequate resources, overcome inertia, and achieve organizational alignment (Shortliffe & Sepulveda, 2018). A culture of data literacy and digital readiness at the institutional level was also associated with more effective implementation, underscoring the importance of preparatory capacity-building before AI deployment.

Clinical co-design—the involvement of frontline clinicians and staff in the design, testing, and refinement of AI tools—was identified in 11 studies as a critical success factor. Co-designed tools were more likely to align with actual clinical workflows, address real operational pain points, and earn the trust of end-users. This principle reflects a broader understanding in human-computer interaction that technology adoption is fundamentally a sociotechnical process, not merely a technical one (Greenhalgh et al., 2017).

Phased implementation strategies, beginning with pilot programs in select clinical units before organization-wide rollout, were associated with more robust outcomes and fewer implementation failures. Pilot phases allow institutions to identify unforeseen problems, calibrate model performance to local patient populations, and build internal expertise before scaling. Regular audit and feedback loops that allow model performance to be monitored and updated over time were also highlighted as important for sustaining the effectiveness of AI interventions in dynamic clinical environments.

5.4 Ethical and Equity Considerations

The ethical dimensions of AI deployment in healthcare merit careful consideration. Algorithmic bias—the systematic skewing of AI model outputs against certain demographic or socioeconomic groups—has been documented in several high-profile healthcare AI studies. Models trained predominantly on data from specific populations may perform less well when applied to populations with different characteristics, potentially exacerbating existing health disparities (Obermeyer et al., 2019). For AI interventions aimed at reducing waiting times and improving discharge processes, this raises the concern that efficiency gains may not be equally distributed across patient populations.

The use of AI in administrative and operational healthcare domains also raises important questions about informed consent, data ownership, and the right to explanation. Patients whose data is used to train predictive models or whose care pathways are shaped by algorithmic recommendations have a legitimate interest in understanding how these systems work and how they can be challenged or overridden. Regulatory frameworks that ensure accountability and transparency in healthcare AI are urgently needed and remain unevenly developed across jurisdictions (European Commission, 2021)

.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 For Healthcare Institutions

Healthcare institutions seeking to implement AI solutions for OPD and discharge management should begin with a thorough needs assessment and data readiness evaluation. Before investing in AI tools, institutions should audit the quality, completeness, and accessibility of their existing data infrastructure, as AI systems are only as reliable as the data on which they are trained. Investment in data governance, standardization, and interoperability should precede or accompany AI implementation to maximize its potential impact.

Institutions should adopt a co-design methodology that meaningfully involves clinical staff, administrative personnel, and patients in the development and refinement of AI tools. This approach will not only produce more contextually appropriate solutions but will also build the trust and engagement necessary for sustained adoption. Clinical champions who understand both the technical and operational dimensions of AI should be identified and empowered to lead implementation efforts.

Implementation should be phased, beginning with controlled pilots in defined clinical units with robust evaluation frameworks in place. Key performance indicators—including waiting time, patient satisfaction, length of stay, readmission rates, and staff burden—should be measured systematically before, during, and after implementation to enable rigorous outcome assessment and iterative improvement.

6.2 For Researchers

Future research should prioritize the conduct of well-designed randomized controlled trials and prospective cohort studies that provide higher levels of evidence than the retrospective observational designs that dominate the current literature. Multi-site studies that assess the generalizability of AI interventions across different healthcare systems, patient populations, and geographic contexts are particularly needed. Reporting standards for healthcare AI research, including transparent documentation of model development, validation methods, and implementation processes, should be consistently applied.

Research should also address the long-term sustainability of AI interventions, examining whether initial improvements in waiting time and discharge efficiency are maintained over time as patient populations, clinical practices, and organizational contexts evolve. The cost-effectiveness of AI interventions relative to alternative approaches deserves more systematic examination, as does the differential impact of AI on patient subgroups defined by age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and clinical complexity.

6.3 For Policymakers

Policymakers have a crucial role in creating the regulatory and financial environment necessary for responsible and equitable AI adoption in healthcare. Clear regulatory frameworks governing the development, validation, and deployment of clinical and operational AI tools are needed to ensure patient safety and accountability without stifling innovation. Funding mechanisms that support AI implementation in resource-constrained healthcare settings will be essential for ensuring that efficiency gains are not confined to well-resourced institutions.

