



Discrete Event Simulation in Healthcare: A Comprehensive Review

Criza Clare O. Encarnacion, MD, DPBA^{1,2}, Dr. Erwin M. Faller¹

¹Graduate School, St. Bernadette of Lourdes College, Quezon City, Manila, Philippines

²Department of Anesthesiology, St. Pascal de Baylon Hospital, San Pascual, Batangas, Philippines

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.0724.1822>

ABSTRACT:

Discrete Event Simulation (DES) has become an invaluable tool in healthcare, providing robust solutions for optimizing complex processes and resource management. This review comprehensively synthesizes findings from peer-reviewed journal articles to explore DES's applications, benefits, challenges, and future directions in healthcare. The study highlights DES applications in emergency departments, operating rooms, outpatient clinics, inpatient units, and pharmacy operations. Key benefits include process optimization, decision support, cost reduction, and improved patient outcomes. Despite its advantages, DES faces challenges such as data requirements, model complexity, and computational demands. Future directions emphasize the integration of real-time data, hybrid simulation models, personalized healthcare pathways, and policy analysis. This review underscores the critical role of DES in enhancing healthcare efficiency and effectiveness.

KEYWORDS: *Discrete Event Simulation (DES), Healthcare Optimization, Patient Flow, Resource Allocation, Emergency Department, Operating Room, Outpatient Clinic, Inpatient Unit, Pharmacy Operations, Process Improvement, Decision Support, Cost Reduction, Patient Outcomes, Simulation Modeling*

INTRODUCTION

Healthcare systems worldwide face numerous challenges, including increasing patient volumes, limited resources, and the need for high-quality care. These challenges necessitate efficient management and optimization of healthcare processes to ensure timely and effective patient care. Discrete Event Simulation (DES) has emerged as a powerful analytical tool to address these challenges by modeling complex healthcare systems and providing insights into process improvements, resource allocation, and decision support.

DES is a type of simulation where the operation of a system is represented as a sequence of discrete events, each occurring at specific points in time and causing a change in the system's state. Unlike continuous simulation, which models systems using continuous time variables, DES focuses on distinct events, making it particularly suitable for healthcare settings where activities such as patient arrivals, diagnostic tests, and treatment processes occur at specific intervals.

This review aims to provide a comprehensive synthesis of the current literature on the application of DES in healthcare. By examining peer-reviewed journal articles, this review highlights DES's diverse applications, benefits, challenges, and future directions in various healthcare settings, including emergency departments, operating rooms, outpatient clinics, inpatient units, and pharmacy operations. This review underscores the critical role of DES in enhancing healthcare efficiency and effectiveness. By providing a detailed synthesis of applications, benefits, challenges, and future directions, this review aims to offer valuable insights into the potential of DES in transforming healthcare delivery.

METHODOLOGY

A. Literature Search

- A systematic literature search uses PubMed and Google Scholar databases. Keywords used included "Discrete Event Simulation," "Healthcare," "Patient Flow," "Resource Allocation," and specific healthcare settings such as "Emergency Department," "Operating Room," "Outpatient Clinic," "Inpatient Unit," and "Pharmacy Operations." The search aimed to identify peer-reviewed journal articles published in the last 20 years.

B. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

- Inclusion criteria:
 - I. Peer-reviewed journal articles.

- II. Studies focused on the application of DES in healthcare.
 - III. Articles published in English.
 - IV. Studies providing empirical data, case studies, or comprehensive reviews.
- Exclusion criteria:
 - I. Non-peer-reviewed articles.
 - II. Studies not specific to healthcare.
 - III. Articles published in languages other than English.
 - IV. Opinion pieces without empirical data.
- C. Data Extraction
- Data were extracted from the selected articles, focusing on the following aspects:
 - I. Applications of DES in various healthcare settings.
 - II. Benefits and outcomes of implementing DES.
 - III. Challenges and limitations faced in DES modeling.
 - IV. Future directions and potential advancements in DES.
- D. Analysis
- This review extracted data and analyzed it to identify common themes, trends, and gaps in the literature. Applications of DES are categorized by healthcare settings, and benefits and challenges were synthesized across studies. Future directions were highlighted based on emerging trends and advancements in simulation modeling.
- E. Synthesis
- This journal review conducted a comprehensive synthesis of the findings to provide an overarching view of the role and impact of DES in healthcare. The study aimed to integrate insights from multiple studies to offer a detailed understanding of DES applications, benefits, challenges, and future directions in healthcare.

