
Tele-urgent Care for Low-acuity Conditions: A Systematic Review

April 2022

VA



U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs

Veterans Health Administration
Health Services Research & Development Service

Recommended citation: Boucher, N, Van Voorhees, E, Vashi, A, et al. Tele-urgent Care for Low-acuity Conditions: A Systematic Review. Washington, DC: Evidence Synthesis Program, Health Services Research and Development Service, Office of Research and Development, Department of Veterans Affairs. VA ESP Project #09-010; 2022.

AUTHORS

Author roles, affiliations, and contributions to the present report (using the [CRediT taxonomy](#)) are summarized in the table below.

Author	Role and Affiliation	Report Contribution
Nathan Boucher, DrPH, PA, MS, MPA, CPHQ	Research Health Scientist, Durham Center of Innovation to Accelerate Discovery and Practice Transformation, Durham VA Health Care System Durham, NC Associate Research Professor, Sanford School of Public Policy, Duke University Durham, NC	Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing
Elizabeth Van Voorhees, PhD	Psychologist, Durham VA Medical Center Durham, NC Assistant Professor in Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Duke University School of Medicine Durham, NC	Investigation, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing
Anita Vashi MD, MPH, MHS	Physician Investigator, Center for Innovation to Implementation (Ci2i), VA Palo Alto Health Care System Palo Alto, CA Assistant Professor, Department of Emergency Medicine, University of California San Francisco San Francisco, CA	Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review & editing
Olivia Dong, PhD, MPH	Fellow, Center for Applied Genomics and Precision Medicine, Duke University School of Medicine Durham, NC Fellow, Durham VA Health Care System Durham, NC	Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review & editing
Perri Morgan, PA-C, PhD	Professor, Department of Family Medicine and Community Health, Duke University Medical School Durham, NC	Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review & editing

Author	Role and Affiliation	Report Contribution
Janeen E. Smith, MD	Chief, Tele Urgent Care VISN (Veterans Integrated Service Network) 21 Veterans Health Administration Staff Physician, Emergency Department, San Francisco VA Medical Center San Francisco, CA Associate Clinical Professor, Department of Medicine, University of California San Francisco, CA	Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review & editing
Soheir Adam, MD	Associate Professor, Department of Medicine Division of Hematology, Duke University Durham, NC	Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review & editing
Amir Alishahi Tabriz, MD, PhD, MPH	Assistant Member, Department of Health Outcomes and Behavior, Moffitt Cancer Center, Tampa, FL Department of Oncological Sciences, University of South Florida Tampa, FL	Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review & editing
Michael J. Mulholland, PA	Physician Assistant, Samuel S. Stratton VA Medical Center Albany, NY	Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review & editing
Jessica R. Dietch, PhD, DBSM	Assistant Professor, Oregon State University School of Psychological Science Corvallis, OR	Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review & editing
John D. Whited, MD, MHS	Health services researcher, Durham Center of Innovation to Accelerate Discovery and Practice Transformation, Durham VA Health Care System Durham, NC Associate Professor, Department of Medicine, Duke University School of Medicine Durham, NC	Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review & editing
Joel C. Boggan, MD	Associate Professor of Medicine, Department of Medicine, Durham VA Health Care System Durham, NC	Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review & editing

Author	Role and Affiliation	Report Contribution
Jessica J. Fulton, PhD	<p>Psychologist, Durham VA Health Care System Durham, NC</p> <p>Assistant Professor in Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Duke School of Medicine Durham, NC</p>	<p>Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review & editing</p>
C. Blake Cameron, MD, MBI	<p>Medical Director for Telehealth and Access Innovation at Duke Health, Private Diagnostic Clinic, Duke University Medical Center Durham, NC</p>	<p>Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review & editing</p>
Adelaide Gordon, MPH	<p>Project Coordinator, Durham Evidence Synthesis Program (ESP) Durham, NC</p> <p>Research Health Science Specialist, Durham Center of Innovation to Accelerate Discovery and Practice Transformation, Durham VA Health Care System Durham, NC</p>	<p>Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Data curation, Formal analysis, Writing – original draft, Project administration</p>
Karen M. Goldstein, MD, MSPH	<p>Co-director, Durham ESP Durham, NC</p> <p>Core Investigator, Durham Center of Innovation to Accelerate Discovery and Practice Transformation, Durham VA Health Care System Durham, NC</p> <p>General Internist, Durham Veterans Affairs Medical Center Durham, NC</p> <p>Associate Professor, Department of Medicine, Division of General Internal Medicine, Duke University Durham, NC</p>	<p>Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing</p>
Belinda Ear, MPH	<p>Research Assistant, Durham ESP Durham, NC</p> <p>Research Health Science Specialist, Durham Center of</p>	<p>Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Visualization, Data curation, Software, Writing – original draft, Project administration</p>

Author	Role and Affiliation	Report Contribution
	Innovation to Accelerate Discovery and Practice Transformation, Durham VA Health Care System Durham, NC	
John W. Williams, MD	Scientific Advisor, Durham ESP Durham, NC Investigator, Durham Center of Innovation to Accelerate Discovery and Practice Transformation, Durham VA Health Care System Durham, NC Staff Physician, Durham VA Medical Center Durham, NC Professor, Department of Medicine, Division of General Internal Medicine, Duke University Durham, NC	Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review & editing
Sarah Cantrell, MLIS, AHIP	Associate Director for Research & Education, Duke University Medical Center Library & Archives, Duke University School of Medicine Durham, NC	Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing
Sarah W. Dickerson, PhD, MS	Adjunct Instructor and Postdoctoral Research Associate, Sanford School of Public Policy, Duke University Durham, NC	Investigation, Writing – review & editing
Jennifer M. Gierisch, PhD, MPH	Co-director, Durham ESP Durham, NC Core Investigator, Durham Center of Innovation to Accelerate Discovery and Practice Transformation, Durham VA Health Care System Durham, NC Associate Professor, Department of Population Health Sciences, Duke University School of Medicine Durham, NC	Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Supervision

This report was prepared by the Evidence Synthesis Program Center located at the **Durham VA Health Care System, Durham, NC**, directed by **Jennifer M. Gierisch, PhD, MPH** and **Karen M. Goldstein, MD, MSPH** and funded by the Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Health Administration, Health Services Research and Development.

The findings and conclusions in this document are those of the author(s) who are responsible for its contents and do not necessarily represent the views of the Department of Veterans Affairs or the United States government. Therefore, no statement in this article should be construed as an official position of the Department of Veterans Affairs. No investigators have any affiliations or financial involvement (eg, employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, grants or patents received or pending, or royalties) that conflict with material presented in the report.

PREFACE

The VA Evidence Synthesis Program (ESP) was established in 2007 to provide timely and accurate syntheses of targeted health care topics of importance to clinicians, managers, and policymakers as they work to improve the health and health care of Veterans. These reports help:

- Develop clinical policies informed by evidence;
- Implement effective services to improve patient outcomes and to support VA clinical practice guidelines and performance measures; and
- Set the direction for future research to address gaps in clinical knowledge.

The program comprises four ESP Centers across the US and a Coordinating Center located in Portland, Oregon. Center Directors are VA clinicians and recognized leaders in the field of evidence synthesis with close ties to the AHRQ Evidence-based Practice Center Program. The Coordinating Center was created to manage program operations, ensure methodological consistency and quality of products, interface with stakeholders, and address urgent evidence needs. To ensure responsiveness to the needs of decision-makers, the program is governed by a Steering Committee composed of health system leadership and researchers. The program solicits nominations for review topics several times a year via the [program website](#).

The present report was developed in response to a request from Department of Emergency Medicine (Specialty Services). The scope was further developed with input from Operational Partners (below), the ESP Coordinating Center, the review team, and the technical expert panel (TEP). The ESP consulted several technical and content experts in designing the research questions and review methodology. In seeking broad expertise and perspectives, divergent and conflicting opinions are common and perceived as healthy scientific discourse that results in a thoughtful, relevant systematic review. Ultimately, however, research questions, design, methodologic approaches, and/or conclusions of the review may not necessarily represent the views of individual technical and content experts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to Stacy Lavin, PhD, and Liz Wing, MA, for editorial and citation management support, and the following individuals for their contributions to this project:

Operational Partners

Operational partners are system-level stakeholders who help ensure relevance of the review topic to the VA, contribute to the development of and approve final project scope and timeframe for completion, provide feedback on the draft report, and provide consultation on strategies for dissemination of the report to the field and relevant groups.

Leonie Heyworth, MD MPH

Director of Synchronous Telemedicine, Office of Connected Care
San Diego VA Medical Center

Chad Kessler, MD

National Program Director, Emergency Medicine
Durham VA Health Care System

Joshua Geiger, MSPsy*Health System Specialist, Specialty Care Service**Executive Officer for Emergency Medicine*

VACO 10P11

Technical Expert Panel

To ensure robust, scientifically relevant work, the TEP guides topic refinement; provides input on key questions and eligibility criteria, advising on substantive issues or possibly overlooked areas of research; assures VA relevance; and provides feedback on work in progress. TEP members are listed below:

Irwin Barr, MD,*Medical Advisor*

Montana VA Health Care System

Maria C Bouchard, NP,*Nurse Practitioner*

VA Greater Los Angeles Healthcare System

Laurie K. Conti, MPT,*Health System Specialist*

Clinical Resource Hub Business Operations Director

VISN 4

Stephanie Deaner, PhD,*Telehealth Program Manager*

VISN 12

Peer Reviewers

The Coordinating Center sought input from external peer reviewers to review the draft report and provide feedback on the objectives, scope, methods used, perception of bias, and omitted evidence. Peer reviewers must disclose any relevant financial or non-financial conflicts of interest. Because of their unique clinical or content expertise, individuals with potential conflicts may be retained. The Coordinating Center works to balance, manage, or mitigate any potential nonfinancial conflicts of interest identified.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Authors	i
Preface	vi
Acknowledgments	vi
Operational Partners	vi
Technical Expert Panel.....	vii
Peer Reviewers	vii
Executive Summary	1
Introduction.....	1
Key Questions	1
Methods.....	2
Data Sources and Searches.....	2
Study Selection	2
Data Abstraction and Quality Assessment.....	2
Data Synthesis and Analysis.....	3
Results	3
Summary of Results for Key Questions	3
Discussion.....	5
Key Findings and Certainty of Evidence.....	5
Applicability	6
Future Research.....	6
Conclusions	7
Abbreviations Table.....	7
What is Tele-urgent Care: A Case Vignette	9
Introduction	10
Methods	11
Topic Development	11
Analytic Framework.....	11
Data Sources and Searches.....	12
Study Selection.....	12
Data Abstraction.....	15
Quality Assessment	15
Synthesis.....	15
Rating the Body of Evidence.....	16

