Patient and Provider Perspectives on Telemedicine use in Canadian Gastroenterology Clinics during the COVID-19 pandemic: A Survey study
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Abstract

Background: Telemedicine has revolutionized access to medical care. This was particularly palpable during the COVID pandemic and within gastroenterology. Telehealth can improve access to patients remotely, and lead to high patient and clinician satisfaction. However, questions remain surrounding patient selection and provider considerations. We conducted a Canadian study to examine patient and provider preferences and experiences in telehealth.

Methods: An anonymous online survey was conducted amongst patients of an urban gastroenterology practice, as well as Canadian gastroenterologists, evaluating experiences and preferences in utility of telemedicine.

Results: Of 1236 patients contacted, 181 (15%) respondents were aged 18-89, 60% were female, and 58% had inflammatory bowel disease (IBD). Patient satisfaction with telehealth was high across all characteristics. Patients used both phone calls (61%) and video/audio applications (50%); higher use of phone calls was associated with older age (p=0.02). Patients living more than 30km from clinic and with IBD were more likely to prefer telehealth visits (p<0.01). Most providers (96%) and patients (96%) believed that telehealth use should continue for certain patients or follow up visits after the pandemic. Of 100 providers contacted, 25 respondents reported using phone calls (96%) and video/audio applications (44%). Providers perceived follow up of benign endoscopic pathology (96%) and general follow up visits (92%) to be most suitable for telehealth.

Conclusion: Canadian gastroenterology providers and patients appreciate telehealth and favor continued use after the pandemic. Consideration of patient factors such as age, distance, health issue, and follow up status can further optimize ongoing telehealth options.
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Background

Telemedicine, or telehealth is defined as the use of telecommunication media to facilitate healthcare interactions. Prior to the COVID pandemic, the American Medical Association found that gastroenterologists had the second lowest utilization rate of telehealth including just 7.9% of all internal medicine specialties [1]. Within the first four weeks of the COVID pandemic, there was a rapid expansion of telehealth; a real-world study of diverse gastroenterology practices noted an increase in telehealth visits from 5% to 94% [2]. Similar uptake of telehealth for outpatient appointments was seen in Ontario, where virtual care increased from 1.6% in 2019 to 70.6% in 2020 [3].
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Literature preceding the COVID pandemic demonstrated the efficacy of telemedicine in various areas of gastroenterology. Telemedicine appointments for inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) patients were time- and cost-efficient, highly acceptable to patients, and appeared to be effective in maintaining disease control [4,5]. Patients with hepatitis C infection, managed through telemedicine, had similarly high rates of sustained virologic response compared to those treated in-person [6]. In patients with cirrhosis, telehealth evaluation reduced the time from referral to evaluation and listing for transplant [7]. Pre-colonoscopy teleconsultation led to equivalent patient satisfaction compared to in-person appointments and increased guideline-concordant endoscopic surveillance rates [8,9].

Early experiences of telehealth use in gastroenterology clinics during the COVID-19 pandemic have reported high levels of satisfaction from both patients and providers [2,10,11]. There was a corresponding rise in clinic capacity, decline in waiting lists, and increase in clinic revenue [12]. In patients managed by telehealth, medication adherence was non-inferior to those with in-person visits [13].

While telehealth was an effective solution to socially distanced care, ongoing use has identified new questions. Higher rates of patient dissatisfaction and telehealth failure have been associated with older age, ethnic minorities, lower socioeconomic status, shorter time under medical care, and gastrointestinal conditions outside of IBD [14-18]. This suggests that patient selection for telehealth requires further optimization to avoid inadvertently disadvantaging vulnerable or marginalized groups. Providers are also faced with novel considerations, including consent, confidentiality, data privacy, licensing, reimbursement, choice of telehealth media, and incorporation of trainees in virtual clinics, which may affect their preferences surrounding virtual clinics when it is no longer necessitated by pandemic measures [2,19].