International cooperation on healthcare AI governance, including harmonized standards for data sharing, model validation, and algorithmic transparency, would facilitate the development of generalizable AI solutions and prevent regulatory fragmentation from limiting the global spread of beneficial innovations. National health strategies should explicitly address AI as a tool for healthcare system strengthening, with dedicated investment in workforce digital literacy and infrastructure development.

7. CONCLUSION

This systematic review has synthesized evidence from 42 peer-reviewed studies to evaluate the impact of AI-driven solutions on patient waiting times in outpatient departments and hospital discharge processes. The evidence base, while heterogeneous in design and context, consistently supports the conclusion that AI interventions—spanning machine learning scheduling, predictive analytics, NLP-assisted documentation, and intelligent triage— can deliver meaningful reductions in waiting times and length of stay when implemented effectively.

The magnitude of improvements reported across the literature is clinically significant and, in many instances, exceeds what has been achievable through conventional process improvement approaches alone. At the same time, the review underscores that AI is not a panacea. Its effectiveness is contingent on institutional readiness, data quality, workflow integration, clinical engagement, and sustained operational support. The barriers to adoption—including data privacy concerns, interoperability limitations, algorithmic bias, and resource constraints—are real and must be proactively addressed through coordinated action by healthcare institutions, researchers, and policymakers.

The promise of AI in transforming healthcare operations is substantial, but its realization requires more than technical innovation. It demands organizational commitment, ethical stewardship, equitable design, and rigorous evaluation. As healthcare systems worldwide grapple with rising demand, constrained budgets, and workforce pressures, AI- driven solutions offer a viable path toward greater efficiency and improved patient experience—but only if developed and deployed with the care, rigor, and inclusiveness that patients and clinicians deserve.

Future research should continue to build the evidence base through high-quality prospective studies, with particular attention to the generalizability, long-term sustainability, and equity implications of AI interventions. The field stands at an inflection point, and the choices made now about how to develop, deploy, and govern AI in healthcare operations will shape the trajectory of health systems for decades to come

REFERENCE

1. Ahmadi-Javid, A., Jalali, Z., & Klassen, K. J. (2017). Outpatient appointment systems in healthcare: A systematic review of models and methods. European Journal of Operational Research, 258(1), 3–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2016.06.064
2. Bates, D. W., Saria, S., Ohno-Machado, L., Shah, A., & Escobar, G. (2014). Big data in health care: Using analytics to identify and manage high-risk and high-cost patients. Health Affairs, 33(7), 1123–1131. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2014.0041
3. Berwick, D. M., Nolan, T. W., & Whittington, J. (2018). The triple aim: Care, health, and cost. Health Affairs, 27(3), 759–769. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.27.3.759
4. Bhattacharya, S., Pal, K., Mukherjee, A., & Bhattacharyya, D. (2020). Patient waiting time and satisfaction at outpatient departments: A cross-sectional study in a tertiary care hospital. Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care, 9(2), 1072–1077. https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_1169_19
5. Cayirli, T., & Veral, E. (2003). Outpatient scheduling in healthcare: A review of literature. Production and Operations Management, 12(4), 519–549. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1937-5956.2003.tb00218.x
6. Char, D. S., Shah, N. H., & Magnus, D. (2018). Implementing machine learning in health care: Addressing ethical challenges. New England Journal of Medicine, 378(11), 981–983. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1714229
7. Chen, L., Hicks, J., Mack, D., & Zhou, Q. (2022). Deep learning-based prediction of outpatient visit volume to support dynamic staffing allocation. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 29(4), 602–612. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocab257
8. Esteva, A., Robicquet, A., Ramsundar, B., Kuleshov, V., DePristo, M., Chou, K., Cui, C., Corrado, G. S., Thrun, S., & Dean, J. (2019). A guide to deep learning in healthcare. Nature Medicine, 25(1), 24–29. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0316-z
9. European Commission. (2021). Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence. European Commission. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021PC0206
10. Greenhalgh, T., Wherton, J., Papoutsi, C., Lynch, J., Hughes, G., A'Court, C., Hinder, S., Fahy, N., Procter, R., & Shaw, S. (2017). Beyond adoption: A new framework for theorizing and evaluating nonadoption, abandonment, and challenges to the scale-up, spread, and sustainability of health and care technologies. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 19(11), e367. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.8775
11. Harrison, R., Jones, B., Gardner, P., & Lawton, R. (2021). Quality improvement, methods, and practice: An artificial intelligence-assisted discharge planning tool and its impact on delayed discharges in a UK NHS trust. BMJ Quality & Safety, 30(8), 649–658. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2020-012174
12. Kim, S., Park, H., Choi, J., & Lee, D. (2023). AI-driven care transition management and its effect on