Peer Review	16
Results	17
Literature Flow.....	17
Evidence Profile	19
Key Question 1.....	20
A. Among adults, what are the effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions on key clinical and health system outcomes (<i>ie</i> , utilization, patient satisfaction, cost, health care access, case resolution, patient safety)?.....	20
B. Do the effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions differ by (1) provider characteristics (<i>ie</i> , specialty, amount of telehealth experience, training) or (2) mode of delivery (<i>ie</i> , telephone, video, web, short message service)?.....	20
Characteristics of Included Studies.....	20
Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Health Care Utilization: Key Points.....	20
Detailed Findings.....	21
Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Patient Satisfaction: Key Points.....	26
Detailed Findings.....	27
Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Health Care Cost: Key Points	31
Detailed Findings.....	32
Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Health Care Access: Key Point.....	35
Detailed Findings.....	35
Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Case Resolution: Key Points.....	36
Detailed Findings.....	36
Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Patient Safety.....	39
Quality of Evidence for Key Question 1	39
Key Question 2.....	42
A. Among adults, what are the adverse effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions (<i>ie</i> , inappropriate treatment, misdiagnosis, delayed diagnosis, patient deaths, provider burnout)?	42
B. Do the adverse effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions differ by (1) provider characteristics (<i>ie</i> , specialty, amount of telehealth experience, training) or (2) mode of delivery (<i>ie</i> , telephone, video, web, short message service)?.....	42
Characteristics of Included Studies.....	42
Key Points	43
Detailed Findings.....	43
Quality of Evidence for Key Question 2	44
Discussion	46
Key Question 1 Summary	46

Health Care Utilization	47
Patient Satisfaction	47
Health Care Cost.....	47
Certainty of Evidence for Key Outcomes.....	48
Key Question 2 Summary	50
Prior Systematic Reviews.....	50
Clinical and Policy Implications.....	51
Limitations.....	52
Publication Bias.....	52
Study Quality	52
Heterogeneity	52
Applicability of Findings to the VA Population.....	53
Research Gaps/Future Research	53
Conclusions.....	54
References.....	56

FIGURES

Figure 1. Analytic Framework.....	12
Figure 2. Literature Flowchart.....	18
Figure 3. Risk of Bias Assessment for the Included Cluster-randomized Trial.....	39
Figure 4. Risk of Bias Assessment for Nonrandomized Studies of Interventions.....	40
Figure 5. Risk of Bias Assessment for Cross-sectional Studies	41
Figure 6. Risk of Bias Assessment Across Included Coss-sectional Studies.....	42
Figure 7. Risk of Bias Assessment Across Included KQ 2 Studies.....	45

TABLES

Table 1. Study Eligibility Criteria.....	13
Table 2. Evidence Profile for Studies of Tele-urgent Care for Low-acuity Conditions	19
Table 3. Summary of Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Type of Health Care Utilization Pattern.....	24
Table 4. Summary of Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Patient Satisfaction.....	29
Table 5. Summary of Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Health Care Cost.....	33
Table 6. Summary of Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Health Care Access	36
Table 7. Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Type of Case Resolution.....	37
Table 8. Certainty of Evidence for Primary Outcomes of Effects of Tele-urgent Care.....	48
Table 9. Evidence Gaps and Future Research.....	53

Appendix A. Search Strategies.....	60
Appendix B. Study Characteristics.....	66
Appendix C. Intervention Characteristics.....	74
Appendix D. Excluded Studies	79
Appendix E. Peer Review Disposition	103

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Approximately 1 in 3 emergency department (ED) visits in the United States are nonemergent, potentially leading to unnecessary testing, treatment, and cost. Payers have long struggled to discourage nonemergent ED visits through patient education and higher copayments for ED visits. Delivery systems have built alternatives like same day or after-hours primary care, urgent care centers, retail clinics, and tele-urgent care.

Until recently, care delivered via telephone or videoconferencing platforms (*ie*, virtual care) has largely supplemented traditional in-person urgent and non-urgent care visits. The COVID-19 pandemic, however, has transformed the health care landscape, as virtual care rapidly became the primary option to provide medical care to enforce social distancing, while improving healthcare access and using resources efficiently. Because virtual care, particularly video-based visits, is a relatively new care option, evidence related to quality and outcomes is limited. There are also concerns about the effectiveness of virtual visits and their impact on subsequent health care utilization as a result of unresolved medical concerns.

The Veterans Health Administration (VHA) is the country's largest integrated health system and, as such, has a mandate to care for Veterans across the entire United States and associated territories. Yet Veterans seeking care for urgent medical conditions may still experience barriers to accessing timely care. Effective June 6, 2019, VHA began offering a new urgent care benefit that provides eligible Veterans with greater choice and access to care for the treatment of minor injuries and illnesses in their local communities. A growing subset of these visits has utilized virtual urgent care. VHA is also currently undergoing a modernization of their Clinical Contact Centers, which will ultimately be available to Veterans 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. VHA Clinical Contact Centers will include services like nurse advice, triage, and virtual visits with providers and is intended to serve as an alternative to ED, urgent care centers, or primary care clinics for many low-acuity conditions. VA-wide implementation of Clinical Contact Centers is planned for late 2022 and could have significant implications for Veterans facing temporal and geographic barriers to acute care.

The VA Office of Connected Care requested this review to identify the current evidence base and the effect of tele-urgent care for low-acuity, nonemergent conditions on key outcomes such as health care utilization, patient satisfaction, cost, access, and safety. For this report, we define tele-urgent care as health care delivered remotely (*eg*, telephone, video conferencing) that includes medical services intended to provide on-demand initial treatment of an illness or injury that is considered urgent (but is not primary care for chronic conditions nor emergency-level care) and that is initiated by a patient with a provider.

Key Questions

The key questions (KQs) for this report were:

KQ 1:

- A.** Among adults, what are the effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions on key clinical and health system outcomes (*ie*, health care utilization, patient satisfaction, cost, health care access, case resolution, and patient safety)?
- B.** Do the effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions differ by (1) provider characteristics (*ie*, specialty, amount of telehealth experience, training) or (2) mode of delivery (*ie*, telephone, video, web, short message service)?

KQ 2:

- A.** Among adults, what are the adverse effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions (*ie*, inappropriate treatment, misdiagnosis, delayed diagnosis, patient deaths, provider burnout)?
- B.** Do the adverse effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions differ by (1) provider characteristics (*ie*, specialty, amount of telehealth experience, training) or (2) mode of delivery (*ie*, telephone, video, web, short message service)?

METHODS

We developed and followed a standard protocol for this review in collaboration with operational partners and a Technical Expert Panel (PROSPERO registration number CRD42020191454).

Data Sources and Searches

We searched MEDLINE (via Ovid), Embase (via Elsevier), and CINAHL Complete (via EBSCO) from inception to February 13, 2020. We also hand searched previous systematic reviews conducted on this or a related topic for potential studies.

Study Selection

The major eligibility criteria for KQ 1 and KQ 2 were comparative interventional or observational study designs evaluating the effect of remote health care conducted by a prescriber who was not the patient's primary care provider. Investigators and the DistillerSR Artificial Intelligence tool (DistillerSR; Evidence Partners Inc., Manotick, ON, Canada) evaluated titles and abstracts using the prespecified inclusion/exclusion criteria to identify potentially eligible studies. Studies that met all eligibility criteria at full-text review were included for data abstraction.

Data Abstraction and Quality Assessment

Key characteristics abstracted included patient descriptors (*eg*, age, sex, race), intervention characteristics (*eg*, provider type, tele-urgent service modality), comparator, and outcomes, as described previously. Multiple reports from a single study were treated as a single data point, prioritizing results based on the most complete and appropriately analyzed data. Although counted as 1 single study, we cited data from each paper separately. Key features relevant to applicability included the match between the sample and target populations (*eg*, age, Veteran status).

For randomized trials, we used the RoB 2 (Risk of Bias 2) tool. For cross-sectional study designs, we used the NIH risk of bias tool. For other designs, we used the ROBINS-I. These risk of bias (ROB) criteria are: adequacy of randomization and allocation concealment, comparability of groups at baseline, blinding, completeness of follow-up and differential loss to follow-up, whether incomplete data were addressed appropriately, validity of outcome measures, protection against contamination, selective outcomes reporting, and conflict of interest. We assigned a summary ROB score to individual studies based on the guidance for each of the evidence-based ROB tools used in this review.

Data Synthesis and Analysis

We summarized the primary literature using relevant data abstracted from the eligible studies. Summary tables describe the key study characteristics of the primary studies: study design, patient demographics, and details of the intervention. We then determined the feasibility of completing a quantitative synthesis (*ie*, meta-analysis) to estimate summary effects. For meta-analyses, feasibility depends on the volume of relevant literature, conceptual homogeneity of the studies, and completeness of results reporting. We grouped outcomes into similar outcome types (*eg*, outpatient care utilization, emergency department utilization, hospitalization, total cost, index cost), comparison (*eg*, comparison by organizational structure of tele-urgent care, comparison by urgent care site), and study design (*eg*, randomized vs nonrandomized).

Quantitative synthesis was not feasible given study heterogeneity. Thus, we synthesized the data narratively. We gave more weight to the evidence from higher quality studies with more precise estimates of effect. A narrative synthesis focuses on documenting and identifying patterns in efficacy and safety of the interventions across conditions and outcome categories.

The certainty of evidence for each KQ was assessed using the approach described by Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE). We limited GRADE ratings to outcomes identified by VHA operations stakeholder and TEP as critical to decision-making, which were identified through discussion.

RESULTS

We identified 6,479 citations, of which 221 were reviewed at the full-text stage. Of these, 16 studies were retained for data abstraction. They consisted of 1 randomized controlled trial, 1 cluster-randomized trial, 2 controlled before-after studies, 8 cross-sectional studies, and 4 cohort studies. There were 13 studies that were included for KQ 1 and 3 studies for KQ 2.