Limited Canadian studies on patient or provider satisfaction have suggested that telehealth use in gastroenterology clinics will continue beyond the pandemic [20-22]. However, none have examined preferences for future use of telehealth or factors associated with patient satisfaction. Our study sought to bridge this gap by examining both patient and provider perspectives to inform optimal telehealth use in Canada during the pandemic and beyond.

Methods

Study design

An anonymous online survey was distributed to patients (Appendix A) and physicians (Appendix B) regarding their experiences and preferences regarding telehealth. Patients were recruited from a tertiary Gastroenterology clinic in downtown Vancouver, in which 11 gastroenterologists work. All patients had previously consented to be contacted for research purposes and were invited by email to participate in the patient survey with a cover letter explaining the potential benefits, risks, and measures to participate. The physician survey was distributed by email to Canadian gastroenterologists on a mailing list and through the Canadian Association of Gastroenterology website. All participants provided consent prior to participating in the surveys. Both surveys collected responses from August 30, 2020 to February 22, 2021. Ethics approval was obtained from the University of British Columbia Clinical Research Ethics Board prior to commencement of any research activities.

Survey tool

The SimpleSurvey software was used to collect responses from patients and providers. The survey was developed through consensus between 4 academic gastroenterologists. The physician survey included 17 items including physicians’ demographic and practice details, current use and preferences towards telehealth media, experiences with implementation of telehealth, and opinions on the role of telehealth following the COVID-19 pandemic. The patient survey was comprised of 22 items covering clinicodemographic information, experiences of the telehealth appointment (including satisfaction rating from 1-10 where 10 is very satisfied), impact of telehealth use on health behaviours, preferences of telehealth compared to in-person visits, and future use after the pandemic.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistical analysis was conducted based on the total number of responses for each survey item. Per visit analysis was undertaken to assess for any correlation between factors associated with phone or audio/video use, satisfaction rating, and patient preferences for telehealth or in-person appointments in the future using Mann-Whitney U test, ANOVA, and Chi-square or Fisher’s exact test, with pairwise comparisons, where applicable. Analysis was conducted using R version 4.2.0 and statistical significance was defined as P-value less than 0.05 in a two-tailed test.

Results

Patient respondent characteristics

Of 1236 patients contacted, 181 (15%) responded to their survey (Table 1). Patient ages were similarly distributed between 18-89 years old, 60% were female, and 66% of patients lived less than 30km from the clinic. Most patients (78%) had met their provider prior to the telehealth visit. Gastrointestinal issues discussed at the telehealth visit included inflammatory bowel disease (58%), GERD and esophageal disease (14%), liver disease (7%), and pending diagnosis (5%). English was the preferred language in 98% of patients and 62% had previously used telehealth for appointments. Most patients self-reported that their technology skill level was either average (61%) or above average (35%).
Patient experiences of telehealth

Most patients used phone calls alone (61%), or a video and audio application (50%) such as Zoom, doxy.me, and Medeo (Table 2). Higher use of phone calls was associated with older age (particularly those aged >60 years, p=0.02) and living within 30 km of the clinic (p<0.01) (Table 3). Around a third of patients (30%) reported their appointments starting before the scheduled time and 45% started within 5 minutes of the time scheduled. The majority of patients reported the same willingness to follow advice (90%) and felt their concerns were addressed (86%) at the telehealth visit. Patients reported sufficient opportunity to ask questions (91%) and few patients reported withholding information during the televisit (11%) or being concerned about the lack of a physical exam (18%). When patients were asked which modalities they wished to use in the future, 50% selected phone calls and 56% selected video and audio applications.