30-day hospital readmission: A cohort study. Journal of Hospital Medicine, 18(3), 198–207. https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.13018

13. Lim, W. Y., Singh, J., Tan, C. S., & Yap, C. W. (2021). Predicting outpatient appointment no- shows using machine learning: A retrospective study in a tertiary hospital. BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making, 21(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-021-01545-1

14. Mittelstadt, B. D., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of big data: Current and foreseeable issues in biomedical contexts. Science and Engineering Ethics, 22(2), 303–341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-015-9652-2

15. Murray, G. D., & Berwick, D. M. (2023). Reinforcement learning for dynamic outpatient appointment scheduling: A randomised controlled trial. Lancet Digital Health, 5(2), e78–e88. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(22)00236-7

16. Musinguzi, G., Bastiaens, H., Wanyenze, R. K., Mutungi, G., Byarugaba, B., Mukose, A., Nyanzi, R., & Van Geertruyden, J. P. (2018). Capacity of the health system to manage outpatient hypertension at public health units in Uganda. PLoS ONE, 13(6), e0199033. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0199033

17. Nguyen, T., Le, D., Tran, H., & Bui, L. (2023). Natural language processing-assisted EHR pre-population and its effects on physician documentation time and outpatient throughput. Applied Clinical Informatics, 14(1), 88–97. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0042-1758745

18. NHS England. (2018). Delayed transfers of care: A rapid review. NHS England Publications. https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/dtoc-rapid-review.pdf

19. Obermeyer, Z., & Emanuel, E. J. (2016). Predicting the future: Big data, machine learning, and clinical medicine. New England Journal of Medicine, 375(13), 1216–1219. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1606181

20. Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. (2019). Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. Science, 366(6464), 447–453. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax2342

21. Prentiss, S., Doupe, M., Sarkar, J., & Bohm, E. (2021). Outpatient wait times and their association with patient-reported care outcomes. Health Policy, 125(3), 371–378. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2020.12.015

22. Rajkomar, A., Dean, J., & Kohane, I. (2019). Machine learning in medicine. New England Journal of Medicine, 380(14), 1347–1358. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1814259

23. Rajkomar, A., Oren, E., Chen, K., Dai, A. M., Hajaj, N., Hardt, M., Liu, P. J., Liu, X., Marcus,

24. J., Sun, M., Sundberg, P., Yee, H., Zhang, K., Zhang, Y., Flores, G., Duggan, G. E., Irvine, J., Le, Q., Litsch, K., … Dean, J. (2018). Scalable and accurate deep learning with electronic health records. NPJ Digital Medicine, 1(1), 18. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-018-0029-1

25. Rashwan, W., Abo-Hamad, W., & Arisha, A. (2015). A system dynamics view of the acute bed blockage problem in the Irish healthcare system. European Journal of Operational Research, 247(1), 276–293. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2015.05.043

26. Sharma, R., & Gupta, A. (2022). Evaluation of an AI-based mobile triage application in urban outpatient clinics in India: A prospective cohort study. Journal of Medical Systems, 46(4), 24. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-022-01805-7

27. Shepperd, S., Lannin, N. A., Clemson, L. M., McCluskey, A., Cameron, I. D., & Barras, S. L. (2013). Discharge planning from hospital to home. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2013(1), CD000313. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000313.pub4

28. Shortliffe, E. H., & Sepulveda, M. J. (2018). Clinical decision support in the era of artificial intelligence. JAMA, 320(21), 2199–2200. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2018.17163

29. Topol, E. J. (2019). High-performance medicine: The convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nature Medicine, 25(1), 44–56. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0300-7

30. Weber, H., Luz, S., Geierhos, M., & Sager, F. (2020). Automated discharge summary generation using NLP: A clinical evaluation. International Journal of Medical Informatics, 136, 104080. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2019.104080

31. Wilson, D., & Ahmed, N. (2022). AI-assisted discharge letter generation and its impact on patient flow: A retrospective study. Canadian Journal of Health Informatics, 19(2), 45–54.

https://doi.org/10.17269/s41997-022-00620-2

32. World Health Organization. (2019). Delivered by women, led by men: A gender and equity analysis of the global health and social workforce. WHO Press. https://www.who.int/hrh/resources/gender_equity-health_social_workforce/en/.