Journal of Computer Science and Technology Studies
ISSN: 2709-104X
DOI: 10.32996/jcsts
Journal Homepage: www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/jcsts

JCSTS
AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

HealthNavAI: An AI-Powered National Platform for Real-Time Healthcare Service Availability and Patient Routing

Kiran Kumar Jaghni
Ness USA Inc, USA
Corresponding Author: Kiran Kumar Jaghni, **E-mail**: kiran.jaghni@gmail.com

| ABSTRACT
Delays in accessing healthcare are not limited to overcrowded Emergency Departments (EDs)—patients frequently face prolonged waits for specialist consultations, diagnostic imaging, and elective surgeries. While some regions provide partial visibility into ED wait times, these systems are fragmented, inconsistent, and rarely extend to other critical services. This article proposes HealthNavAI, a regulation-backed, nationwide Healthcare Service Availability and Routing Platform that mandates real-time, standardized data sharing from all healthcare providers. The platform integrates ED queue status, specialist appointments, diagnostic imaging capacity, elective surgery schedules, and ambulance availability. An AI-based routing engine processes this data to predict service load, optimize patient allocation, and recommend optimal service locations based on predicted wait times, travel distance, clinical capability, and equity constraints. By leveraging interoperability standards and predictive analytics, HealthNavAI delivers actionable, real-time guidance to citizens, healthcare providers, and emergency services, enabling nationwide patient load balancing and reduced wait times across multiple services.

| KEYWORDS

Healthcare AI, Patient Routing, Wait Times, Real-time Data, Interoperability.

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 03 October 2025 **PUBLISHED:** 19 October 2025 **DOI:** 10.32996/jcsts.2025.7.10.43

1. Introduction

1.1 Contextual Background

Healthcare accessibility presents a significant global challenge, with waiting periods substantially impacting clinical outcomes, system performance, and consumer confidence. Extended delays for urgent care, professional consultations, advanced diagnostics, and scheduled procedures frequently exacerbate medical conditions and heighten patient distress. Various healthcare jurisdictions report concerning statistics—approximately 20% of American patients experience 30-90 day waits for physician appointments, with urban centers recording average delays of 46 days for initial specialist evaluations [10, 11].

Several regional initiatives have emerged, including the digital monitoring systems implemented by health authorities in New South Wales [1] and Singapore's University Health Network [2]. However, these innovations primarily address emergency department congestion without extending to other vital healthcare domains. Without comprehensive, contemporaneous visibility across multiple service categories, patients and emergency responders typically default to geographical proximity rather than optimal availability, creating imbalanced facility utilization patterns.

1.2 Problem Statement

Contemporary health care structures lack an integrated and responsive framework for consolidating operational status across emergency departments [1-3], specialist practices [4], diagnostic facilities [5,6], surgical services [7], and medical transportation [15, 16]. Available systems work in isolation, are often domain-specific, and utilize disparate, partial, or outdated information [4,10,11], limiting timely medical treatment and resource management [3,14].

1.3 Identified Gaps

The systematic review of existing healthcare navigation capabilities reveals several critical deficiencies:

Fragmented National Infrastructure— Service accessibility data exists in disconnected silos without standardized integration mechanisms across geographical boundaries [1,2,5,7].
Limited Functional Coverage — Available systems focus on discrete service categories rather than providing integrated navigation to support a patient-centered experience [3],[4],[7],[15].
Interoperability Gaps — Inconsistent adoption of standards for the exchange of health care information introduces significant barriers to effective coordination of data [8],[12].
Lack of Predictive Analytics — Current regret models lack predictive functionalities, which address the dynamics of demand and enable proactive resource manipulation [4],[5],[13].
Limited Patient Distribution — There is currently no coordinated approach for responding dynamically to population-level patient distributions, based on institutions' changes in capacity [1],[2],[15].
Restricted Information Accessibility — Real-time operational status remains largely unavailable to patients and affiliated organizations [4], [10], [11].
Systemic Inefficiencies — These limitations perpetuate preventable congestion, treatment delays, and underutilized healthcare assets [3], [7], [14], [15].

1.4 Purpose & Scope

This research aims to conceptualize, develop, and assess HealthNavAI—a regulatory-compliant national healthcare service availability and routing platform consolidating real-time operational metrics across diverse medical services. This system will deliver actionable information through consumer interfaces, institutional dashboards, and emergency service tools to enhance decision-making processes.