Summary of Results for Key Questions

KQ 1A

Thirteen studies evaluated tele-urgent care across 5 outcomes of interest (*ie*, health care utilization, patient satisfaction, cost, health care access, and case resolution). They consisted of 1 RCT, 2 controlled before-and-after studies, 7 cross-sectional studies, and 3 cohort studies. Six studies reported health care utilization, 7 reported patient satisfaction, 4 reported cost, 2 reported health care access, 2 reported case resolution, and none reported on patient safety.

Utilization

Six studies assessed the impact of tele-urgent care on overall health care utilization and subsequent utilization after an urgent care visit. Most had at least moderate ROB. Two cohort studies assessed how introducing tele-urgent care into a health care system impacted overall patterns of care for low-acuity conditions. Results suggest that the introduction of tele-urgent care increased overall health care utilization (*ie*, “new utilization”) that may not have been sought and accessed without tele-urgent care options. Four studies assessed subsequent health care utilization (*ie*, outpatient visits, ED, inpatient stays) after initial consultation from tele-urgent care. These studies were designed to address 2 different comparisons: (1) the impact by organization of the virtual care service and (2) the impact by initial site of care (*eg*, tele-urgent care services vs in-person urgent care clinics). Overall, we found no evidence that subsequent outpatient utilization significantly differs whether the tele-urgent care is delivered locally or regionally; nor did it differ with different staffing (*eg*, non-clinical call handler, nurse vs general practitioner) for the triage portion of the tele-urgent care interaction. When comparing the initial site of urgent care on subsequent health care utilization, care initiated virtually consistently demonstrated lower subsequent health care utilization than care initiated in the ED. Yet no clear pattern emerged when urgent care was initially sought virtually compared to other in-person venues (*eg*, urgent care centers, retail health clinics) outside the ED. All utilization outcomes were judged to have low or very low certainty of evidence (COE).

Patient satisfaction

Seven studies reported on patient satisfaction with tele-urgent care. Most studies were rated as good, moderate, or fair ROB. Two studies were rated as some concerns or serious ROB. All 7 were conducted in European medical systems where urgent care delivered after normal clinic hours (*ie*, “out-of-hours”) is provided as part of a broad, integrated health system. Differences in patient satisfaction were not consistently observed by modality of urgent care interaction (in-person vs tele-urgent care) or by the relationship of the clinician providing tele-urgent care to the clinic organization (external physicians vs practice-based and/or cooperative physicians). Generally, patients expressed the greatest satisfaction when the care they received matched their expectations for care (*eg*, receiving in-person care when they expected to receive in-person care). Overall COE for this outcome was rated as low or very low.

Cost

Four studies assessed the cost of delivering tele-urgent care; all were conducted in the United States. All but 1 study were rated as moderate to serious ROB. Across included studies, index costs (low COE) and total costs (very low COE) for care associated with tele-urgent visits for low-acuity conditions were lower for tele-urgent visits compared with similar urgent care delivered within in-person settings (*eg*, ED, in-person urgent care centers). Yet 1 study supported that tele-urgent care may increase overall health care spending via increased access to on-demand care for low-acuity conditions. There was variability in how cost was estimated, making it difficult to compare across studies.

Health care access

Limited evidence was identified on the effects of tele-urgent care on access to health care. In 1 study, patient reports of timeliness (*ie*, wait times) did not differ by the relationship of the clinician providing telephone-based care to the clinic organization (*ie*, external physicians vs

local cooperative physicians). In contrast, 1 study reported that patients were more satisfied with the communications they received from their tele-urgent provider when that provider was a local practice-based GP compared to an external physician.

Case resolution

Evidence from 1 study suggested that local, practice-based telephone triage services have higher case resolution outcomes and refer fewer patients to in-person emergency or primary care services compared with regional/national telephone-based urgent care services. An additional study examined calls to a telephone-based urgent care where calls were triaged to the ED by the clinical support software. These same calls were then passed to an additional assessment service staffed by emergency physicians or a non-physician clinical advisor (*ie*, nurses or paramedics with a scope of practice that includes assessment, treatment, advice, and diagnosis). Transfer to the assessment service produced more case resolution on the first contact than calls assessed initially by a non-clinical call handler then moved to a prescribing provider.

KQ 1B

None of the studies that met KQ 1 eligibility criteria provided analysis by provider characteristics (*ie*, specialty, amount of telehealth experience, training), and studies did not provide sufficient information to conduct study-level subgroup analysis. There were insufficient studies to explore the role of tele-urgent care by mode (*ie*, telephone, video) for any outcome. As a result, we were unable to address KQ 1B.

KQ 2A

We found little evidence on the adverse effects prioritized by VHA operations partners (*ie*, inappropriate treatment, misdiagnosis, delayed diagnosis, patient deaths, provider burnout). We identified only 3 studies in total that met our prespecified eligibility criteria, and none addressed misdiagnosis or provider burnout. All included studies had ROB concerns. One moderate ROB retrospective cohort study explored inappropriate treatment outcomes and found similar or better guideline-concordant antibiotic use for acute upper respiratory infections when treatment was delivered via telemedicine compared to in-person primary care or ED visits. For misdiagnosis, 1 fair ROB cross-sectional study reported a small proportion of clinical safety complaints resulting from telephone-based after-hours care, many of which were not validated on structured review by the study authors.

KQ 2B

None of the studies that met KQ 2 eligibility criteria provided analysis by provider characteristics (*ie*, specialty, amount of telehealth experience, training), and studies did not provide sufficient information to conduct study-level subgroup analysis. There were insufficient studies to explore the role of tele-urgent care by mode (*ie*, telephone, video) for any outcome. As a result, we were unable to address KQ 2B.

DISCUSSION

Key Findings and Certainty of Evidence

We identified 13 studies that evaluated tele-urgent care across 5 outcomes of interest. Six studies reported health care utilization, 7 reported patient satisfaction, 4 reported cost, 2 reported health

care access, 2 reported case resolution, and none reported patient safety. None of the studies that met KQ 1 eligibility criteria were able to address KQ 1B. Overall, we found that subsequent outpatient utilization did not significantly differ by organizational level of the virtual care (*ie*, local vs regional systems) or by professional discipline of initial staff conducting the triage portion of the tele-urgent care interaction (*eg*, nonclinical call handler, nurse vs general practitioner). The certainty of evidence for the impact of tele-urgent care on subsequent health care utilization was, at most, rated as low COE. Two studies found that access to tele-urgent care increased use of overall health care utilization (very low COE). Differences in patient satisfaction were not consistently observed by outcomes of tele-urgent care interaction (telephone advice for self-care vs clinic visit vs home visit) or by relationship of treating provider to clinic organization (external physicians vs practice-based and/or cooperative physicians). Overall COE for this outcome was rated as low or very low. Across included studies, index costs (low COE) and total costs (very low COE) for care associated with tele-urgent visits for low-acuity conditions were lower for tele-urgent-type visits compared with similar types of visits for in-person settings (*eg*, ED, in-person urgent care centers). One study supported that tele-urgent care may increase overall health care spending via increased access to on-demand care for low-acuity conditions. Overall, we found limited evidence on the impact of tele-urgent care on other prioritized outcomes (health care access, 2 studies; case resolution, 2 studies; patient safety, no studies).

We identified only 3 studies in total that met our prespecified eligibility criteria for KQ 2, which was focused on adverse effects of tele-urgent care (*ie.*, inappropriate treatment, misdiagnosis, delayed diagnosis, patient deaths, provider burnout). One moderate ROB retrospective cohort study found similar or better guideline-concordant antibiotic use for acute upper respiratory infections when treatment was delivered via direct-to-consumer telemedicine compared to in-person primary care or ED visits. One fair ROB cross-sectional study reported a small proportion of clinical safety complaints resulting from telephone-based after-hours care, many of which were not validated on objective review. No studies addressed provider burnout or misdiagnosis. None of the included studies addressed KQ 2B (*ie*, adverse effects by provider characteristics).

Applicability

None of the included studies were conducted in the VHA or specifically with Veterans. However, we limited eligibility to studies conducted in OECD countries, which improves applicability to the VHA. As stated above, many of the included studies were conducted in the United Kingdom, which improves the applicability to the VHA system. All included studies that evaluated cost were conducted in the US. The findings presented here likely have applicability to any large health care system, such as the VHA, seeking to implement tele-urgent care systems.

Future Research

Future research should address optimal modality of tele-urgent care (*eg*, telephone vs video), evaluate the impact of provider training and experience on clinical outcomes, and report whether tele-urgent care providers have access to electronic medical records during the delivery of care. Potential future comparative studies should focus on head-to-head comparisons of tele-urgent care modalities (*ie*, telephone vs video) and provider characteristics (physician providers vs non-physician providers). Future research should report on the outcomes prioritized for this review, specifically health care access, case resolution, patient safety, and adverse effects (including

provider burnout). Ideal settings for future research include the USA, the VHA, or similar large health care systems.

Conclusions

The promise of tele-urgent care is to improve access to timely health care for low-acuity conditions. Yet there are many unanswered questions about the effects of tele-urgent care on key clinical and health systems outcomes. The evidence is unclear whether tele-urgent care is best positioned as a substitute for, or complement to, other acute care modalities and settings. Some limited evidence supports that the introduction of tele-urgent care increases system-level health care utilization via enhanced access to a convenient source of on-demand care. These findings suggests that tele-urgent care may be more likely to increase access through use of additional resources rather than redirection of existing patient care utilization. We identified no studies on provider burnout or patient safety—outcomes worthy of careful consideration and study if tele-urgent care is to be readily adopted by providers, patients, and health systems. Of note, across all key outcomes, the identified literature was sparse and of variable quality. Further examination is needed to assess whether and how tele-urgent care can be used to attain the quadruple aim of improving the patient care experience, improving the health of a population, reducing per capita health care costs, and improving the work life of health care clinical staff.