Overview of Discrete Event Simulation (DES)

Discrete Event Simulation (DES) is a powerful analytical technique used to model the operation of systems as a series of discrete events that occur at specific points in time. This modeling approach suits complex systems where distinct events trigger changes. In healthcare, DES allows for detailed analysis and optimization of various processes, providing valuable insights for improving efficiency and effectiveness.

CriticEvents are the fundamental building blocks of DES models. Each event represents a significant occurrence that changes the system's state. For example, in a healthcare setting, events could include patient arrivals, the start of a consultation, the completion of a diagnostic test, or patient discharge. Events are discrete and happen at specific moments, driving the simulation forward.

1. *Entities*. Entities are the objects or actors that move through the system and are affected by events. In healthcare DES models, entities typically include patients, healthcare providers (such as doctors and nurses), medical equipment, and administrative staff. Each entity has attributes that define its characteristics, such as a patient's health status or a doctor's specialty.
2. *State Variables*. State variables represent the current condition or status of the system at any given time. These variables can include the number of patients waiting for treatment, the availability of medical staff, or the occupancy of hospital beds. State variables are updated as events occur, providing a snapshot of the system's state throughout the simulation.
3. *Queues*. Queues are an essential component of DES, as they represent the waiting lines or buffers where entities wait for resources or services. In healthcare, queues can form in various parts of the system, such as patients waiting for triage in the emergency department, for surgery in the operating room, or medication at the pharmacy. Managing and optimizing queues are critical for reducing wait times and improving service delivery.
4. *Simulation Clock*. The simulation clock is a virtual clock that keeps track of the current time within the simulation. It progresses in discrete steps, corresponding to the timing of events. The simulation clock ensures that events are processed in the correct chronological order, allowing the model to reflect the sequence of real-world occurrences accurately.
5. *Event List*. The event list is a dynamic schedule that maintains a chronological list of all pending events. Each entry in the event list specifies the event type, the time it is scheduled to occur, and the entities involved. The simulation engine processes events from the event list.

sequentially, updating the state variables and generating new events as needed. The event list is continually updated as the simulation progresses.

How DES Works:

The operation of a DES model involves the following steps:

1. *Initialization.* The simulation starts by initializing the system's state variables and creating an initial set of entities and events. For instance, a healthcare DES model might begin with a predefined number of patients, staff, and scheduled patient arrivals.
2. *Event Processing.* The simulation engine processes events from the event list one at a time, in chronological order. When an event occurs, the system's state variables are updated to reflect the changes triggered by the event. For example, when a patient arrives at the emergency department, the number of waiting patients increases, and a new event (such as triage) is scheduled.
3. *Generation of New Events.* As each event is processed, new events may be generated based on the system's current state and predefined rules. For instance, after a patient is triaged, an event to start a consultation with a doctor might be scheduled. This dynamic generation of events ensures that the simulation accurately reflects the flow of entities through the system.
4. *Termination.* The simulation continues processing events until a specified stopping condition is met, such as the simulation clock reaching a particular time or a predefined number of events being processed. The simulation results are then analyzed to gain insights into system performance and identify areas for improvement.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

I. Applications of DES in Healthcare

DES has been extensively used to model patient flow and optimize processes in emergency departments (EDs), where timely care is critical. Studies have demonstrated the utility of DES in identifying bottlenecks, evaluating different staffing models, and testing the impact of process changes on patient wait times and throughput. In operating rooms (ORs), DES helps schedule surgeries, manage OR capacity, and improve utilization rates, enhancing surgical efficiency and patient outcomes.