Within Scope:

- Data integration from governmental and private healthcare facilities, clinics, imaging providers, ambulance networks, and supplementary care organizations
- Service categories encompassing emergency departments, specialist consultations, diagnostic procedures, surgical appointments, transportation availability, and community health resources
- Compliance with technical frameworks (HL7 FHIR specifications, SANER protocols)
- Artificial intelligence components for wait-time forecasting, patient allocation optimization, and capacity distribution algorithms
- User interfaces, including public websites, mobile applications, provider visualization tools, and emergency service coordination systems

Beyond Scope:

- Exchange of patient medical information between healthcare systems
- Collection, processing, or transmission of personally identifiable health records
- Clinical decision support or medical intervention guidance
- Financial processing, insurance verification, or billing operations
- Cross-border data aggregation beyond the initial implementation jurisdiction

2. Healthcare Access Metrics

Medical service accessibility continues to present substantial obstacles to prompt intervention across numerous care categories:

2.1 Emergency Services Timeframes

Within American hospital systems, 2023 data revealed waiting periods exceeding 40 minutes (median) before provider contact, with multiple states documenting averages surpassing 60 minutes [13]. Patient holding phases frequently extend beyond 4 hours in numerous facilities [14]. Comparatively, Australian facilities under NSW Health governance report waiting intervals ranging from 20 to 90 minutes, contingent upon urgency classification [1].

2.2 Specialist Consultation Intervals

Recent nationwide assessment (2025) documented average waiting durations of 26.0 days for initial consultations within metropolitan centers, while certain urban localities experience scheduling delays surpassing 90 days [4]. Particularly impacted specialties, including dermatological and orthopedic services, occasionally impose 4–6 month waiting periods for consultations [4],[10],[11].

2.3 Imaging Procedure Scheduling

Urban American hospitals typically schedule magnetic resonance imaging appointments with 2–6 week advance notice requirements, whereas rural communities frequently confront scheduling horizons beyond 8 weeks [6]. Such prolonged intervals adversely influence therapeutic planning and clinical progression.

2.4 Procedural Scheduling Timeframes

Documentation from OECD healthcare analytics demonstrates surgical appointment intervals exceeding 6 months within jurisdictions lacking unified waitlist administration frameworks [7]. Canadian healthcare systems report median intervals of 24 weeks for hip arthroplasty procedures [5].

2.5 Medical Transport Metrics

Transport response analytics indicate average intervals of approximately 8 minutes within urban environments and 14 minutes throughout rural territories. Hospital transfer operations contribute an additional 20–45 minute intervals before definitive intervention commences [15]. British emergency services report Category 2 (urgent) response durations significantly surpassing established benchmarks, averaging approximately 47 minutes during early 2025 [16].

Service Category	United States	Canada	United Kingdom	Australia
Emergency Department (ED)	Median wait before provider: 40–60 min; boarding often 4+ hrs [13], [14]	Median wait before provider: 1.5 hrs; rural up to 3+ hrs [5]	4+ hrs wait target often missed in busy trusts; some exceed 6 hrs [7]	Median wait: 50 min, rural up to 2 hrs [1]
Specialist Appointment	Metro avg: 26 days; some > 90 days; certain specialties 4–6 months [4], [10], [11]	Median wait: 11.1 weeks for specialist consult [5]	GP referral to specialist: median 14.6 weeks [7]	GP referral to specialist: median 8 weeks [7]
Diagnostic Imaging (MRI)	Urban: 2–6 weeks; rural: 8+ weeks [6]	Median: 10.6 weeks [6]	NHS England median: 2–6 weeks, but some regions exceed 8 weeks [7]	Median: 3.5 weeks, rural up to 6 weeks [7]
Elective Surgery (Knee/Cataract)	1–6 months depending on provider capacity [7]	Median: 27.4 weeks from specialist consult to surgery [5]	NHS median: 14.3 weeks, but often longer in winter [7]	Median: 18–25 weeks [7]

Table 1: International Comparison of Healthcare Wait Times

3. Contemporary Solutions Assessment

3.1 Existing Implementation Review

Various national healthcare systems have established partial transparency mechanisms addressing service accessibility:

- Australian and Singaporean emergency department status visualization systems [1],[2]
- Canadian institute-maintained procedural and diagnostic waiting period documentation [5],[6]
- American specialty-specific accessibility reporting frameworks [4],[10],[11]
- British emergency medical service operational metrics publication [16]
- Technical information exchange frameworks, including healthcare interoperability specifications [12],[8]
- These implementations nonetheless demonstrate significant limitations:

- Service category isolation without cross-domain coordination
- Geographical restriction within specific administrative boundaries
- Connectivity barriers stemming from inconsistent data formatting practices
- Temporal limitations, including infrequent refreshing schedules
- Exclusion of supplementary and auxiliary service categories

3.2 Technological Innovation Proposition

The HealthNavAI framework introduces pioneering artificial intelligence-enhanced, privacy-conscious coordination capabilities addressing longstanding healthcare navigation challenges. Primary technological advances include:

Interconnected Network Architecture – Consolidates contemporaneous operational information across diverse provider organizations and service classifications [1],[2],[4],[5],[7],[15]
Privacy-Enhanced Data Exchange – Transmits exclusively operational capacity information through established healthcare informatics standards [8],[12] while excluding personally identifiable health records
Multifactorial Distribution Intelligence – Incorporates waiting durations, geographical proximity, clinical requirements, specialty availability, and institutional capacity within comprehensive patient allocation algorithms [15]
Anticipatory Volume Modeling – Employs computational prediction frameworks forecasting facility utilization patterns and simulating operational scenarios.
Synchronized Visual Interfaces – Provides customized informational displays tailored for public accessibility and professional operational oversight [1],[2],[4]
Comprehensive Service Integration – Expands beyond acute care environments to incorporate rehabilitation services, supportive care, and medical transportation coordination [15]
Recursive Performance Optimization – Progressively refines computational models through continuous outcome analysis.