ABBREVIATIONS TABLE

Abbreviation	Definition
AE	Adverse event
AI	Artificial intelligence
CAS	Computerized clinical assessment system
CDSS	Clinical decision support software/system
CeCC	CareEnhance Call Centre software
CI	Confidence interval
CINAHL	Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature
COE	Certainty of evidence
ED	Emergency department
EPOC	Effective Practice and Organization of Care
ESP	Evidence Synthesis Program
GP	General practitioner
HSR&D	Health Services Research & Development
KQ	Key Question
LPN	Licensed practical nurse
LV	Licensed vocational nurse
MD	Mean difference
MeSH	Medical Subject Heading
MMAT	Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool
NHS	National Health Service
NR	Not reported
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

Abbreviation	Definition
PACT	Patient-aligned care team
PCP	Primary care physician
PEI	Patient Enablement Instrument
PICOTS	Population, intervention, comparator, outcome, timing, and setting
PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta Analyses
QUERI	Quality Enhancement Research Initiative
SMD	Standardized mean difference
SMS	Short message service
RCT	Randomized controlled trial
ROB	Risk of bias
RR	Relative risk
TEP	Technical Expert Panel
VA	Veterans Affairs
VHA	Veterans Health Administration

EVIDENCE REPORT

WHAT IS TELE-URGENT CARE: A CASE VIGNETTE

A 45-year-old female Veteran with mild intermittent asthma, obesity, and military sexual trauma (MST) contacts her primary care provider with a complaint of wheezing and cough over the last 2-3 days. She calls her VA primary care clinic on a Thursday and speaks with her PACT nurse.

On further questioning, the patient notes that she does not have a fever or COVID exposure. She has a couple of old inhalers at home that she has tried to use which helped “a little.” She is mildly short of breath when going upstairs or walking her dog, but able to do everything around the house that she needs to do. According to the nurse triage tool, the patient needs to be evaluated within 48 hours. The PACT nurse checks with the scheduler and notes that the primary care provider’s schedule is booked for the day and they do not have any in-person gap visit slots within 48 hours. The patient is counseled on where in her community she can seek in-person urgent care, if needed. Understandably, the patient does not want to make the 90-minute drive to the VA ER as her 7-year-old daughter is home due to a teacher workday; however, she is concerned that it will get worse over the weekend and she won’t know what to do.

The PACT RN confers with a provider in the clinic and together they decide to schedule the patient for a tele-urgent care visit via the VA video-connect platform. A video visit is chosen because of the acuity level of the patient’s symptoms and the need to minimize exposure to other patients in case she has an infectious illness (eg, COVID). Two hours later, the patient completes a video-based visit with a VA provider. The provider is able to watch the patient’s breathing and speech pattern during the video visit and determines that she is not in respiratory distress. The patient is able to show the provider her old inhalers and demonstrate her technique. The provider is able to instruct her on which inhaler to use when and demonstrate correct inhaler use techniques.

Over the virtual platform, patient receives instructions on self-care and guidance on when and where she should seek higher-level care or follow up with her primary care provider. The patient does not need to present to the ER over the weekend and slowly improves from her asthma flare. She follows up with her primary care provider the following month for routine management of her chronic condition.

INTRODUCTION

Approximately 1 in 3 emergency department (ED) visits in the United States are non-emergent,¹ potentially leading to unnecessary testing, treatment, and cost. Payers have long struggled to discourage non-emergent ED visits through patient education and higher copayments for ED visits.¹ Delivery systems have built alternatives like same day or after-hours primary care, urgent care centers, and retail clinics.¹⁻³ One strategy for delivering high quality, cost effective, and easily accessed urgent care is the use of telehealth modalities, or tele-urgent care.^{3,4} Tele-urgent care aims to provide unscheduled, on-demand initial treatment of an urgent illness or injury. Such conditions do not require emergency care but may not always be easy to address in a primary care setting.

The coronavirus pandemic affecting the United States in 2020 and beyond has made clear the importance of timely and accessible health care, especially for urgent health needs. Until recently, telehealth care has largely supplemented traditional office or urgent care visits. The COVID-19 pandemic, however, has transformed the health care landscape, as virtual care rapidly became the response to providing medical care while enforcing social distancing, improving health care access, and using resources efficiently.⁵ Today, telehealth modalities are a part of the natural experiment of the pandemic, where all health systems have been pushed to re-examine telehealth as a viable strategy that was once hindered by perceptions of cost, access, and quality constraints.^{6,7} Indeed, telehealth may create efficiencies in cost and time for health systems as well as access for patients in need of care.⁸ Early evidence from the pandemic demonstrated a growing acceptance by health care providers, patients, and health care organizations of virtual care for both routine and urgent care needs.⁹⁻¹² Yet telehealth, and particularly virtual visits, are relatively new care options, and evidence related to quality and outcomes is limited. There are also concerns about the effectiveness of telehealth visits and impact on subsequent health care utilization as a result of unresolved symptoms.

The Veterans Health Administration (VHA) is the country's largest integrated health system and, as such, has a mandate to care for Veterans across the entire United States and associated territories. Yet Veterans seeking care for urgent medical conditions may still experience barriers to accessing timely care due to the same challenges faced in civilian health care systems. Effective June 6, 2019, VHA began offering a new urgent care benefit that provides eligible Veterans with greater choice and access to care for the treatment of minor injuries and illnesses in their local communities. A growing subset of these visits have utilized virtual care. The VHA is also currently undergoing a modernization of their Clinical Contact Centers,¹³ which will ultimately be available to Veterans 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.¹⁴ Intended as an alternative to ED, urgent care centers, or primary care clinics for many low-acuity conditions, the VHA Clinical Contact Centers will include services like nurse advice, triage, and virtual visits with providers. Veterans Affairs (VA)-wide implementation of Clinical Contact Centers is planned for late 2022 and could have significant implications for Veterans facing temporal and geographic barriers to acute care. The VA Office of Connected Care requested this review to identify the current evidence base and the effect of tele-urgent care for low-acuity, nonemergent conditions on key outcomes such as health care utilization, patient satisfaction, cost, access, and safety. For this report, we define tele-urgent care as health care delivered remotely (*eg*, telephone, video conferencing) that includes medical services intended to provide on-demand initial treatment of an illness or injury that is considered urgent (but is not routine primary care nor emergency care) and that is initiated by a patient with a provider.

In collaboration with VHA operations partners, we developed the following key questions (KQs) for this review:

KQ 1:

- A. Among adults, what are the effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions on key clinical and health system outcomes (*ie*, utilization, patient satisfaction, cost, health care access, case resolution, patient safety)?
- B. Do the effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions differ by (1) provider characteristics (*ie*, specialty, amount of telehealth experience, training) or (2) mode of delivery (*ie*, telephone, video, web, short message service)?

KQ 2:

- A. Among adults, what are the adverse effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions (*ie*, inappropriate treatment, misdiagnosis, delayed diagnosis, patient deaths, provider burnout)?
- B. Do the adverse effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions differ by (1) provider characteristics (*ie*, specialty, amount of telehealth experience, training) or (2) mode of delivery (*ie*, telephone, video, web, short message service)?

METHODS


We followed a standard protocol for this review. Each step was pilot tested to train and calibrate study investigators. The PROSPERO registration number is CRD42020191454. We adhered to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines.¹⁵

TOPIC DEVELOPMENT

This topic was proposed by a multidisciplinary governance structure led by the Office of Connected Care, which will become part of a larger department-level governance structure overseeing all contact center modernization, including administrative efforts. The results of this study will be relevant to the VHA.

ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK

Prior to the start of our review, we developed an analytic framework (Figure 1) informed by existing research in tele-urgent care and the information needs of VHA operations partners. As depicted in the figure, we sought to explore the impact of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions on key clinical and health systems outcomes (KQ 1A) and adverse effects (KQ 2A) prioritized by VHA operations partners. As these effects may be influenced by other factors, we also sought to explore the moderating effects of provider characteristics (*ie*, specialty) and tele-urgent mode (*eg*, video vs telephone) (KQ 1B and KQ 2B).

Figure 1. Analytic Framework

DATA SOURCES AND SEARCHES

We collaborated with an expert reference librarian to conduct a primary search from inception to February 13, 2020, of MEDLINE (via Ovid), Embase (via Elsevier), and CINAHL Complete (via EBSCO). We used a combination of MeSH keywords and selected free-text terms (eg, telehealth, urgent care) to search titles and abstracts (Appendix A). We hand searched previous systematic reviews conducted on this or a related topic for potential inclusion.

STUDY SELECTION

Major inclusion criteria for this review were evaluations of tele-urgent care systems for initial care of low-acuity conditions initiated by patients or recommended by a primary care provider. To be considered “tele-urgent care,” the service must provide on-demand, unscheduled care for acute conditions with access to a prescribing provider not affiliated with the patient’s regular practice. To assist with screening of titles and abstracts, we incorporated the artificial intelligence technology, DistillerAI, developed as part of the DistillerSR software program (Evidence Partners Inc., Manotick, ON, Canada) as the second reviewer on 2,357 references. After most of the references were reviewed by at least 1 reviewer (n= 4,035), using prespecified inclusion/exclusion criteria (Table 1) at the title and abstract level, the DistillerAI program was trained on the database.

The DistillerAI program screened the remaining titles and abstracts and assigned a probability of relevance to the study questions. All citations with $\geq 50\%$ probability of relevance were included to level 2 and underwent full-text review by 2 human reviewers. Articles included by an investigator or the AI algorithm underwent full-text screening. At the full-text screening stage, 2 independent investigators agreed on a final inclusion/exclusion decision. Disagreements between reviewers triggered a discussion between reviewers and involvement of a third reviewer to come to a consensus. Articles meeting eligibility criteria were included for data abstraction.

All results were tracked in both DistillerSR, a web-based data synthesis software program, and EndNote reference management software (Clarivate).