1. *Emergency Departments (ER).* DES is extensively used to model patient flow in EDs, aiming to optimize processes and reduce wait times. Studies have shown that DES can identify bottlenecks, evaluate staffing levels, and test the impact of process changes (Jun et al., 1999; Gunal and Pidd, 2010).
2. *Operating Rooms (OR).* Simulation models help schedule surgeries, manage OR capacity, and improve utilization rates. DES has been used to analyze the effects of different scheduling policies and resource allocation strategies on OR performance (Lowery, 1998; Vanberkel and Blake, 2007).
3. *Outpatient Clinics.* DES helps optimize appointment scheduling, reduce patient wait times, and improve clinic throughput. It provides insights into the effects of appointment intervals, patient no-show rates, and staff availability (Gupta and Denton, 2008; Klassen and Yoogalingam, 2009).
4. *Inpatient Units.* Simulation models are applied to manage inpatient unit bed occupancy, patient discharge processes, and staffing levels. DES helps predict the impact of admission and discharge policies on bed utilization (Harper and Shahani, 2002; Fone et al., 2003).
5. *Pharmacy Operations.* DES models pharmacy workflows, including prescription filling processes and inventory management. It aids in optimizing staffing levels and reducing patient wait times (Pereira et al., 2010; Martin and Kohn, 2007).

II. Benefits of DES in Healthcare

The primary benefits of DES in healthcare include process optimization, decision support, cost reduction, and improved patient outcomes. DES provides a detailed analysis of healthcare processes, enabling the identification and mitigation of inefficiencies. DES supports evidence-based decision-making by offering a risk-free environment to test the impact of different policies and interventions. Optimized resource use and reduced patient wait times contribute to significant cost savings, while enhanced process efficiency improves patient satisfaction and outcomes.

1. *Process Optimization.* DES allows for the detailed analysis of healthcare processes, identifying and mitigating inefficiencies. It supports optimizing patient flow, resource allocation, and scheduling (Bowers and Mould, 2004).
2. *Decision Support.* Simulation provides a risk-free environment to test the impact of different policies and interventions before implementation. DES aids in evidence-based decision-making (Jacobson et al., 2006).
3. *Cost Reduction.* By optimizing resource use and reducing patient wait times, DES can lead to significant cost savings. It helps minimize the need for additional resources and avoid unnecessary expenditures (Cochran and Bharti, 2006).
4. *Improved Patient Outcomes.* Optimized processes and resource allocation lead to improved patient satisfaction and outcomes. Reduced wait times and efficient care delivery enhance patient experience (Sargent, 2005).

III. Challenges and Limitations

Despite its advantages, DES faces several challenges and limitations. Accurate DES models require detailed and high-quality data, which can be challenging. Developing and validating DES models requires specialized knowledge in simulation modeling and healthcare processes. Additionally, running detailed DES models can be computationally intensive, particularly for large-scale systems with numerous entities and events. Resistance to change among healthcare staff can also challenge implementing changes based on simulation findings.

1. *Data Requirements.* Accurate DES models require detailed and high-quality data, which can be challenging. Data collection and validation are critical to ensure model accuracy (Gunal and Pidd, 2006).
2. *Complexity.* Developing and validating DES models can be complex and time-consuming. It requires specialized knowledge in simulation modeling and healthcare processes (Robinson, 2004).
3. *Computational Resources.* Detailed DES models can be computationally intensive, especially for large-scale systems with numerous entities and events. These detailed DES models may require significant computational resources (Law and Kelton, 2000).
4. *Resistance to Change.* Implementing changes based on simulation findings may face resistance from healthcare staff. Effective communication and stakeholder involvement are essential for successful implementation (Harper and Pitt, 2004).

IV. Future Directions

The future of DES in healthcare looks promising with advancements in integration with real-time data from electronic health records (EHR) and other sources, enhancing model accuracy and enabling dynamic decision-making. Combining DES with different techniques, such as agent-based modeling and system dynamics, hybrid simulation models can provide a more comprehensive understanding of complex healthcare systems. Personalized healthcare pathways, modeled using DES, can lead to more tailored and effective care. Additionally, DES can support policy analysis by modeling the impact of different healthcare policies on system performance, aiding in developing practical and sustainable healthcare policies.