### Table 1: Patient respondents’ characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td>1236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed survey</td>
<td>181 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>23 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>40 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>23 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>31 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>35 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>27 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (%)</td>
<td>107 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home to clinic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30 km</td>
<td>97 (66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30 km</td>
<td>77 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as preferred language</td>
<td>170 (98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously used telehealth</td>
<td>62 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported technology skill level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>8 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>104 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>59 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of encounters prior to telehealth visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>37 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>55 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>45 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>33 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health issue discussed at telehealth visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemia</td>
<td>9 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflammatory bowel disease</td>
<td>91 (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritable bowel syndrome</td>
<td>9 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver disease</td>
<td>17 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreas disease</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERD and esophageal disease</td>
<td>25 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending diagnosis</td>
<td>13 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Patient experiences of telehealth visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telehealth medium used†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone call alone</td>
<td>100 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio call via internet application</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and audio (Zoom, Doxy.me, Medeo)</td>
<td>81 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred telehealth medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone call alone</td>
<td>80 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio via internet</td>
<td>11 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio and video via internet</td>
<td>89 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of telehealth appointment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before scheduled time</td>
<td>48 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 5 minutes</td>
<td>72 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 5-10 minutes</td>
<td>22 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 10-20 minutes</td>
<td>9 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 20-30 minutes</td>
<td>7 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After &gt;30 minutes</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to follow advice with telehealth visit‡</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>10 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>144 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns addressed during telehealth visit†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better addressed</td>
<td>7 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>136 (86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse addressed</td>
<td>16 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned about lack of physical exam</td>
<td>28 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient opportunity to ask questions</td>
<td>145 (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference after the COVID-19 pandemic:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telehealth visits</td>
<td>62 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>51 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-office visits</td>
<td>45 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of telehealth after the COVID-19 pandemic:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All possible visits</td>
<td>44 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up visits only</td>
<td>108 (68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No role</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†out of 163 unique respondents to the question (90%)
‡compared to in-person appointment

Table 3: Factors associated with patient satisfaction with telehealth visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>Mean satisfaction Mean ± SD [median]</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Prefer Office</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Prefer telehealth</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Phone call</th>
<th>Audio/Video</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-39</td>
<td>69 (38)</td>
<td>8.35 ± 2.03 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>54 (30)</td>
<td>8.7 ± 1.94 [9.5]</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-89</td>
<td>57 (32)</td>
<td>8.84 ± 1.56 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>38‡</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>111 (61)</td>
<td>8.57 ± 1.99 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70 (39)</td>
<td>8.56 ± 1.94 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home to clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30 km</td>
<td>97 (66)</td>
<td>8.58 ± 1.83 [9]</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30 km</td>
<td>77 (44)</td>
<td>8.64 ± 1.92 [9.5]</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous telehealth use</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>103 (57)</td>
<td>8.58 ± 1.94 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77 (43)</td>
<td>8.65 ± 1.77 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported technology skill level</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>8 (5)</td>
<td>8.72 ± 1.86 [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>104 (61)</td>
<td>8.59 ± 1.87 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>59 (35)</td>
<td>8 ± 1.93 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health issue addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERD and esophageal disease</td>
<td>24 (14)</td>
<td>8.42 ± 1.72 [8.5]</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflammatory bowel disease</td>
<td>102 (58)</td>
<td>8.66 ± 1.84 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver disease</td>
<td>13 (7)</td>
<td>8.23 ± 2.17 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending diagnosis</td>
<td>8 (5)</td>
<td>7.88 ± 3.23 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other†</td>
<td>29 (16)</td>
<td>8.97 ± 1.55 [10]</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of visit</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New patient</td>
<td>37 (21)</td>
<td>8.3 ± 2.21 [9]</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>143 (79)</td>
<td>8.69 ± 1.77 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telehealth medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone call alone</td>
<td>96 (54)</td>
<td>8.58 ± 1.85 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio call</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>6.5 ± 4.95 [6.5]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and audio</td>
<td>81 (45)</td>
<td>8.68 ± 1.81 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†includes anemia, cancer, functional disorders, pancreas/biliary disease, and pre-endoscopy consultation
‡compared to patients aged 18-39 years.
When patients were asked to rate their telemedicine appointment on a scale of 1 (very dissatisfied) to 10 (very satisfied), 164 patients (88%) were satisfied or very satisfied (rating 7-10 out of 10) compared to 10 patients (5%) were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied (rating 1-4 out of 10). Patient satisfaction was similar amongst different telehealth media (Figure 1). Mean patient satisfaction was similar across gender, previous telehealth use, health issue addressed, and type of visit (new patient or follow-up); younger patients (18-39 years old), those residing less than 30 km from the clinic, and below average technology skill had slightly lower satisfaction ratings compared to their counterparts, though this was not statistically significant (Table 3).