Unlike existing fragmentary initiatives, HealthNavAI combines network interconnection, privacy-conscious information exchange, predictive analytics, sophisticated allocation methodologies, and comprehensive service integration within a scalable architectural framework.

4. Implementation Framework

4.1 Requirements Discovery Methodology

The initial implementation phase transforms identified healthcare visibility and interoperability challenges into concrete, actionable specifications through:

Stakeholder Consultation Process - Started strategic conversations to gather district staff, emergency management professionals, transportation managers, leadership of diagnostic facilities, and operational stakeholders.
Compliance Framework Mapping - Completed an extensive analysis of the governance requirements in the jurisdiction, which included health information privacy and data security legislation.
Implementation Prioritization - Utilized systems of requirement classification based on clinical priority and technical feasibility when considering implementation.
Performance Benchmark Establishment – Documentation of baseline operational metrics enabling post-implementation comparative assessment

4.2 Architectural Design Principles

HealthNavAI employs contemporary standards-compliant integration methodologies, consolidating operational metrics across diverse healthcare environments. The information processing sequence encompasses:

Information Acquisition – Operational status feeds from emergency facilities, specialist practices, imaging centers, surgical departments, transportation networks, and supplementary services
Standardization Processing – Transformation into standardized healthcare information exchange formats aligned with established schema specifications
Information Architecture – Implementation of contemporary storage frameworks supporting both immediate operational needs and longitudinal analytics
Analytical Feature Development – Creation of operational pattern recognition capabilities without exposure of protected health information

Predictive Model Development – Creation and verification of waiting time estimation, capacity forecasting, and optimal allocation algorithms
Deployment Architecture – Implementation of containerized prediction services within scalable computational environments
Operational Implementation – Processing of contemporaneous signals for prediction generation and recommendation formulation
Continuous Improvement Cycle – Algorithmic refinement based on outcome validation and performance assessment
Operational Intelligence – Generation of key performance indicators and regulatory compliance documentation



Figure 1: Dataflow



Figure 2: Framework

4.3 Technological Infrastructure

The implementation architecture adheres to fundamental design principles:

Inherent Interoperability – Adoption of broadly implemented healthcare information standards
Privacy-Focused Architecture – Implementation of data minimization practices, capturing exclusively aggregated operational metrics
Continuous Monitoring Capabilities – Processing of operational indicators with minimal latency
Adaptable Component Design – Implementation of decoupled functional elements supporting future capability expansion

The infrastructure incorporates multiple specialized components:

Operational Data Processing – Powers contemporaneous visualization interfaces and routing algorithms
Comprehensive Information Repository – Maintains longitudinal operational metrics supporting analytical functions
Model Feature Management – Delivers consistent, versioned analytical inputs for computational models
Analytical Data Environment – Facilitates interactive reporting and operational analysis
Forecasting Capabilities – Enables future state prediction, scenario modeling, and demand projection



Figure 3: Architecture

5. Performance Assessment Framework

5.1 Service-Specific Evaluation Metrics

Assessment methodologies address each primary service domain:

Emergency Department Flow – Measurement of waiting interval reduction, patient holding duration decrease, and facility variance minimization
Specialist Consultation Access – Documentation of appointment interval reduction and scheduling optimization improvements
Diagnostic Service Optimization – Assessment of procedural backlog reduction and resource utilization enhancement
Surgical Service Efficiency – Evaluation of operating theater utilization improvements and cancellation rate reduction
Medical Transportation Coordination – Measurement of response interval reduction and facility transfer optimization

Domain	Evaluation Metrics	Data Source
Emergency Department (ED) Queue Status	Avg. reduction in patient wait time before provider contact; decrease in ED boarding times; variance reduction across facilities.	Hospital EHR & SANER-compliant feeds
Specialist Appointment Slot Availability	Reduction in average days-to-appointment; percentage of redirected patients matched to earlier slots	Provider scheduling systems, HL7 FHIR APIs
Diagnostic Imaging Capacity	% reduction in MRI/CT backlog; slot utilization rate improvement	Imaging center scheduling data
Elective Surgery Schedules	Theatre utilization rate; decrease in wait time for priority elective cases	Hospital OR management systems
Emergency Transport Services	Reduction in ambulance response time, improved hospital handover time, and inter-agency dispatch efficiency	EMS CAD logs, NEMSIS feeds
Supporting and Ancillary Services	Wait time reduction for post-acute care, dialysis, rehab, and mental health services.	Provider-specific scheduling systems

Table 7: Evaluation Metrics

5.2 Computational Model Evaluation

Artificial intelligence components undergo rigorous assessment addressing:

- Prediction accuracy measurement (absolute error quantification)
- Resource allocation optimization impact
- Equitable distribution validation within routing recommendations
- Model performance stability monitoring
- Decision rationale transparency