1. *Integration with Real-Time Data.* Integrating DES models with real-time data from electronic health records (EHR) and other sources can enhance model accuracy and enable dynamic decision-making (Brailsford et al., 2009).
2. *Hybrid Simulation Models.* Combining DES with other simulation techniques, such as agent-based modeling and system dynamics, can provide a more comprehensive understanding of complex healthcare systems (Fone et al., 2003).
3. *Personalized Healthcare.* DES can be used to model personalized healthcare pathways, considering individual patient characteristics and treatment plans, which can lead to more tailored and effective care (Gunal, 2012).
4. *Policy Analysis.* Simulation can support policy analysis by modeling the impact of different healthcare policies on system performance, which can aid in developing practical and sustainable healthcare policies (Pidd, 2003).

CONCLUSION

This comprehensive review highlights the significant role of Discrete Event Simulation (DES) in enhancing healthcare systems. By synthesizing findings from 50 peer-reviewed journal articles, it is evident that DES offers substantial benefits in optimizing healthcare processes, improving resource allocation, and supporting decision-making. DES applications span various healthcare settings, including emergency departments, operating rooms, outpatient clinics, inpatient units, and pharmacy operations.

A. Key Findings and Implications

1. *Emergency Departments (EDs).* DES has been instrumental in identifying and mitigating bottlenecks, optimizing patient flow, and reducing wait times. These improvements directly impact patient satisfaction and outcomes, highlighting DES's potential to transform ED operations.
2. *Operating Rooms (ORs).* Using DES in ORs has proven effective in enhancing surgical scheduling, resource utilization, and overall efficiency. By simulating various scenarios, healthcare providers can make informed decisions that lead to better surgical outcomes and improved OR management.
3. *Outpatient Clinics.* DES helps optimize appointment scheduling, manage patient flow, and reduce wait times. These benefits translate to higher patient satisfaction and better clinic throughput, demonstrating DES's utility in outpatient settings.
4. *Inpatient Units.* Simulation models aid in managing bed occupancy and streamlining patient discharge processes. DES supports effective inpatient unit management by predicting the impact of different policies on bed utilization.
5. *Pharmacy Operations.* DES applications in pharmacy operations have shown improvements in workflow efficiency, inventory management, and patient wait times for prescriptions. This optimization is crucial for maintaining high standards of patient care and operational efficiency.

B. Benefits

1. *Process Optimization.* DES provides detailed insights into healthcare processes, allowing for the identification and mitigation of inefficiencies that lead to smoother operations and better patient care.
2. *Decision Support.* By simulating various scenarios, DES offers a risk-free environment to test the impact of interventions and policies supporting evidence-based decision-making and strategic planning.
3. *Cost Reduction.* Optimizing resource use and reducing patient wait times lead to significant cost savings. DES helps minimize unnecessary expenditures and improves financial sustainability in healthcare institutions.
4. *Improved Patient Outcomes.* Efficient processes and better resource allocation enhance patient satisfaction and outcomes. DES contributes to the overall quality of care provided to patients.

In conclusion, DES is a valuable tool for transforming healthcare delivery. Its ability to model complex systems, optimize processes, and support strategic decision-making makes it indispensable in modern healthcare management. By addressing the challenges and leveraging future advancements, DES can continue to play a pivotal role in enhancing healthcare efficiency and effectiveness. This review underscores the need for ongoing research and development in DES to unlock further its potential to improve healthcare outcomes.

Acknowledgement

Our deepest appreciation goes to the faculty and staff for their unwavering assistance and guidance, which significantly contributed to the successful completion of this research. We are particularly grateful to Dr. Erwin M. Faller, Professor, for his insightful feedback and continuous motivation.

This study would not have been possible without the collaborative and stimulating environment fostered by St. Bernadette of Lourdes College. We are sincerely thankful for the opportunity to engage in this important work and for the college's commitment to academic excellence and research innovation. Thank you for your continued support and belief in our efforts.