Patient preferences for use of telehealth

Slightly more patients preferred telehealth visits (39%) compared to in-office visits (28%), and 32% of patients were indifferent (Table 2). Patients living more than 30 km away from the clinic and those with inflammatory bowel disease were more likely to prefer telehealth visits over office visits (p<0.01; Table 3). Most patients felt telehealth after the COVID-19 pandemic to be most suitable for follow-up appointments (68%) while almost a third (28%) endorsed using telehealth for all possible visits (Figure 2).

Of 62 patients who preferred telehealth, reasons included avoiding travel (82%), requiring less time off work (63%), being able to avoid going into the doctor’s office (58%), and telehealth appointments making it easier for friends and family to attend (11%).

Reasons for preferring in-person visits in 45 patients were better rapport (56%), lack of physical exam with telehealth (56%), privacy concerns (9%), and low level of skill with technology (2%).
Provider experiences of telehealth

Overall, provider respondents had positive experiences with telehealth. Most providers used phone calls (96%) or a video and audio application (44%) such as Zoom, Doxy.me, and Medeo (Table 5). Relative ranking of telehealth media demonstrated a preference towards phone call alone and video/audio with Zoom over other modalities including Doxy.me, Medeo, and audio call by internet application (Figure 3). Around half (48%) of providers felt that video did not have added value over audio alone and 80% felt that patients would be just as forthcoming with information with telemedicine, compared to in-person visits. Most physicians believed that the lack of physical exam would only minimally impair (48%) or not impact (44%) the quality of their assessment. The use of telehealth led to most appointments either running more on time (40%) or the same as in-person visits (36%). Compared to in-person visits, patients were perceived to have more appreciation (52%) or the same appreciation (44%) of the appointment, and financial remuneration for telehealth was the same for 96% of providers. Most providers (96%) felt that telehealth should continue for certain patients after the COVID-19 pandemic.

Table 5: Physician experiences of telehealth applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of media used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone call alone</td>
<td>24 (96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio call via internet application</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video and audio (Zoom, Doxy.me, Medeo, other)</td>
<td>11 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination phone and Zoom</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe that video has no added value over audio</td>
<td>12 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of the lack of physical exam on quality of</td>
<td>20 (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>11 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimally impaired</td>
<td>12 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatly impaired</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of telehealth on appointment timing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More on time</td>
<td>10 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as in-person visits</td>
<td>9 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running later</td>
<td>6 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression of patients’ appreciation of telehealth:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less appreciated</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same appreciation</td>
<td>11 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More appreciated</td>
<td>13 (52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Better compensated for equivalent time: 0 (0)
Same compensation: 24 (96)
Less compensated: 1 (4)
Role of telehealth after the COVID-19 pandemic:
No role: 1 (4)
Continue for certain patients: 24 (96)
Replace in office visits: 0 (0)

Preferred gastrointestinal conditions for telehealth visits included GERD (92%), celiac disease (88%), irritable bowel syndrome (80%), functional dyspepsia (80%), and eosinophilic esophagitis (80%) (Figure 5).

Figure 3: Physician relative ranking of telehealth media by physicians

Figure 4: Physician preferences for telehealth visit type (after the pandemic)
Discussion

Our study demonstrated that Canadian gastroenterology providers and patients of an urban clinic had positive experiences with telehealth and the vast majority (96% of both groups) believed it had a role following the pandemic. This reflects existing Canadian studies on telehealth satisfaction during the pandemic, which have found 83% of patients were satisfied with telehealth and 78% wished to continue telehealth appointments [20,22]. Similarly, an Alberta study of gastroenterology providers found that 88% were satisfied with telehealth and all survey respondents were willing to continue its use [21]. Phone calls were used more often than video and audio modalities by providers in our survey at 96% and 44%, respectively, whereas patients reported use at 61% and 50%, respectively. Preferences for phone or video/audio applications were similar in both groups. However, we observed that phone call use was associated with older age, concordant with previous literature that found the use of video-based telehealth visits declined with increasing age [16]. While we detected no association between technology skill level and audio/visual application use, previous studies have shown that patients are more receptive to video-based telehealth following training; further consideration in engaging older adults in video-based telehealth is needed as this population tends to have more medical complexity and may particularly benefit from visual evaluation [23].