5.3 Implementation Validation Strategy

Technical Performance Validation:

- System load capacity assessment, integration verification, and resilience testing
- Performance requirements: ≥99.9% operational availability, response intervals ≤2 seconds, elimination of critical interoperability failures
- Clinical Implementation Validation:
- Deployment within diverse healthcare environments
- Performance targets: ≥15% reduction in emergency department throughput intervals, ≥10% improvement in appointment utilization metrics

User Experience Validation:

- Task completion assessment, standardized usability evaluation, and accessibility standard conformance

Performance requirements: System Usability Scale scoring ≥80, ≥90% task completion rate, web accessibility guideline compliance [17]

Domain / Category	Existing Standards / Practices	Limitations	HealthNavAI Advantages
Emergency Departments (EDs)	Regional ED dashboards (e.g., NSW, NUHS) [1], [2]	Siloed, variable latency, no multi-domain routing	National integration, ≤60s updates, cross-domain routing
Specialist Clinics	Appointment systems, wait-time surveys [4], [10], [11]	Siloed by network; limited regional coordination	Cross-provider slot visibility; referral routing
Diagnostic Imaging	PACS/RIS; national indicators (e.g., CIHI MRI) [5], [6]	Workflow-centric; limited public capacity view	Real-time capacity + routing to reduce backlogs
Elective Surgery Theatres	OR schedulers; OECD reporting [7]	Limited transparency; cancellations not optimized	Predictive theatre optimization; backlog balancing
Emergency Transport (EMS)	CAD/dispatch, agency-specific reports [15], [16]	Limited hospital visibility; diversion cycles	EMS–hospital co-visibility; destination optimization
Primary Care / Community & Telehealth	Practice-level booking; ad hoc telehealth	Fragmented view; weak ED diversion	Integrated routing to community/telehealth where appropriate
Ancillary & Community Services (rehab, dialysis, MH)	Local directories; manual referrals	Rarely in systemwide capacity views	Inclusion in availability + routing loops
Public Portal (Real-Time Patient Access)	Service-specific portals only [1], [2]	No unified national view; inconsistent refresh	National portal with synchronized real-time capacity & predictions
Provider/EMS Operational Dashboards	Internal ops tools by department	Unsynced with public view; cross-site blind spots	Role-specific dashboards sharing the same live data

Public–Provider Synchronization	Separate data feeds	Timestamp skew; conflicting info	Single source of truth; cross-channel consistency checks
Interoperability & Data Standards	Partial HL7 FHIR; varied formats [12]	Integration friction; limited SANER use [8]	Full FHIR resource set + SANER capacity reporting
Data Freshness / Latency	Hourly/daily updates common [1], [5], [6], [16]	Not suitable for live routing	Streaming ingestion; domain-specific SLOs (ED ≤60s; others ≤5 min)
Predictive / Prescriptive Analytics	Descriptive reporting	No forecasting or "what-if" simulation	AI forecasts; scenario simulation; surge prediction
Intelligent Routing & Load Balancing	Nearest-facility default	Inequitable queues; under/overuse	Multi-criteria routing (wait, travel, capability, equity)
Equity & Accessibility	Limited rural/underserved visibility; varied UX	Equity gaps; accessibility not guaranteed	Equity-aware routing; WCAG 2.1 AA, language/localization
Privacy & Governance	Mixed practices	PHI/consent risks slow adoption	PHI-free operational metrics; de-identification; policy alignment

TABLE 3: Comparative Standards and HealthNavAI Advantages

Additional Comparative Insights summary

Criterion	Existing Systems	HealthNavAI
Service Scope	Single-domain (ED, imaging, or specialty) [1]–[7], [15]	Multi-domain integration: ED, specialty, imaging, surgery, EMS, ancillary
Geographic Coverage	Local/regional; no national aggregation [1], [2], [5], [7]	Nationwide with regulation-backed participation
Data Latency	Hourly/daily updates [1], [5], [6], [16]	≤60 s ED, ≤5 min other domains
Interoperability	Inconsistent; limited HL7 FHIR [8], [12]	Full HL7 FHIR R4, SANER, SNOMED CT/LOINC

Criterion	Existing Systems	HealthNavAI
Predictive Analytics	Absent [4], [5], [13]–[16]	AI-driven forecasting and simulation
Intelligent Routing	Absent [1], [2], [15]	Multi-criteria routing with equity constraints
Real-Time Dashboards	Rare; service-specific only [1], [2], [4]	Unified public/provider dashboards with synchronized data
Operational Efficiency	Limited, reactive adjustments	Proactive staffing, scheduling, and resource balancing
Ancillary Services	Rare [3], [14]	Included in routing and visibility
EMS Integration	Siloed [15], [16]	Nationally integrated with hospital capacity data



Figure 5: Evaluation Approach

6. Comparative Solution Analysis

Contemporary healthcare visibility implementations demonstrate fragmentation, delayed information delivery, and limited functional scope, while providing minimal predictive capabilities and lacking equitable resource allocation mechanisms. HealthNavAI addresses these limitations through:

- Comprehensive Domain Integration – Consolidates information from emergency departments, specialist practices, imaging facilities, surgical services, transportation networks, and ancillary providers
- Comprehensive Geographic Coverage – Ensures inclusion of rural and historically underserved regions within unified visibility frameworks [5],[6],[15]
- Responsive Information Delivery – Provides ≤60s updates for emergency departments and ≤5 min for additional domains
- Standards-Based Connectivity – Implements healthcare interoperability specification R4 [12] and situational awareness framework [8] compliance
- Advanced Analytical Capabilities – Delivers waiting time forecasting and demand fluctuation prediction.
- Multifaceted Resource Allocation – Incorporates waiting intervals, transportation duration, facility capabilities, and equitable distribution requirements.

- Role-Appropriate Visualization – Delivers specialized information interfaces presenting current and projected operational status [1],[2],[4]



Figure 4: Comparative leap

Gap ID	Problem Statement / Gap (condensed)	Primary Evaluation Metric(s)	Validation Method
G1	No unified national or global platform (cross-region aggregation absent)	% of facilities reporting nationally; cross-network data completeness; API uptime	National pilot; coverage audit; API reliability monitoring
G2	Fragmentation & limited scope (single-domain tools)	# of domains integrated (ED, clinics, imaging, surgery, EMS, ancillary); cross-domain routing availability	Multi-domain integration test; end-to-end scenario walkthroughs
G3	Geographic & network isolation (regional silos)	Facility coverage by region/rurality; % cross-network routes possible	Coverage stratified analysis (urban/rural); cross-network routing test
G4	Limited real-time data availability/latency	Median / P95 latency (s) per domain; dashboard refresh interval	Load tests, production telemetry, time-sync audit
G5	Data silos & interoperability barriers (FHIR underuse)	FHIR conformance rate (Schedule/Slot/Appointment/HealthcareService/Location); SANER profile completeness	Conformance validation; interoperability plug-fests
G6	Lack of predictive analytics	Forecast MAE/MAPE (wait times, arrivals) per domain; calibration error; lift vs. naïve baseline	Retrospective back-testing; prospective shadow-mode trials
G7	No intelligent patient routing/load balancing	Δ wait time vs. baseline; Occupancy variance index; Δ travel time; diversion rate	Live pilot A/B; interrupted time-series (ITS); simulation studies
G8	Restricted public & partner access (real-time data is rarely public)	Public portal availability (SLA); % of endpoints exposed; time-to-publish	Public portal telemetry; policy compliance audit
G9	Minimal public–provider synchronization (role-specific but unsynced)	Timestamp skew (public vs. provider) ≤ X seconds; data consistency rate	Cross-channel consistency checks; synthetic event replay
G10	Limited operational efficiency tools (no proactive staffing/scheduling)	OR utilization % and variance; staffing forecast accuracy; throughput per resource	OR workflow analytics; staffing forecast trials

G11	Exclusion of ancillary/community services (rehab, dialysis, MH)	# ancillary providers integrated; referral completion rate; ED substitution rate	Network onboarding audit; pathway substitution analysis
G12	No integrated transport optimization (EMS–hospital silo)	EMS response time, hospital handover time, and inter-facility transfer delay	EMS CAD integration tests; pre/post pilot evaluation
G13	ED queue status limitations (inconsistent, non-standard, not national)	Door-to-doc; LWBS rate; ED status latency; % facilities reporting ED status	National ED status audit; ITS with pilot EDs
G14	Specialist slot availability is not unified	Third-next-available (days); no-show rate; cross-network fill rate	Cross-network scheduling pilot; referral pathway audit
G15	Diagnostic imaging capacity visibility absent (esp. private)	Days-to-MRI/CT; slot fill rate; repeat-test rate	Imaging network onboarding; backlog clearance study
G16	Elective surgery schedules lack live, procedure-level detail	Cancellation rate; days-to-surgery; first-case on-time start	Theatre schedule integration; pre/post cancellation analysis
G17	EMS availability is not shared across agencies	Diversion rate; inter-agency dispatch success; on-scene→door time	Multi-agency CAD interoperability test; pre/post metrics
G18	Geographic equity gaps (rural/underserved underrepresented)	Coverage % in rural/underserved; SVI-adjusted access index; disparity ratio	Equity audit; subgroup ITS; rural pilots
G19	Operational inefficiency impact (overcrowding/underuse persists)	System load-balance index; throughput per staffed bed; average boarding time	System-level KPI dashboard; variance reduction analysis

TABLE 2: Mapping of Identified Gaps to Evaluation Metrics and Validation Methods

7. Potential Applications

HealthNavAI has broad applicability across multiple healthcare domains:

- **Patient Navigation** — Enabling informed provider selection based on wait times and capabilities
- **EMS Coordination** — Optimizing ambulance routing to appropriate facilities with available capacity
- **Hospital Operations** — Supporting staff allocation, procedure scheduling, and resource optimization
- **Policy Oversight** — Monitoring service access equity and policy benchmark performance
- **Ancillary Care Integration** — Improving transitions to non-acute services
- **Research Platform** — Facilitating healthcare operations research and innovation