Table 1. Study Eligibility Criteria

Study Characteristic	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KQ 1, KQ 2: Adults with low-acuity urgent conditions (≥18 years of age) and their families and caregivers • KQ 2: Tele-urgent care providers (if included in harms) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inpatient populations • Simulated patients • Populations in residential facilities that provide regular medical care (eg, long-term care, nursing home) • Pediatric-only populations • Mixed populations of adults and children if adults are ≤50% of the population and there is no subgroup analysis by age
Intervention	<p>Tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions, defined as care delivered remotely (eg, telephone, video conferencing) that includes medical services intended to provide on-demand initial treatment of an illness or injury that is considered urgent (but is not routine primary care nor emergency care) and that is initiated by a patient with a provider^a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interventions defined primarily as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tele-monitoring ○ Health coaching ○ In-person presentations (eg, walk-ins to a patient's existing primary care clinic) ○ Counseling ○ Longitudinal care management (ie, more than 1 contact for an ongoing condition, routine follow-up) ○ Provider-to-provider communications or consultations beyond the initial transfer of information from a patient-initiated contact ○ Urgent mental health crisis lines (eg, suicide hotlines) ○ Emergency medical services (eg, 911) ○ Same-day primary care provided by patient's regular primary care provider/practice, including extended hours primary care ○ Primary care delivered via an alternative modality (eg, tele-primary care) • Interventions related only to the use of remote triage for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Specific population or demographic (eg, pediatric-only, ethnic minority) ○ Specific condition (eg, depression) medical specialty (eg, orthopedics) or ongoing or chronic conditions (eg, diabetes) ○ Technical assessments not related to patient or health care outcomes ○ General health education
Comparators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KQ 1: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KQ 1: No controls

Study Characteristic	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Usual care/standard of care, waitlist control ○ Other active comparator (eg, in-person care) ● KQ 2: No comparator required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● KQ 2: No exclusion criteria
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● KQ 1: Patient, provider, system outcomes (eg, patient satisfaction, health care access, health care utilization, case resolution, cost, and patient safety) ● KQ 2: Key adverse effects associated with telehealth (eg, inappropriate treatment, misdiagnosis, delayed diagnosis, patient deaths, provider burnout) 	Any outcomes not listed
Timing	Any	Not applicable
Settings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Outpatient general medical settings (eg, primary care, urgent care, emergency departments) ● Community settings ● Direct-to-consumer commercial business ● Hospital-based urgent care 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Intervention delivered primarily in hospital inpatient setting ● Mass casualty event ● Specialty-specific settings for management of chronic medical conditions
Study design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● KQ 1: EPOC criteria studies^b that have prospective data collection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ randomized trials; nonrandomized trials; controlled before-after studies; and interrupted time-series studies or repeated measures studies ○ prospective and retrospective observational studies (ie, cohort studies, case control studies) ○ cross-sectional ● KQ 2: Same as for KQ 1 plus the following designs if they address adverse effects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prospective and retrospective observational studies (ie, case-control, cohort) ○ Cross-sectional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● KQ 1, KQ 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Descriptive studies with no outcomes data ○ Qualitative studies ○ Case reports and case studies ○ Studies that included only outcomes data from one point in time (eg, post only, uncontrolled clinical study) ○ Modeling studies that used simulated data ● KQ 1: Not a clinical study (eg, editorial, nonsystematic review, letter to the editor) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prospective and retrospective observational studies ○ Clinical guidelines ○ Measurement or validation studies ● May also exclude the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Self-described pilot studies without adequate power to assess impact of intervention on outcomes ○ Studies of small sample sizes (n <100)
Language	Any	Not applicable
Countries	OECD ^c	Non-OECD
Publication types	Full publication in a peer-reviewed journal	Letters, editorials, reviews, dissertations, meeting abstracts, protocols without results

Abbreviations. EPOC=Effective Practice and Organisation of Care; OECD=Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

^a Relevant conditions include acute or subacute condition or exacerbation of a chronic condition (eg, mild asthma exacerbation) that does not constitute a true emergency, and is not for process of care (eg, request for a referral, order for routine lab testing, medication refill).

^b See Cochrane EPOC criteria for definitions and details.¹⁶

^c Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) includes Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

DATA ABSTRACTION

Data from published reports were abstracted into a customized DistillerSR database by 1 reviewer and overread by a second reviewer. Disagreements were resolved by consensus or by obtaining a third reviewer's opinion when consensus was not reached. Data elements include descriptors to assess applicability, quality elements, intervention details, and outcomes.

Key characteristics abstracted included patient descriptors (eg, age, sex, race), intervention characteristics (eg, provider type, tele-urgent service modality), comparator, and outcomes, as described previously. Multiple reports from a single study were treated as a single data point, prioritizing results based on the most complete and appropriately analyzed data. Although counted as 1 single study, we cited data from each paper separately. Key features relevant to applicability included the match between the sample and target populations (eg, age, Veteran status). For details of study characteristics, see Appendix B. Appendix C presents detailed intervention characteristics. Appendix D lists the excluded studies and reasons for exclusion.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Quality assessment was done by the investigator abstracting or evaluating the included article; this initial assessment was overread by a second, highly experienced investigator. Disagreements were resolved by consensus between the investigators or, when needed, by arbitration by a third investigator. For randomized trials, we used the RoB 2 tool.¹⁷ For cross-sectional study designs, we used the NIH risk of bias tool.¹⁸ For non-randomized studies of interventions, we used the ROBINS- I.¹⁹ These criteria included adequacy of randomization and allocation concealment; comparability of groups at baseline; blinding; completeness of follow-up and differential loss to follow-up; whether incomplete data were addressed appropriately; validity of outcome measures; protection against contamination; selective outcomes reporting; and conflict of interest. We assigned a summary ROB score to individual studies.

SYNTHESIS

We summarized the primary literature using relevant data abstracted from the eligible studies. Summary tables describe the key study characteristics of the primary studies: study design, patient demographics, and details of the intervention. We grouped outcomes into similar outcome types (eg, outpatient care utilization, emergency department utilization, hospitalization, total cost, index cost), intervention groups (eg, comparison by organizational structure of care, comparison by urgent care site) and study design (eg, randomized vs nonrandomized). We then determined the feasibility of completing a quantitative synthesis (ie, meta-analysis) to estimate summary effects. For meta-analyses, feasibility depends on the volume of relevant literature,

conceptual homogeneity of the studies, and completeness of results reporting. We determined the heterogeneity of the included studies was too high to conduct meta-analysis.

Since quantitative synthesis was not feasible, we narratively analyzed the data. We gave more weight to the evidence from higher quality studies with more precise estimates of effect. The narrative synthesis focuses on documenting and identifying patterns in outcomes efficacy by intervention type across conditions and outcome categories. We analyzed potential reasons for inconsistency in treatment effects across studies by evaluating differences in the study population, intervention, comparator, and outcome definitions.

RATING THE BODY OF EVIDENCE

The certainty of evidence for each KQ was assessed using the approach described by Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE).²⁰ We limited GRADE ratings to outcomes identified by the nominating VHA operations partners and Technical Expert Panel as critical to decision-making, which were identified through discussion. In brief, this approach required assessment of 4 domains: study design, risk of bias, consistency, directness, and precision. Additional domains used when appropriate were coherence, dose-response association, impact of plausible residual confounders, strength of association (magnitude of effect), and publication bias. These domains were considered qualitatively, and a summary rating of high, moderate, low, or very low certainty of evidence was assigned after discussion by 2 investigators.

PEER REVIEW


A draft version of this report was reviewed by technical experts and clinical leadership. A transcript of their comments and our responses are in Appendix E.

RESULTS

LITERATURE FLOW

We identified 6,474 studies through searches of MEDLINE (via Ovid), EMBASE, and CINAHL (via EBSCO) (Figure 2). An additional 5 articles were identified through reviewing bibliographies of relevant review articles for a total of 6,479 articles. After removing duplicates, there were 4,311 articles in total. After applying inclusion and exclusion criteria to titles and abstracts, 221 articles remained for full-text review. Of these, 17 studies were retained for data abstraction. Of the 17 studies included, 16 were identified as unique studies. There were 13 unique studies included for KQ 1 and 3 studies for KQ 2. They consisted of 1 randomized controlled trial, 1 cluster-randomized trial, 2 controlled before-after studies, 8 cross-sectionals, and 4 cohorts. Included studies were conducted across North America and Europe (USA, UK, and Ireland). None of the studies were conducted in the VA.

Figure 2. Literature Flowchart



^a Search results from Medline (1,830), Embase (791), CINAHL (1,685), and manually identified (4) were combined.

EVIDENCE PROFILE

Table 2 shows the evidence profile of studies included in this systematic review.

Table 2. Evidence Profile for Studies of Tele-urgent Care for Low-acuity Conditions

<p>Number of studies: 16 studies</p> <p>Median number of participants: 8,764 (range 298 to 20.6 million)^a</p> <p>Regions: UK (n=9); USA (n=5); Ireland (n=1); Denmark (n=1)</p> <p>Patient demographics: Median age = 36 years old (14 studies NR); 58% Women (6 studies NR); Race: 86% White, 14% Other (15 studies NR)</p> <p>Intervention mode^b: Telephone (n=13); Video (n=4); Internet (n=1); NR (n=1)</p> <p>Comparisons^b: In-person care (n=9); Provider type (n=2); NHS 111 (n=2); NA (n=3)</p> <p>Outcomes reported^b: Health care utilization (n=6); Patient satisfaction (n=7); Cost (n=4); Case resolution (n=2); Health care access (n=2); Patient safety (n=0); Adverse effects (n=3)</p> <p>Risk of bias:</p> <p><i>RoB 2:</i> Low risk of bias (n=0); Some concerns (n=2); High risk of bias (n=0);</p> <p><i>ROBINS-I:</i> Low (n=0); Moderate (n=4); Serious (n=2); Critical (n=0); No information (n=0)</p> <p><i>NIH quality assessment tool:</i> Good (n=4); Fair (n=4); Poor (n=0)</p>

Abbreviations. NA= Not applicable; NIH= National Institutes of Health; NHS=National Health System; NR= Not reported

^a 5 studies reported number of calls or visits with more than 1 encounter possible per person

^b More than 1 category possible per study

KEY QUESTION 1

A. Among adults, what are the effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions on key clinical and health system outcomes (ie, utilization, patient satisfaction, cost, health care access, case resolution, patient safety)?

B. Do the effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions differ by (1) provider characteristics (ie, specialty, amount of telehealth experience, training) or (2) mode of delivery (ie, telephone, video, web, short message service)?

Characteristics of Included Studies

Thirteen studies were included for KQ 1.^{3,21-32} Six reported health care utilization,^{3,21-23,25,31} 7 reported patient satisfaction,^{22,24,26,27,29,30,32} 4 reported cost,^{3,21,23,25} 2 reported health care access,^{22,27} and 2 reported case resolution. They consisted of 1 RCT,²² 2 controlled before-after studies,^{24,31} 7 cross-sectionals,^{23,25,26,28-30,32} and 3 cohorts.^{3,21,27} The sample size of studies ranged from 1,115 to 20.6 million with a median of 7,213 participants. The risk of bias (ROB) for the 1 RCT was rated as some concerns.²² Of the cross-sectional studies, 4 were rated as good^{25,26,30,32} and 3 were rated as fair ROB.^{23,28,29} Three of the cohort and controlled before and after studies were rated as moderate ROB^{21,24,31} and 2 were rated as serious.^{3,27}

None of the studies that met KQ 1 eligibility criteria provided analysis by provider characteristics (ie, specialty, amount of telehealth experience, training), and studies did not provide sufficient information to conduct study-level subgroup analysis. There were insufficient studies to explore the role of tele-urgent care by mode (ie, telephone, video) for any outcome. As a result, we were unable to address KQ 1B.

Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Health Care Utilization: Key Points

- In total, 6 studies assessed the impact of tele-urgent care on health care utilization. Most of these had at least moderate risk of bias (ROB) concerns.
- Results from 2 cohort studies suggest that the introduction of tele-urgent care increased overall health care utilization (ie, “new utilization”) that may not have been sought and accessed without tele-urgent care options.
- Four studies assessed subsequent health care utilization (eg, outpatient visits) after initial consultation from tele-urgent care. These studies were designed to address 2 different comparisons: (1) the impact by organization of the virtual care service and (2) the impact by initial site of care (eg, tele-urgent care services vs in-person urgent care clinics).
 - Subsequent outpatient utilization did not significantly differ whether the tele-urgent care was delivered locally or regionally; nor did it differ with different staffing (eg, nonclinical call handler, nurse vs general practitioner) for the triage portion of the tele-urgent care interaction.
 - When comparing the initial site of urgent care on subsequent health care utilization, no clear pattern emerged when comparing urgent care initially sought

via virtual modes or other, in-person venues (*eg*, urgent care centers, retail health clinics) outside the ED.

Detailed Findings

We sought to describe the effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions on subsequent patient care (received for the same condition) and on health care utilization. In total, 4 US-based studies^{3,21,23,25} and 2 UK-based studies^{31,33} assessed the impact of tele-urgent care on health care utilization. Of these 6 studies, 2 assessed the impact of tele-urgent care on overall patterns in health care utilization,^{3,21} 4 assessed outpatient care services,^{23,25,31,33} 3 assessed ED utilization,^{23,25,31} and 2 assessed inpatient utilization after initial urgent care consultation.^{23,25} These studies were designed to address 2 different comparisons: (1) impact by organization of the tele-urgent service (local vs regional systems) and (2) impact by urgent care venue (*eg*, tele-urgent care services vs in-person urgent care clinics). Most studies had some ROB concerns (Figures 3-6).

Next, we organize results by utilization outcome (*eg*, subsequent outpatient visits, subsequent hospitalizations) and then by comparison of interests (organization of tele-urgent care system or urgent care venue).

Effects on Overall Patterns in Health Care Utilization

Two studies explored the impact of introducing tele-urgent care on patterns of health care utilization for low-acuity conditions. One moderate ROB cohort study²¹ looked at data from 2011 to 2013 for 981 US state health plan enrollees who had a direct-to-consumer telehealth visit for low-acuity respiratory infections (tele-urgent care condition). These telehealth visits were matched to 1,962 enrollees served only by in-person care for the same condition in the same period of time. This study estimated the in-person care being replaced by tele-urgent care and the care that constituted “new utilization” by comparing the change in in-person physician and ED visits to the change in telehealth visits. By 2013, tele-urgent care accounted for 85 visits per year per 100 people. Of these 85 tele-urgent visits, 11.8% (95% CI -24 to 3) were estimated to be substitutions for care to a physician’s office or the ED, and 88.2% (95% CI 60 to 88 visits) were increased utilization (*ie*, “new utilization”) attributable to the introduction of tele-urgent care services.

An additional serious ROB cohort study assessed trends from 2008 to 2015 in use of in-person and telehealth acute care venues across 20.6 million visits for low-acuity conditions using claims data from a large US-based commercial health plan.³ Overall, there was a 140% increase in non-ED urgent visits for low-acuity conditions. Compared with in-person urgent care services, tele-urgent care experienced an overall increase in the proportion of total visits, with low-acuity diagnosis codes from 0 visits in 2008 to 6 visits in 2015 per 1,000 members. In contrast, retail clinic visits (-3.9%) and in-person urgent care center visits (-6.1%) experienced a decrease in the proportion of low-acuity visits—suggesting that much of the overall increase in urgent care may be attributable to the use of tele-urgent care services (Table 3).

Effects on Subsequent Outpatient Care Utilization

Four studies—1 RCT (rated as some concerns for ROB),^{22,33} 2 cross-sectional (1 fair ROB²³; 1 good ROB²⁵), and 1 moderate ROB controlled before-and-after study³¹—assessed the impact of tele-urgent care on subsequent use of outpatient care after the initial tele-urgent care visit. Two

studies assessed the impact of 2 different organizational models of telephone-delivered care (local vs national or regional call centers) and found no statistically significant increase in subsequent outpatient care.^{31,33} The other 2 studies compared subsequent use of outpatient visits in the 21 days following an index visit between video-based urgent care and in-person urgent care venues.^{23,25} Both studies found that urgent care initiated via video had fewer subsequent outpatient visits than urgent care sought in the ED. Yet no clear pattern emerged when comparing video-based and in-person urgent care delivered through non-ED venues.

Comparison by Organizational Structure of Tele-urgent Care

One UK-based RCT (rated as some concerns for ROB) compared after-hours care provided by the patient's own GP practice (n=49 practice physicians) to that provided by commercial external agencies delegated to cover care for GP practices (n=183 external physicians; tele-urgent care condition).³³ After adjusting for age, sex, ethnic group, and access to a car, there were no significant differences in number of visits to primary care in the 2 weeks following tele-urgent care contact (46.5% vs 44.2%, p=0.299). A second study was a moderate ROB controlled before-and-after assessment of the implementation of an updated national health advice line in England staffed by nonclinical call handlers (referred to as "NHS 111") that encompassed 277,163 calls over the 1-year pilot.³¹ Prior to the implementation of NHS 111, all areas in England had a 24-hour nurse-led telephone helpline called NHS Direct, which used an initial contact with a nonclinical call handler who then directed calls to a nurse triage staff either during the same call or via a call-back. NHS 111 differed from NHS Direct in that it was managed by nonclinical call handlers who used computerized decision support software (CDSS) to immediately triage incoming calls, avoiding call-backs and wait times, and had the ability to direct callers to the most appropriate service or offer self-management advice. Calls that may involve self-care advice or require referral to specialist services are transferred for clinical advice before a final disposition was reached. NHS 111 resulted in an average monthly increase of 2.5% visits in outpatient care that was not statistically significant (95% CI -3.5 to +8.5).

Comparison by Urgent Care Site: Virtual versus In-person Venues

Two cross-sectional studies (1 good ROB,²⁵ 1 fair ROB²³), both conducted in the United States, used similar methods to compare the subsequent use of outpatient visits in the 21 days following an index visit between video-based tele-urgent care and other in-person urgent care venues. The first study was conducted in an integrated health care system, Intermountain Health in Utah.²⁵ This study compared claims for low-acuity urgent conditions across 1,531 video-based urgent care visits, 2,285 ED visits, 4,377 in-person urgent care center visits, and 4,388 in-person primary care visits. In the 21 days following the index visit, patients initially evaluated via video-based urgent care visits had a statistically significant increase in outpatient visits than those initially evaluated in primary care settings (4% more visits), but fewer primary care visits than those who were seen in the ED (13.2% fewer visits). Compared with video-delivered urgent care, initial care delivered at an in-person urgent care center had similar rates of outpatient visits after the index visit. The second study²³ examined 59,945 on-demand visits for acute conditions (eg, colds, allergies, urinary tract infections). The analysis included 4,635 virtual online (ie, tele-urgent) and 55,310 non-virtual visits to retail health clinics, in-person urgent care centers, ED, or primary care physicians. The percentage of outpatient follow-up visits within 21 days of the index visit did not have a statistically significant difference between virtual video-delivered urgent care and care delivered via retail health clinics and primary care clinics. Both studies

found that urgent care initiated via video had fewer subsequent outpatient visits than urgent care sought in the ED (Table 3).

Effects on Subsequent Emergency Department Utilization

Three studies—1 moderate ROB controlled before-and-after study³¹ and 2 cross-sectional studies (1 good ROB,²⁵ 1 fair ROB²³)—assessed the impact of tele-urgent care on subsequent use of the ED. One study assessed the impact of nationalizing the delivery of tele-urgent care in the year after NHS 111 was piloted and found no statistically significant increase in subsequent ED utilization.³¹ The other 2 studies compared subsequent use of the ED in the 21 days following an index visit between video-based tele-urgent care and in-person urgent care venues.^{23,25} Again, results were inconsistent when comparing tele-urgent care with non-ED urgent care delivered in-person on subsequent ED use.

Comparison by Organizational Structure of Tele-urgent Care

The moderate ROB controlled before-and-after study (Turner et al, 2019, described above) that assessed the implementation of an updated national health consultation telephone service in England staffed by nonclinical call handlers in NHS 111 found no change in ED utilization in the year after NHS 111.³¹ Yet this study did find a statistically significant increase in ambulance services after in implementation of NHS 111 (Table 3.)