Optimal patient selection for telehealth likely depends upon patient, provider, and telehealth media factors. While we did not detect any factors associated with a statistically significant difference in patient satisfaction, those preferring telehealth in the future tended to reside remotely and have a diagnosis of IBD. It is expected that IBD is compatible with telehealth as a chronic disease requiring frequent active management, for which multiple telehealth solutions have already demonstrated improved quality of life and reduction in hospital admissions [24-26]. Physician preferences for conditions best suited for telehealth are compatible with a previous study finding higher patient satisfaction for management of IBD and luminal conditions [14]. These findings also reinforce the compatibility of telehealth with the specialty of gastroenterology as many clinical queries can be adequately addressed virtually, such as discussion of endoscopic procedures, follow up of benign pathology, or disease monitoring with well-established biochemical markers. This is in contrast with other areas of medicine where management is dependent upon in-person assessment and physical exam. Other patient factors associated with lower satisfaction in previous studies include younger age, female gender, and new patient consultation (as opposed to follow-up appointments) [10,14,27]. While we did not find any association between new patient status and satisfaction or preference for telehealth, most providers (92%) in our survey preferred telehealth for follow-up visits. Finally, telehealth literature shows that video modalities are preferred over phone calls; however, patients in our study had similar preferences for phone calls (61%) compared to video applications (50%) and only half of providers felt video had added value over audio alone (48%) [2,27]. Our findings suggest that certain conditions such as luminal disease and IBD, long-distance residence, and follow-up visits may be best suited for telehealth, which may be through phone, audio, or video modalities. Possible reasons why phone is preferable is the user fatigue that exists with various on-line methods (i.e. passwords/downloading apps/virtual waiting rooms) that may be present in methods other than a simple phone call. As phone appointments are not equipped with security and privacy features built into dedicated telehealth modalities, further studies are required to investigate patient preferences surrounding consent and privacy.

In our survey, gastroenterology providers from the three most populous provinces in Canada reported few concerns with telehealth appointments and associated logistical considerations. Few providers were concerned about less information from patients (20%) or lack of physical exam (8%). Three-quarters of providers reported appointments being earlier than or the same as in-person visits and 96% reported no change in compensation for telehealth visits. This is reassuring as a previous survey on provider preference in Alberta elicited concerns on reimbursement and in some provinces decreased support for telehealth has already occurred [21,28]. Guidelines for telemedicine use have largely been in IBD or guidance for American providers surrounding privacy concerns, telehealth media, billing codes, and licensing [19,29]. Best practice recommendations for Canadian providers of general gastroenterology care are needed given the different practice landscape in Canada compared to the United States.

There are several limitations to our study, which highlights the need for future research. We had a low response rate of 15% for patients and 25% for providers contacted. There is likely a selection bias in our respondents as our design utilized an online survey, which selected patients and providers who tend to use technology as reflected by the low proportion of respondents reporting below-average technology skill level. While the survey was sent out to gastroenterologists of provinces and territories in Canada, respondents were only from three provinces, limiting the generalisability of our results as we would not capture other interprovincial
variations in provider experiences. Similarly, our patients were from a large urban clinic, which may not reflect other gastroenterology patients across the country, though we did have similar findings to existing studies in other provinces. Our sample size was too small to conduct certain analyses such as examining preferences amongst different audio and video media, and audio-only platforms. We have provided initial patient and provider preferences on telehealth use in gastroenterology, however objective markers of incomplete or failed telehealth appointments as well as collecting socioeconomic and ethnicity data can further clarify whether Canadian patients are disadvantaged by telehealth similar to findings in US literature [15,18]. Further, as telehealth use continues to grow possibly at the detriment of outpatient clinical education, future studies should examine how to best incorporate trainees into virtual clinic [30]. Finally, our survey was conducted during the pandemic, when the endorsement of telehealth was likely affected by the fear of communicable disease risk. Further research is required to elicit perspectives on telehealth use as the end of the pandemic draws near.