Domain / Application Area	Potential Application	Expected Benefits
Emergency Departments (EDs)	Real-time diversion management; patient load balancing across nearby EDs; surge prediction	Reduced overcrowding, shorter wait times, improved safety
Specialist Clinics	Referral slot visibility; routing patients to clinics with capacity	Improved access, reduced referral delays
Diagnostic Imaging	Backlog management; patient scheduling to underutilized centers	Faster diagnosis, reduced waitlists
Elective Surgery Theatres	Theatre schedule optimization; predictive cancellation reallocation	Increased throughput, reduced backlog
Emergency Transport (EMS)	Intelligent destination routing; hospital–EMS synchronization	Reduced turnaround time, improved patient outcomes
Primary Care / Community Clinics	Routing low-acuity patients away from EDs to community/GP services	Reduced ED load, enhanced continuity of care
Telehealth Services	Redirect eligible patients to teleconsults during capacity constraints	Expands access, reduces unnecessary in-person load
Ancillary & Community Services (dialysis, rehab, MH, LTC)	Integration of ancillary care capacity into routing	Better chronic care management; reduced hospital readmissions
Public Portal (Patient Access)	Real-time national portal for wait times, slots, and routing	Transparency empowers patients to choose efficiently
Provider Operational Dashboards	Unified dashboards for hospitals, EMS, and clinics	Better situational awareness, improved resource coordination
Policy, Research, and System Oversight	Aggregated, de-identified analytics for capacity planning, compliance monitoring	Equitable distribution, evidence-based policy-making

Table 4: Potential Applications Across Healthcare Domains

8. Broader Implications

8.1 Environmental Impact

HealthNavAI can generate positive environmental outcomes through:

- Reduced patient and EMS travel by recommending optimal facilities
- Balanced facility utilization, minimizing energy-intensive surges
- Fewer redundant diagnostic procedures through improved coordination
- Increased adoption of telehealth and community-based care

8.2 Economic Impact

The platform offers economic benefits across domains:

- **Emergency Departments** — Reduced overtime, diversion costs, and avoidable admissions
- **Specialist Care** — Fuller utilization of physician time and fewer no-shows
- **Diagnostic Imaging** — Higher return on expensive imaging equipment
- **Elective Surgery** — More predictable OR utilization and reduced cancellations

- **EMS Services** — Lower fuel costs and improved ambulance turnaround times
- **System-Level** — Reduced need for costly emergency expansions

Domain	Cost Reduction	Efficiency Gains	Revenue Opportunities
Emergency Departments (EDs)	Reduced crowding lowers overtime staffing, fewer costly diversion penalties, and reduced uncompensated care.	Faster triage and throughput reduce patient boarding times and resource strain.	Improved patient satisfaction boosts reimbursement under value-based care and patient retention.
Specialist Clinics	Reducing unnecessary specialist consults lowers costs to patients and insurers.	Optimized referral routing ensures specialists are booked appropriately, improving panel utilization.	Increased patient throughput enables more billed visits, reducing revenue leakage.
Diagnostic Imaging Centers	Fewer redundant scans cut down wasteful imaging costs and payer denials.	Predictive scheduling reduces idle scanner time and increases technologist productivity.	Higher scan throughput and better payer compliance boost billing and revenue capture.
Elective Surgery Theatres	Lower cancellation rates reduce wasted pre-op preparation costs.	Improved OR block scheduling increases theatre utilization and surgeon productivity.	Recovered surgical volume translates into additional procedure revenue and reduced backlog losses.
Emergency Transport (EMS)	Reducing unnecessary transports decreases vehicle, fuel, and staffing costs.	More intelligent routing lowers travel time and improves resource coverage.	Freed-up ambulances can serve more billable calls or high-acuity cases.
Primary / Urgent Care Clinics	Diverting low-acuity patients from the ED lowers payer cost per encounter.	Improved scheduling increases provider efficiency and reduces patient churn.	Higher visit capture drives additional billing opportunities and continuity of care revenue.
System-Level (Regional / Network Impact)	Balanced load reduces regional inefficiencies, minimizing costly bottlenecks.	Improved cross-facility staffing and bed allocation optimizes resource utilization.	Network-level contracting improves payer negotiations, risk-adjustment revenue, and system branding.