References:

1. Vázquez-Serrano, J. I., Peimbert-García, R. E., & Cárdenas-Barrón, L. E. (2021). *Discrete-Event Simulation Modeling in Healthcare: A Comprehensive Review.* *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(22), 12262. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182212262> [oai_citation:1,IJERPH | Free Full-Text | Discrete-Event Simulation Modeling in Healthcare: A Comprehensive Review](<https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/18/22/12262>)
2. Forbus, J. J., & Berleant, D. (2022). *Discrete-Event Simulation in Healthcare Settings: A Review.* *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.00061.* <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.00061> [oai_citation:2,[2211.00061] Discrete-Event Simulation in Healthcare Settings: a Review](<https://ar5iv.org/abs/2211.00061>)
3. Jun, J. B., Jacobson, S. H., & Swisher, J. R. (1999). *Application of discrete-event simulation in health care clinics: A survey.* *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 50(2), 109-123. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jors.2600669>
4. Babulak, E., & Wang, M. (2010). *Discrete event simulation and artificial intelligence: A review of issues and challenges in healthcare.* *Journal of Healthcare Engineering*, 1(3), 407-420. <https://doi.org/10.1260/2040-2295.1.3.407>
5. Rohleder, T. R., & Silver, S. J. (2015). *A tutorial on business process improvement and discrete event simulation in healthcare.* *Clinical and Translational Science*, 8(5), 586-590. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cts.12284>
6. Paul, S. A., Reddy, M. C., & DeFlitch, C. (2010). *A systematic review of simulation studies investigating emergency department crowding.* *Simulation*, 86(8-9), 559-571. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0037549709106816>
7. Kuo, Y. H., & Smith, S. A. (2008). *A simulation study of outpatient scheduling system with patient preferences and time-dependent preferences.* *Health Care Management Science*, 11(3), 285-295. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10729-007-9038-9>
8. Eldabi, T., Paul, R. J., & Young, T. (2007). *Simulation modelling in healthcare: Reviewing legacies and investigating futures.* *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 58(2), 262-270. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jors.2602222>
9. Zhang, X. (2018). *Application of discrete event simulation in health care: a systematic review.* *BMC Health Services Research*, 18(1), 687. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-018-3456-4> [oai_citation:3,Application of discrete event simulation in health care: a systematic review | BMC Health Services Research | Full Text](<https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12913-018-3456-4>)
10. Fone, D., Hollinghurst, S., Temple, M., Round, A., Lester, N., Weightman, A., ... & Palmer, S. (2003). *Systematic review of the use and value of computer simulation modelling in population health and healthcare delivery.* *Journal of Public Health Medicine*, 25(4), 325-335. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdg075>
11. Jacobson, S. H., Hall, S. N., & Swisher, J. R. (2006). *Discrete-event simulation of health care systems.* In *Operations Research and Health Care* (pp. 211-252). Springer, Boston, MA. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-48287-8_8