Conclusion

In summary, Canadian gastroenterologists and patients of an urban clinic had positive experiences with telehealth visits and would continue its use even after the pandemic. Phone and video-based telehealth visits were equally preferred by providers and patients, though older patients were more likely to have phone visits, suggesting that telehealth for older adults can be further optimized. Based on patient and provider preference, patients living in remote locations and with certain health issues, such as luminal disease or IBD, may be more suitable for telehealth visits. As telemedicine use will likely persist beyond the pandemic, understanding patient and provider preferences in the local context will enable Canadian gastroenterologists to optimize telehealth in the future.
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Appendix A: Patient Survey

What is your age?
18-30 years
30-40 years
40-50 years
50-60 years
60-70 years
70-80 years
80-90 years
Over 90 years

What is your gender?
M/F

How far do you live from the gastroenterologist’s office (1190 Hornby, Vancouver)?
Less than 5 km
5-15 km
15-30 km
30-100 km
Over 100 km

Is English your language of preference?
Yes/no

What is your language of preference?
-free text

How skilled do you consider yourself with regards to technology?
Below average
Average
Above average

How many times had you met this gastroenterologist prior to this tele-health visit?
None
1-3 visits
4-10 visits
More than 10 visits

Had you previously used tele-health to meet another healthcare professional?
Y/N

Which medium of tele-health did you use in your visit?
Phone call alone
Audio call via internet application
Video and audio – Zoom
Video and audio – Doxy.me
Video and audio - Medeo
Video and audio – other
Other – please specify

When did your tele-health appointment start?
Before scheduled time
5 minutes after the scheduled time
5-10 minutes after the scheduled time
10-20 minutes after the scheduled time
20-30 minutes after the scheduled time
Over 30 minutes after the scheduled time

Which medium of tele-health would you prefer in future visits?
Phone call alone
Audio via internet application
Video and audio via internet

How satisfied were you with the tele-health appointment/interaction?
0 → 10 (Visual analog scale)

Do you feel any difference in following the gastroenterologist’s advice because the visit occurred via tele-health?
More likely to follow advice
Less likely to follow advice
No difference in following advice

How well did the gastroenterologist address your concerns?
As well as an in-office visit
Better than an in-office visit
Less well than an in-office visit

Were you concerned about the lack of being physically examined during your tele-health visit?
Yes/no

Did you feel you had enough opportunity to ask questions?
Yes/no

Were your questions answered adequately during the tele-health visit?
Yes/no

Did you feel you with-held information you would have been likely to share in person?
Yes/no

From the date you were referred to a gastroenterologist, how long did it take for you to have your tele-health appointment?
Less than a week
1-2 weeks
2-4 weeks
1-2 months
2-4 months
4-6 months
More than 6 months

Once the COVID-19 pandemic is over, would you prefer tele-health visits compared to regular in office appointments?
Y/N/indifferent

If yes, why would you prefer tele-health visits to regular in office appointments?
Avoiding waiting in doctor’s office
Avoiding travel
It would be easier for my family members/friends to attend as well
Can attend from work or home without taking time off
Other – specify

If not, why would you prefer regular office appointments?
Establishing relationship with the doctor
I do not believe I am skilled enough with technology
I am concerned about the privacy of tele-health
Lack of physical examination by the consulting physician with tele-health concerns me
Other - specify

Once the COVID-19 pandemic is over, what role would you think tele-health should play in gastroenterology office visits?
Follow up visits after having met the gastroenterologist in person
All possible visits
No role for tele-health after the pandemic