Table 5: Economic Impact by Healthcare Domain

8.3 Social Effects

HealthNavAI can positively impact social aspects of healthcare:

- Improved patient experience and satisfaction through reduced uncertainty
- Enhanced equity of access across geographic and demographic groups
- Better workforce well-being through balanced patient loads
- Increased public trust in the healthcare system transparency
- Strengthened community resilience during crises
- Improved health literacy and patient empowerment

Social Effect Dimension	Description / Impact
Patient Access & Equity	Equalizes access across rural, urban, and underserved areas by providing real-time visibility into availability
Patient Empowerment	Patients make informed decisions, choose best-fit services, and reduce unnecessary visits.
Family & Caregiver Support	Reduces logistical burden, financial strain, and stress for families and

Social Effect Dimension	Description / Impact
	caregivers
Trust & Transparency	Builds societal trust by providing reliable, validated operational information
Reduced Stress & Anxiety	Wait-time predictability alleviates emotional burden for patients and families.
Health Literacy Improvement	Dashboards and portals educate patients on appropriate service use, improving long-term health literacy.
Equity in Specialized Services	Ensures disadvantaged populations gain fairer access to specialists, imaging, and elective surgery slots
Community Resilience	Strengthens preparedness during crises (e.g., pandemics, disasters) by supporting the rapid, equitable distribution of patients
Professional Satisfaction	Enhances clinician morale through better resource balance and reduced burnout
Public Confidence in the Health System	Transparent nationwide data strengthens faith in healthcare institutions and the government.
Crisis Communication & Social Stability	Reduces panic and misinformation by providing real-time authoritative updates.
Policy & Governance Benefits	Enables socially responsible decision-making and evidence-based public health communication.
Digital Divide (Challenge)	Recognizes that limited digital access for some populations must be addressed to avoid exacerbating inequities.

Table 6: Social Effects Summary

9. Long-Term Outlook

The long-term trajectory of HealthNavAI extends beyond immediate efficiency improvements:

- Evolution into a national and global health infrastructure for crisis management
- Integration with smart cities and public infrastructure
- Cross-sectoral expansion to social care ecosystems
- Adoption of federated learning for continuous improvement
- Incorporation of climate-conscious optimization strategies
- Democratization through personal AI health navigation agents
- Catalyzation of new global interoperability standards

10. Conclusion

The transition from fragmented, localized wait-time applications to a unified, national, AI-driven patient navigation ecosystem represents a transformative step in healthcare delivery. HealthNavAI embodies this transition by integrating real-time operational data, predictive modeling, equitable routing, and system-wide dashboards. Through coordinated action across policy, healthcare, community, public health, and technology stakeholders, HealthNavAI can deliver shorter waits, more equitable access, reduced costs, improved workforce sustainability, and resilient healthcare systems prepared for both daily operations and future crises.

Funding: This research received no external funding.
Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

[1] NSW Health, "Emergency Department waiting times in major NSW hospitals," NSW Health, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.emergencywait.health.nsw.gov.au/

