

# An inbox total does not show which work is stuck.

A message count can conceal aging items, routing loops and unclear ownership. Distinguish incoming volume from unresolved work.

## Proposed response

1. Choose an agreed message category and review period. Use approved aggregate reporting rather than exporting patient messages.
2. Review volume, unresolved age, routing and turnaround together. Keep definitions consistent.
3. Choose one operational exception, assign its next owner and review after the agreed response. Clinical priority decisions stay with the responsible team.

## Checklist

- [ ] The category and review period are defined.
- [ ] Incoming work is separate from unresolved items.
- [ ] Oldest-item age and owner are visible in approved reporting.
- [ ] A routing or ownership change has an agreed review.

## Worked example

Fictional example, not a client record or reported outcome.

|          |                                                                  |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Category | Fictional administrative request                                 |
| Issue    | Repeated reassignment between roles                              |
| Check    | Confirm the routing rule and final responsible role              |
| Measure  | Unresolved age and repeat reassignments                          |
| Review   | Compare the same category and definitions after an agreed change |

# Check it locally. Inspect the sources.

## Run the check

Use fictional messages with different ages and owners. Is an old, repeatedly reassigned item visible even when the total count looks ordinary?

## Candidate local measure

Candidate local measures: volume, unresolved age, routing repetition and turnaround by category. A lower count alone does not establish less work or better care.

## Scope

The research is descriptive. This proposed check is not a validated burnout score or evidence of a causal improvement.

## Independent public sources

### Alberta specialist In Basket study

Peer-reviewed descriptive study | S037 | Checked 2026-10-25

The study examined In Basket time, message volume and turnaround among Alberta specialists.

Limit: Its setting and descriptive design do not establish a universal benchmark or show that this checklist reduces workload.

<https://www.jmir.org/2024/1/e53122/>

Proposed checks are Clinopilot operational synthesis. Independent sources do not establish a Clinopilot client result.

<https://clinopilot.com/proof/inbox-backlog/>