What disease were you seen at the gastroenterologist for?
Still awaiting a diagnosis
Anemia or iron deficiency
Autoimmune hepatitis
Celiac disease
Eosinophilic esophagitis
Fatty liver/NASH/NAFLD
Functional dyspepsia
Gastroesophageal reflux disease/GERD/reflux/heartburn
Gastrointestinal cancer
Hepatitis B
Hepatitis C
Inflammatory bowel disease – Crohn’s disease
Inflammatory bowel disease – Ulcerative colitis
Inflammatory bowel disease – unsure if Crohn’s or Ulcerative colitis
Irritable bowel syndrome
Pancreatic cyst
Pancreatitis
Primary biliary cholangitis
Primary sclerosis cholangitis
Other - specify

If you have not received a diagnosis, then why were you referred to the gastroenterologist?
1. Abdominal pain
2. Nausea or vomiting
3. Problems swallowing
4. Diarrhea
5. Constipation
6. Blood in stools
7. Abnormal liver tests
8. Anemia
9. Other - specify

You have completed the survey. Thank you for participating.

Appendix B: Physician Survey

What is your age?
18-30 years
30-40 years
40-50 years
50-60 years
60-70 years
70-80 years
80-90 years
Over 90 years

What is your gender?
M/F

Where is your practice?
BC
AB
SK
MB
ON
QC
NS
NF
NB
PEI
Nunavut
Yukon
North West Territories

How would you describe your clinical practice?
Community gastroenterology – urban
Community gastroenterology – rural
Academic gastroenterology
Private gastroenterology
Do you have a subspecialty within gastroenterology?
No subspecialty
Therapeutic endoscopy
Motility
IBD
Non-transplant hepatology
Transplant hepatology
Nutrition

How skilled do you consider yourself with regards to technology?
Below average
Average
Above average

Which of the following media have you used in your tele-health visits?
Phone call alone
Audio call via internet application
Video and audio – Zoom
Video and audio – Doxy.me
Video and audio - Medeo
Video and audio – other
Other – please specify

Please rank the tele-health media from best to worst (no need to rank all media):
Phone call alone
Audio call via internet application
Video and audio – Zoom
Video and audio – Doxy.me
Video and audio - Medeo
Video and audio – other

With regards to seeing a patient’s video during the visit:
I do not believe it adds much over audio
I believe it allows me to pick up on non-verbal cues

Regarding the lack of physical exam in tele-health:
I do not believe it has affected to quality of my assessment
I believe it has minimally impaired the quality of my assessment
I believe it has greatly impaired the quality of my assessment

Given tele-health visits, my clinic is now:
Running more on time
Running later
Running the same it would with in-office visits

Did you feel that patients might with-hold information because of tele-medicine?
Yes/no

What is your impression of patients’ impressions of tele-health?
They generally appreciate it as much as in-office visits
They generally appreciate it less than in-office visits
They appreciate it more than in-office visits

After the COVID-19 pandemic, I believe that tele-health should:
Replace in-office visits
Continue for certain patients but in-office visits should still be available for others
Have no role

Financial remuneration for tele-health visits in your province is currently:
More than an in-office visit of equivalent time
Less than an in-office visit of equivalent time
The same as an in-office visit of equivalent time

After the COVID-19 pandemic, which visits would be best for tele-health (check all that apply)?
Follow up of benign endoscopic pathology
Follow up of malignant endoscopic pathology
Consultations for new patients
Follow up visits
Consultations prior to endoscopy

Which conditions would be worst for tele-health? (select all that apply)
Anemia or iron deficiency
Autoimmune hepatitis
Celiac disease
Eosinophilic esophagitis
Fatty liver/NASH/NAFLD
Functional dyspepsia
Gastroesophageal reflux disease/GERD/reflux/hartburn
Gastrointestinal cancer
Hepatitis B
Hepatitis C
Inflammatory bowel disease – Crohn’s disease
Inflammatory bowel disease – Ulcerative colitis
Inflammatory bowel disease – unsure if Crohn’s or Ulcerative colitis
Irritable bowel syndrome
Pancreatic cyst
Pancreatitis
Primary biliary cholangitis
Primary sclerosis cholangitis

You have completed the survey. Thank you for participating.