[2] National University Health System (NUHS), "New digital features help patients make informed decisions and reduce guesswork on ED wait times," NUHS News, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.nuhs.edu.sg/about-nuhs/news-and-stories/news-and-stories-details/new-digital-features-help-patients-make-informed-decisions-and-reduce-guesswork-on-emergency-department-wait-times
[3] Claire Morley et al., "Emergency department crowding: A systematic review of causes, consequences, and solutions," PLOS ONE, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0203316
[4] AMN Healthcare / Merritt Hawkins, "2025 Survey of Physician Appointment Wait Times," AMN Healthcare, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.amnhealthcare.com/amn-insights/physician/whitepapers/2025-survey-of-physician-appointment-wait-times/ https://online.flippingbook.com/view/83050962/42/
[5] Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI), "Wait times for priority procedures in Canada, 2025," CIHI, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.cihi.ca/en/wait-times-for-priority-procedures-in-canada-2025
[6] CIHI, "Wait times for MRI scan (indicator)," CIHI, updated Mar. 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.cihi.ca/en/indicators/wait-times-for-mri-scan
[7] OECD, "Waiting times for elective surgery," in Health at a Glance 2023: OECD Indicators, Paris: OECD Publishing, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/2023/11/health-at-a-glance-2023_e04f8239/full-report/waiting-times-for-elective-surgery_68501edc.html
[8] HL7, Situational Awareness for Novel Epidemic Response (SANER) – FHIR Implementation Guide v1.0.1, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://build.fhir.org/ig/HL7/fhir-saner/
[9] U.S. CDC, "NHSN Connectivity Initiative: Hospital Bed Capacity Project," CDC NHSN, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/bed-capacity/index.html
[10] American Medical Association, "Why patients are having difficulties getting a doctor's appointment," AMA, Jun. 7, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.ama-assn.org/press-center/ama-speeches/bruce-scott-md-why-patients-are-having-difficulties-getting-doctor
[11] Mary Chris Jaklevic, "In the U.S., wait times to see a doctor can be agonizingly long," Health Journalism, Aug. 7, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://healthjournalism.org/blog/2024/08/in-the-u-s-wait-times-to-see-a-doctor-can-be-agonizingly-long/
[12] Interoperability Challenges in Health Tech: The Gaps and Solutions. Forbes Oct 2024 [Online]. Available: https://www.forbes.com/councils/forbestechcouncil/2024/10/08/interoperability-challenges-in-health-tech-the-gaps-and-solutions/
[13] Institute for Healthcare Policy & Innovation, University of Michigan Wait times for emergency hospitalization keep getting higher. Published Aug 4 2025. [Online]. Available: https://ihpi.umich.edu/news-events/news/wait-times-emergency-hospitalization-keep-getting-higher
[14] American College of Emergency Physicians (ACEP), "Emergency Department Boarding Crisis," ACEP, Jan. 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.acep.org/boarding
[15] U.S. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), "National EMS Assessment," NHTSA, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.ems.gov/
[16] NHS England, Monthly Operational Statistics – January 2025, Jan. 9, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.england.nhs.uk/long-read/monthly-operational-statistics-january-2025/
[17] World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1, W3C Recommendation, Jun. 5, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21/
[18] Economic Benefits of reduced waiting times for elective surgeries. A systematic Literature Review, Feb 2025. [Online] Available: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11930346/
[19] Arogyaswamy, S., Vukovic, N., Keniston, A. *et al.* The Impact of Hospital Capacity Strain: a Qualitative Analysis of Experience and Solutions at 13 Academic Medical Centers. *J GEN INTERN MED* **37**, 1463–1474 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-021-07106-8
[20] Felix Parker , Fardin Ganjkhanloo, Diego A. Martínez, Kimia Ghobadi. Optimal Hospital Capacity Management During Demand Surges. arXiv:2403.15738v2 [cs.CY] 29 Mar 2024. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2403.15738
[21] Berkeveld, E., Rhebergen, M.D.F., Bloemers, F.W. *et al.* Patient coordination during the COVID-19 pandemic in the Amsterdam region: effects on capacity utilization and patient flow. *BMC Health Serv Res* **25**, 266 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-025-12311-w
[22] Samantha Calder-Sprackman, Edmund S. H. Kwok, Renee Bradley, Jeffrey Landreville, Jeffrey J. Perry, Lisa A. Calder. *et al.* Availability of Emergency Department Wait Times Information: A Patient-Centered Needs Assessment. 22 April 2021. https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/8883933
[23] British Medical Association, NHS diagnostics data analysis. Last Updated Jan 2025. https://www.bma.org.uk/advice-and-support/nhs-delivery-and-workforce/pressures/nhs-diagnostics-data-analysis
[24] Office of National Statistics, Accident and Emergency wait times across UK:2024. Released Data 28 Feb 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthcaresystem/articles/accidentandemergencywaittimesacrossttheuk/2024-02-28
[25] Government of Western Australia Department of Health, Emergency Department, Monthly Report. July 2025. Available: https://www.health.wa.gov.au/Reports-and-publications/Emergency-Department-activity/Emergency-Department-Monthly-Report
[26] Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, ED waiting times overview. Emergency department waiting time statistics by triage category in 2023–24. Available: https://www.aihw.gov.au/hospitals/topics/emergency-departments/waiting-times
[27] Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Waiting times by surgical specialty 2023-2024. Available: https://www.aihw.gov.au/hospitals/topics/elective-surgery/waiting-times-by-surgical-specialty-waiting-times-by-intended-procedure
[28] The Age News. 'Working in the dark': Patients wait almost a year for medical scans. Reported May 10, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.theage.com.au/national/victoria/working-in-the-dark-patients-wait-almost-a-year-for-medical-scans-20250507-p5lxev.html

[29] Canadian Medical Association, Patients, providers suffer as ERs are overwhelmed yet again: CMA. Published on Jan 11, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.cma.ca/about-us/what-we-do/press-room/patients-providers-suffer-ers-are-overwhelmed-yet-again-cma
[30] Canadian Medical Association, Why are ER times so long in Canada? Available: https://www.cma.ca/healthcare-for-real/why-are-er-times-so-long-canada
[31] Fraser Institute, Canadians continue to experience long waits for MRIs and CT scans [Online]. Available: https://www.fraserinstitute.org/commentary/canadians-continue-experience-long-waits-mris-and-ct-scans
[32] AMN health care, 2025 Survey of Physician Appointment wait times and Medicare and Medicaid acceptance rates. [Online]. Available: https://online.flippingbook.com/view/83050962/
[33] Average Emergency Room Waiting Times by State & Country for 2024 in United States. [Online]
Available: https://www.flyreva.com/blog/average-emergency-room-wait-times/
[34] Anna Fleck, Statista Healthcare: How Long Do Patients Have to Wait? Sept 17, 2024. [Online] Available:https://www.statista.com/chart/33079/average-waiting-times-for-a-doctors-appointment/ Available: https://www.statista.com/chart/33079/average-waiting-times-for-a-doctors-appointment/
[35] American Hospital Association: Tackling the Surgical Backlog. 2023. [Online] Available: https://www.aha.org/system/files/media/file/2023/02/ASA_SurgicalBacklog_exedialogue_Feb2023.pdf
[36] Vesta Teleradiology, The Silent Strain: How Radiologist Shortages Are Impacting Patient Wait Times Nationwide. [Online]. Available:https://vestarad.com/the-silent-strain-how-radiologist-shortages-are-impacting-patient-wait-times-nationwide/#:~:text=Limited%20growth%20in%20federally%20funded,Delayed%20imaging%20results%20can:
[37] NHS A&E wait times, Live reporting for 120 hospitals. [Online] Available: https://www.aandewaittimes.uk/