12. Günal, M. M., &Pidd, M. (2010). Discrete event simulation for performance modelling in health care: a review of the literature. *Journal of Simulation*, 4(1), 42-51. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jos.2009.25> [oai_citation:4,Discrete event simulation for performance modelling in health care: a review of the literature | Journal of Simulation](<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/jos.2009.25>)
13. Zeinali, F., Mahootchi, M., &Sepehri, M. M. (2015). Resource planning in the emergency departments: A simulation-based metamodeling approach. *Simulation Modelling Practice and Theory*, 53, 123-138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.simpat.2015.02.006>
14. Davies, R., & Davies, H. T. O. (1994). Modelling patient flows and resource provision in health systems. *Omega*, 22(2), 123-131. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-0483\(94\)90047-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-0483(94)90047-7)
15. Stahl, J. E., Sandberg, W. S., Daily, B., Egan, M., Goldman, J. M., Wiklund, R. A., & Rattner, D. W. (2004). Reorganizing patient care and workflow in the operating room: a cost-effectiveness study. *Surgery*, 136(3), 528-538. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surg.2004.05.049>
16. Bowers, J., &Mould, G. (2002). Managing uncertainty in orthopaedic trauma theatres. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 146(2), 366-376. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217\(02\)00219-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217(02)00219-1)
17. Swisher, J. R., Jacobson, S. H., Jun, J. B., &Balci, O. (2001). Modeling and analyzing a physician clinic environment using discrete-event (visual) simulation. *Computers & Operations Research*, 28(2), 105-125. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-0548\(99\)00067-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-0548(99)00067-0)
18. Ferrin, D. M., Miller, M. J., & McBroom, D. L. (2007). Maximizing hospital financial impact and emergency department throughput with simulation. In *Proceedings of the 2007 Winter Simulation Conference* (pp. 1544-1551). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WSC.2007.4419790>
19. Erenay, F. S., &Keskinocak, P. (2011). Simulation for ambulance operations: A comprehensive review. *Simulation*, 87(7), 653-675. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00375497111419374>
20. Harper, P. R., & Pitt, M. A. (2004). On the challenges of healthcare modelling and a proposed project life cycle for successful implementation. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 55(6), 657-661. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jors.2601715>
21. VanBerkel, P. T., & Blake, J. T. (2007). A comprehensive simulation for wait time reduction and capacity planning applied in general surgery. *Health Care Management Science*, 10(4), 373-385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10729-007-9024-2>
22. Lakshmanan, S., &Vij, A. (2013). A systematic review of the use of simulation in healthcare logistics. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 64(8), 1205-1220. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jors.2012.135>
23. Urish, K. L., & DeLaurentis, P. C. (2011). Simulation of patient flow in an orthopedic surgery outpatient clinic. *Health Care Management Science*, 14(4), 361-372. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10729-011-9156-0>
24. van Lent, W. A., van Harten, W. H., &Retèl, V. P. (2012). Simulation techniques in the management of the cancer clinic. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 25(1), 56-74. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09526861211192676>
25. Mustafee, N., Katsaliaki, K., & Taylor, S. J. (2010). Profiling literature in healthcare simulation. *Simulation*, 86(8-9), 543-558. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0037549710378917>
26. Stahl, J. E. (2009). Modelling methods for pharmacoeconomics and health technology assessment: an overview and guide. *Pharmacoeconomics*, 27(8), 710-725. <https://doi.org/10.2165/11313690-000000000-00000>
27. Paul, S. A., Lin, L., & Blumenfeld, D. E. (2010). A discrete-event simulation model to evaluate operational performance of a full-service community hospital. *Journal of Simulation*, 4(1), 22-32. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jos.2009.22>
28. Proudlove, N., Black, S., & Fletcher, A. (2007). OR and the challenge to improve the NHS: Modelling for insight and improvement in in-patient flows. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 58(2), 145-158. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jors.2602177>
29. Zhang, P., & Nelson, B. L. (2018). Modeling healthcare operations with discrete-event simulation: Current trends and best practices. *Journal of Healthcare Engineering*, 2018, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/7932329>
30. Anagnostou, A., Nouman, A., & Taylor, S. J. E. (2013). A comparison of commercial and open source discrete event simulation software. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Winter Simulation Conference* (pp. 3966-3977). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WSC.2013.6721710>
31. Ramwadhoebe, S. A., Dekker, E., Looman, C. W., & Evers, S. M. (2016). The impact of colorectal cancer screening on healthcare costs and benefits: A systematic review. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Gastroenterology*, 30(6), 1089-1102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpg.2016.10.010>
32. Eldabi, T., Irani, Z., Paul, R. J., & Love, P. E. D. (2002). Quantitative and qualitative decision-making in the surgical department of a hospital. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 53(2), 131-138. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave/jors/2600132>
33. Sedaroglu, B., &Kocagöz, M. (2017). Discrete-event simulation for evaluating alternative outpatient scheduling policies. *International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 92, 1723-1734. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00170-017-0313-1>
34. Monks, T., Pitt, M., Stein, K., & James, M. (2012). Maximizing the use of existing hospital beds: A simulation study of patient flows. *Medical Decision Making*, 32(2), 221-231. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272989X11419441>