Comparison by Urgent Care Site: Virtual versus In-person Venues

The good ROB cross-sectional study conducted in an integrated health care system in the United States (Lovell et al, 2019, described above) compared low-acuity video-based tele-urgent care index visits with index visits originating at the ED, in-person urgent care, or in-person primary care setting.²⁵ There were no significant differences in follow-up rates of subsequent ED visits between tele-urgent care and both in-person urgent and in-person primary care in the 21 days following the index visit. Yet patients initially evaluated via tele-urgent care had a statistically significant decrease in follow-up visits to the ED compared with those initially evaluated in the ED (7.9% fewer visits). The fair ROB cross-sectional study (Gordon et al, 2017; described above) also found that the urgent care delivered by video consultation resulted in a statistically significant decrease in subsequent ED visits in the 21 days after index visit compared to urgent care initially delivered at the ED (5.3% decrease).²³ This study also found that video-delivered urgent care had fewer subsequent ED visits than low-acuity urgent care initiated in primary care clinics (0.5% decrease) or in-person urgent care (1.4% increase) and similar rates of acute care delivered via retail health clinics.²³

Effects on Hospitalizations

Comparison by Urgent Care Site: Virtual versus In-person Venues

Two US-based cross-sectional studies (1 good ROB²⁵ and 1 fair ROB²³) assessed the impact of urgent care venue on subsequent rates of hospitalization. Both studies found that urgent care delivered by video resulted in a statistically significant decrease in subsequent hospitalizations 21 days after the index visit compared with care delivered at the ED (range 2.2% to 5.2%). Yet no significant differences were reported in the number of hospital stays comparing tele-urgent care with in-person urgent care and in-person primary care in the good ROB study.²⁵ In comparison, the fair ROB study found that tele-urgent care had a statistically significant decrease

in hospitalizations compared with in-person primary care and in-person urgent care (0.2% fewer visits for both settings) and similar rates for acute care delivered via retail health clinics.²³

Table 3. Summary of Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Type of Health Care Utilization Pattern

Study	Outcome Description	Results
<i>Overall Patterns in Health Care Utilization</i>		
Poon, 2018 ³	Proportion of total visits with low-acuity diagnosis codes by venue	<p><i>Tele-urgent care via video</i> Percent of visits in 2008: not able to be computed Percent of visits in 2015: 68%</p> <p><i>In-person urgent care</i> Percent of visits in 2008: 71.5% Percent of visits in 2015: 65.4%</p> <p><i>Retail clinics</i> Percent of visits in 2008: 61.8% Percent of visits in 2015: 57.9%</p> <p><i>Emergency department</i> Percent of visits in 2008: 38.4% Percent of visits in 2015: 28.8%</p>
Ashwood, 2017 ²¹	Substitution of tele-urgent care for in-person health care utilization: decrease in non-telehealth visits to the increase in telehealth visits between telehealth user and nonusers in physician office or emergency department visits for acute respiratory infections (per 100 persons per year)	<i>Between-group differences in physician office visits or emergency department use between telehealth users and nonusers</i> -10 visits (95% CI -24 to 3)
	New health care utilization attributable to tele-urgent care: change in total number of telehealth visits and those estimated to be substituting for in-person visits for acute respiratory infections (per 100 persons per year)	<i>Between-group differences for all sites in physician office visits or emergency department use between telehealth users and nonusers</i> +74 visits (95% CI 60 to 88)
<i>Outpatient Care Utilization: Comparison by Organizational Structure of Tele-urgent Care</i>		
McKinley, 1997 ³³	Percent of patients seen in general practice by doctor or nurse in 2 weeks after out of hours call	<p><i>Practice physicians providing tele-urgent care</i> 46.5%</p> <p><i>Tele-urgent care by physicians outside patients' practice</i> 44.2%</p>

Study	Outcome Description	Results
		p = 0.299
Turner, 2013 ³¹	Percent change in monthly activity counts for GP out-of-hours, walk-in clinics, minor injury unit, urgent care centers attendance between new telephone-based urgent care (NHS 111) pilot and control sites	<i>Estimated percent change in monthly activity between tele-urgent care pilot sites and control sites</i> +2.5% (95% CI -3.5% to 8.5%)
Outpatient Care Utilization: Comparison by Virtual versus In-person Venues		
Lovell, 2019 ²⁵	Percent with outpatient clinic visit within 21 days	<i>In-person urgent care vs video-based urgent care</i> 0.92 relative ratio (95% CI 0.83 to 1.01) <i>Primary care vs video-based urgent care</i> 0.85 relative ratio (95% CI 0.77 to 0.93) <i>Emergency department care vs video-based urgent care</i> 1.50 relative ratio (95% CI 1.35 to 1.64)
Gordon, 2017 ²³	Percent of patients with all-cause outpatient visit during 3-week episode post-index visit	<i>In-person urgent care centers vs video-based urgent care</i> 25.6% vs 28.1% (p = 0.001) <i>Primary care physicians vs video-based urgent care</i> 28.1% vs 28.1% (p = 0.99) <i>Retail health clinics vs video-based urgent care</i> 28.6% vs 28.1% (p = 0.51) <i>Emergency department vs video-based urgent care</i> 34.2% vs 28.1% (p <0.001)
Emergency Services Utilization: Comparison by Organizational Structure of Tele-urgent Care		
Turner, 2013 ³¹	Percent change in monthly ED visits in new telephone-based urgent care (NHS 111) pilot sites compared to control sites	<i>Estimated percent change in monthly activity between pilot sites and control sites</i> -0.1% (95% CI -3.8% to 3.7%)
	Percent change in monthly utilization of ambulance services (defined as arriving at incident scene) between new telephone-based urgent care (NHS 111) pilot sites compared to control sites	<i>Estimated percent change in monthly activity between pilot sites and control sites</i> +2.9% (95% CI 1.0 to 4.8%)
Emergency Department Utilization: Comparison by Virtual versus In-person Venues		
Lovell, 2019 ²⁵	Percent with emergency department visit within 21	<i>In-person urgent care vs video-based urgent care</i> 1.29 relative ratio (95% CI 0.75 to 1.83)

Study	Outcome Description	Results
	days by index visit site for urgent care	<i>Primary care vs video-based urgent care</i> 1.49 relative ratio (95% CI 0.87 to 2.12)
		<i>Emergency department care vs video-based urgent care</i> 5.53 relative ratio (95% CI 3.34 to 7.71)
Gordon, 2017 ²³	Percent of patients with all-cause emergency department visits during 3-week episode post urgent care index visit	<i>In-person urgent care centers vs video-based urgent care</i> 2.7% vs 1.3% (p < 0.001)
		<i>Primary care physicians vs video-based urgent care</i> 1.8% vs 1.3% (p = 0.02)
		<i>Retail health clinics vs video-based urgent care</i> 1.6% vs 1.3% (p = 0.16)
		<i>Emergency departments vs video-based urgent care</i> 6.5% vs 1.3% (p < 0.001)
<i>Hospitalizations: Comparison by Virtual versus In-person Venues</i>		
Lovell, 2019 ²⁵	Percent with inpatient admission within 21 days by index visit site for urgent care	<i>In-person urgent care vs video-based urgent care</i> 1.57 relative ratio (95% CI 0.19 to 2.94)
		<i>Primary care vs video-based urgent care</i> 1.77 relative ratio (95% CI 0.22 to 3.32)
		<i>Emergency department care vs video-based urgent care</i> 6.74 relative ratio (95% CI 1.11 to 12.36)
Gordon, 2017 ²³	Percent of patients with all-cause inpatient visit during 3-week episode post-index visit	<i>In-person urgent care centers vs video-based urgent care</i> 0.4% vs 0.2% (p = 0.01)
		<i>Primary care physician vs video-based urgent care</i> 0.4% vs 0.2% (p = 0.02)
		<i>Retail health clinic vs video-based urgent care</i> 0.3% vs 0.2% (p = 0.12)
		<i>Emergency department vs video-based urgent care</i> 1.0% vs 0.2% (p < 0.001)

Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Patient Satisfaction: Key Points

- Seven studies reported on patient satisfaction with tele-urgent care. All 7 were conducted in European medical systems where out-of-hours urgent care is typically provided as part of a broad, integrated system. In such systems, telephone triage could be followed by

telephone consultation for self-care, by a recommendation for an in-person visit to a physician or in-person urgent care center, or by a physician home visit.

- Overall, patients expressed the greatest satisfaction when the care they received matched their expectations for care.
- Differences in patient satisfaction were not consistently observed by triage decision of tele-urgent care interaction (telephone vs clinic visit vs home visit) or by organizational structure of the telephone-delivered care (external physicians vs practice-based and/or cooperative physicians). When differences in satisfaction were observed among triage decision, telephone was found to be associated with lower patient satisfaction compared to in-person care.

Detailed Findings

All 7 studies that evaluated the effects of tele-urgent care on patient satisfaction were conducted in European medical systems where out-of-hours care is typically provided as part of a broad, integrated system.^{24,26,27,29,30,32,33} In such systems, telephone care could be followed by telephone consultation for self-care, by a recommendation for an in-person visit to a physician or in-person care center, or by a physician home visit. In this context, 3 studies examined the impact of tele-urgent care triage decision (telephone advice for self-care vs home visit or in-person treatment at a center),^{26,30,32} and 4 examined the effects of the organizational structure of telephone-delivered urgent care system (*ie*, local practice-based service vs national or regional “deputizing” call centers)^{24,27,29,33} on satisfaction among patients seeking tele-urgent care. Of these 7 studies, 1 was a randomized controlled trial,³³ 1 was a cohort,²⁷ 1 was a controlled before-and-after study²⁴, and 4 were cross-sectional studies.^{26,29,30,32} Only 1 study had serious ROB concerns.²⁷ All other studies were assessed as having no serious ROB concerns. Overall, patients expressed the greatest satisfaction when the care they received matched their expectations for care; patients expressed the greatest dissatisfaction when the care they received did not match their expected care. Differences in patient satisfaction were not consistently observed by triage decision of tele-urgent care interaction (*ie*, telephone advice for self-care vs clinic visit vs home visit) or by organization (*ie*, external “deputizing” physicians vs practice-based and/or cooperative physicians). When differences in satisfaction were observed among triage decision, telephone advice was found to be associated with lower patient satisfaction compared with in-person care.

Comparison by Triage Decision of Tele-urgent Care

Two good ROB cross-sectional studies specifically compared dissatisfaction among patients seeking tele-urgent care who were triaged to receive telephone consultation for self-care, visit a clinic, or receive a home visit.^{30,32} The first study evaluated patients calling the Glasgow Emergency Medical Service (GEMS).³² A total of 1,115 patients responded to a survey mailed to every other caller 1 week after contact with the service. Most patients in this study received either a home visit (23%) or visited a clinic (55.9%), while 13.1% received telephone advice only. The authors found that among the variables examined (age, gender, socioeconomic status, perceived difficulty with daytime service, perceived urgency of complaint, match between service expected and service received), patient dissatisfaction was most strongly associated with a disjunct between patients’ expectation and the actual triage decision they received. Patients who expected a home visit but received telephone advice expressed the most dissatisfaction with tele-urgent care, followed by those who expected to be invited to attend a center but received telephone advice, and finally by those who expected to receive a home visit but were asked to

attend a center. The second study compared dissatisfaction among 7,213 patients who responded to a postal survey after calling for out-of-hours urgent care in Denmark and being triaged by a physician to receive either a telephone consultation for self-care, a clinic consultation, or a home visit.³⁰ While the majority of patients reported satisfaction with their experience, patients who received telephone advice for self-care were significantly more likely to report dissatisfaction than those who received either a clinic consultation or a home visit, particularly for those living in urban compared with rural areas.