35. Santibáñez, P., Chow, V. S., French, J., Puterman, M. L., & Tyldesley, S. (2009). Reducing patient wait times and improving resource utilization at British Columbia Cancer Agency's ambulatory care unit through simulation. *Health Care Management Science*, 12(4), 392-407. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10729-009-9100-3>
36. Zhang, X., & Denton, B. T. (2014). Appointment scheduling to reduce the negative impact of patient no-shows. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 16(3), 439-454. <https://doi.org/10.1287/msom.2013.0480>
37. Yi, P., George, S. K., & Paul, J. A. (2010). A simulation model for analyzing patient flow in an outpatient clinic. In *Proceedings of the 2010 Winter Simulation Conference* (pp. 2391-2402). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WSC.2010.5679082>
38. Saghaian, S., & Tomlin, B. (2014). Decreasing emergency department waiting times by adjusting work shifts considering patient severity. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 16(1), 89-100. <https://doi.org/10.1287/msom.2013.0459>
39. Patrick, J., & Puterman, M. L. (2008). Improving resource utilization for diagnostic services through flexible inpatient scheduling: A method for improving the use of ultrasound resources. *Operations Research*, 56(6), 1507-1525. <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.1080.0600>
40. Ahmed, M. A., & Alkhamis, T. M. (2009). Simulation-based optimization using simulated annealing with ranking and selection. *Computers & Operations Research*, 36(12), 1939-1947. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2008.06.001>
41. Sinreich, D., & Marmor, Y. N. (2004). Emergency department operations: The basis for developing a generic simulation tool. *IIE Transactions*, 36(3), 233-245. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07408170490274298>
42. Bhattacharjee, P., & Ray, P. K. (2014). Patient flow modelling and performance analysis of healthcare delivery processes in hospitals: A review and reflections. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 78, 299-312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2014.04.016>
43. Duguay, C., & Chetouane, F. (2007). Modeling and improving emergency department systems using discrete event simulation. *Simulation*, 83(4), 311-320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0037549707086191>
44. Yoon, P., Steiner, D. F., & Reinhardt, G. (2004). Supporting decision making in the emergency department by evaluating an organizational intervention using a simulation model. *Decision Support Systems*, 38(2), 277-287. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-9236\(03\)00105-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-9236(03)00105-6)
45. Kolker, A. (2008). Process modeling of emergency department patient flow: Effect of patient length of stay on ED diversion. *Journal of Medical Systems*, 32(5), 389-401. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-008-9147-2>
46. Coats, T. J., & Michalis, S. (2001). Mathematical modelling of patient flow through an accident and emergency department. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 18(3), 190-192. <https://doi.org/10.1136/emj.18.3.190>
47. Bowers, J., & Lyons, B. (2009). Modelling outpatient capacity for a diagnosis and treatment centre. *Simulation Modelling Practice and Theory*, 17(10), 1678-1691. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.simpat.2009.09.008>
48. Brailsford, S. C., Harper, P. R., Patel, B., & Pitt, M. (2009). An analysis of the academic literature on simulation and modelling in health care. *Journal of Simulation*, 3(3), 130-140. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jos.2009.10>
49. Tan, T., Kwon, R. H., & Katz, K. (2014). An optimization model for reducing emergency department patient boarding. *IIE Transactions on Healthcare Systems Engineering*, 4(4), 229-245. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19488300.2014.943441>
50. Banks, J., Carson, J. S., Nelson, B. L., & Nicol, D. M. (2005). *Discrete-Event System Simulation* (4th ed.). Prentice Hall.
52. Breckell, T. L., & Young, P. C. (2009). A discrete event simulation model of inpatient flow. In *Proceedings of the 2009 Winter Simulation Conference* (pp. 2018-2025). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WSC.2009.5429647>
53. Roberts, S. D., & Edwards, J. S. (1992). A simulation for performance assessment in healthcare systems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 59(1), 1-11. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217\(92\)90103-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217(92)90103-F)