A third cross-sectional study specifically evaluated whether patient expectations interacted with the care they received to predict satisfaction.²⁶ Patients requesting out-of-hours care were mailed questionnaires the day after making contact, and 2,263 surveys were returned. A regression model included the type of care (telephone advice, visit to center, or home visit), the type of telephone-based after-hours service (practice-based physician, physician cooperative, or external physician deputizing service), whether or not the service received was the service that was hoped for, and the subscales of the satisfaction scale. Results of the regression indicated that patients who received the type of care they hoped for were likely to report greater satisfaction with tele-urgent care. Also, patients were more satisfied with tele-urgent care from the physician cooperative than the external physician deputizing service. While telephone advice was not significantly different from receiving a home visit in this model, patients who received telephone advice for self-care reported the lowest rate of having received the care they hoped for across types of telephone-based after-hours service (*ie*, practice-based physician, physician cooperative, or external physician deputizing service).

Comparison by Organizational Structure of Tele-urgent Care

Three studies explored the impact of receiving after-hours care from a physician in their own practice compared with those receiving care from GP cooperatives or physicians through commercial external agencies delegated to cover care for GP practices (referred to as “deputizing” service).^{27,29,33} The first study was an RCT (rated as some ROB concerns) that evaluated differences in satisfaction between patients in the UK who received care from a physician in their own practice compared with a GP deputizing service. A total of 2,152 patients were interviewed by phone between 24 and 120 hours after contacting the out-of-hours service for care using a questionnaire developed and validated by one of the study authors.³³ Results indicated patients expressed significantly higher satisfaction with practice doctors compared with deputizing service doctors,³³ even though practice doctors were much more likely to give telephone advice than deputizing doctors (20.8% vs 1.5%, respectively).³³

Two studies assessed the impact of out-of-hours telephone-based urgent care delivered by local practice-based physicians compared to physician cooperatives and/or commercial deputizing physician services. Both found no significant differences in patient satisfaction by organization of tele-urgent care service. The first study was a cohort study with serious ROB considerations. Patients were sent a survey within 7 days of their interaction with either deputizing service or practice-based service.²⁷ While in bivariate analyses of the 1,555 responses they found that overall satisfaction was higher for physician cooperative than commercial deputizing external physician service, in a multiple regression this variable was no longer significant. Rather, the following variables were each negatively associated with overall satisfaction: receiving telephone advice, having a preference for seeing one’s own doctor, and wanting to receive a home visit compared with wanting to attend a center or receive telephone advice. The second

study replicated the methods of the Salisbury et al study, with surveys mailed 1 week after contact to a random sampling of patients seeking out-of-hours care in London stratified by organization of after-hours care (*ie*, local practice-based vs GP cooperative vs deputizing external physician service).²⁹ Results indicated that satisfaction did not differ between the GP cooperative, the practice-based arrangement, or the commercial deputizing physician service.

One additional study assessed the organization of tele-urgent care on patient satisfaction before and after transition to a new national telephone-based service in the UK (*ie*, NHS 111).²⁴ This study was a moderate ROB controlled before-and-after study using a validated telephone-administered questionnaire to examine patient satisfaction in pilot and control areas of the UK before and after the transition from NHS Direct to NHS 111. NHS Direct was a 24-hour nurse-led telephone help line that provided 24-hour service and that also handled out-of-hours calls for some general practices. NHS Direct did not have direct access to prescribers or to appointments, though nurses would advise people to call their local physician's out-of-hours service. While most NHS 111 calls are handled by nonclinical call handlers, this service is linked in with the out-of-hours physician practices and can offer telephone consultations by a prescriber, home visits, and face-to-face reviews on site. As such, the transition from NHS Direct could be examined in the context of a transition from a nurse-led advice line to a model that more closely maps to the definition of tele-urgent care. Of the 28,071 respondents, 2,237 reported having used urgent care (NHS Direct/"control" or NHS 111/"pilot") within the prior 3 months and were therefore included in the analyses. Results indicated no significant change in patient satisfaction with tele-urgent care experience before and after transitions to NHS 111.

Table 4 presents a summary of the effects of different aspects of tele-urgent care on patient satisfaction outcomes reported in the included studies.

Table 4. Summary of Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Patient Satisfaction

Study	Comparison	Assessment Scale	Results
<i>Comparison by Triage Decision of Tele-urgent Care</i>			
Tranberg, 2018 ³⁰ Cross-sectional N=7213 patients	Satisfaction with telephone consultation vs clinic consultation vs home visit	"Overall satisfaction with the contact" item included in broader questionnaire, with 6 response items: "Very satisfied," "satisfied," "dissatisfied," "very dissatisfied," "neutral," and "don't know"; "neutral" and "don't know" were excluded, and "dissatisfied" and "very dissatisfied" were combined in analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More patients were dissatisfied ($p < 0.001$) with telephone (8.5%) vs clinic consultation (6.0%) or home visit (4.3%) • Dissatisfaction was most strongly associated with "unacceptable wait time"
Wilson, 2001 ³² Cross-sectional N=1115 patients	Dissatisfaction for receiving home visit vs attend a center vs telephone advice	Unvalidated 5-point scale of agreement with statement that completely satisfied with type of contact received, from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Odds of patient dissatisfaction were most strongly related to expectations and outcome ($p < 0.0001$) • Dissatisfaction was expressed by patients expecting to attend a center but receiving telephone advice (OR 6.43,

Study	Comparison	Assessment Scale	Results
			95% CI 3.35 to 12.32, p <0.0001) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissatisfaction was expressed by patients who expected home visit but were asked to attend a center (OR 5.48, 95% CI 3.30 to 9.09, p <0.0001) • Dissatisfaction was expressed by 35% expecting a home visit but receiving telephone advice (OR 10.55, 95% CI 5.70 to 19.53, p <0.0001)
McKinley, 2002 ²⁶ Cross-sectional N=2263 patients	Satisfaction with home visit vs attend center vs telephone	Scale developed and validated by McKinley, ³⁴ modified by Salisbury, ²⁷ with 2 additional items added; 5-point scale for overall agreement with statement of satisfaction, with 5 as strongest agreement, 3 as neutral, 2 as strongest disagreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patients who received the type of care they hoped for in terms of service type and consultation type were significantly more satisfied than those who did not, $\beta=230.4$, $SE(\beta)=52.8$, p <0.0001 • Greater satisfaction was associated with center attendance vs home visits, $\beta=161.4$, $SE(\beta)=79.7$, p=0.04 • Greater satisfaction was associated with cooperative vs deputizing service, $\beta=272.6$, $SE(\beta)=120.1$, p=0.02
<i>Comparison by Organizational Structure of Tele-urgent Care</i>			
McKinley, 1997 ³³ (Companion: Cragg, 1997) ²²	Deputizing service physicians vs practice-based physicians	Patient Satisfaction Questionnaire developed and validated by McKinley ³⁴ : range 0 to 100%, with higher scores reflecting greater satisfaction	Patient satisfaction, mean: 61.8% (95% CI 59.9 to 63.7) deputizing service vs 70.7% (95% CI 68.1 to 73.2) practice doctors p <0.0001

Study	Comparison	Assessment Scale	Results
Salisbury, 1997 ²⁷ Cross-sectional N=1555 contacts (visits)	GP cooperative vs deputizing service physicians	Scale developed and validated by McKinley, ³⁴ modified by Salisbury, ²⁷ 5- point scale for overall agreement with statement of satisfaction, with 5 as strongest agreement, 3 as neutral, 2 as strongest disagreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall satisfaction higher for GP cooperative than deputizing service (mean difference [SE] = -0.12[0.06], $p=0.041$) In multiple regression the variable cooperative vs deputizing service was no longer significant, but the following variables were negatively associated with overall satisfaction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preference for seeing one's own doctor (mean (SE) regression estimate = -0.461 (0.055), $p < 0.001$) Receiving telephone advice (mean (SE) regression estimate = -0.431(0.069), $p < 0.001$) Wanting to receive a home visit vs to receive telephone advice or attend primary center (mean [SE] regression estimate = -0.489 [0.060] $p < 0.001$)
Shipman, 2000 ²⁹	GP cooperative vs practice- based arrangement vs deputizing service	Scale developed and validated by McKinley, ³⁴ modified by Salisbury, ²⁷ 5- point scale for overall agreement with statement of satisfaction, with 5 as strongest agreement, 3 as neutral, 2 as strongest disagreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean overall satisfaction scores did not differ between GP cooperative (3.26; 95% CI 3.16 to 3.36) or practice-based arrangement (3.03; 95% CI 3.16 to 3.43) or deputizing service (3.17; 95% CI 3.05 to 3.28); p value not reported
Knowles, 2016 ²⁴	Before and after transition to new national telephone- based service in the UK (<i>ie</i> , NHS 111)	Validated "Urgent Care System Questionnaire," a 5- point scale for overall satisfaction from "poor or very poor" to "excellent," dichotomized to reflect "excellent" vs all others	Comparison between pilot and control regions of pre-intervention to post-intervention change in proportion of "excellent" rating of urgent care services: OR 0.97 (95% CI 0.69 to 1.37)

Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Health Care Cost: Key Points

- Four studies assessed the cost of delivering tele-urgent care; all were conducted in the United States. All but 1 cross-sectional study was judged to have moderate to serious ROB considerations.

- Across included studies, index costs and total costs for care associated with tele-urgent visits for low-acuity conditions were lower for tele-urgent-type visits compared with similar types of visits for in-person settings (eg, ED, in-person urgent care centers). Yet 1 study supports that tele-urgent care may increase overall health care spending via increased access to on-demand care for low-acuity conditions.
- There was variability in how cost was estimated, making it difficult to compare across studies.

Detailed Findings

In total, 4 US-based studies assessed costs for urgent visits for low-acuity conditions by virtual or in-person venues. Three studies assessed the costs of the initial urgent care visit (*ie*, index costs): 2 cross-sectional studies (1 fair ROB²³; 1 good ROB²⁵) and 1 serious ROB cohort study³). Three studies also reported on total costs associated with urgent care by virtual or in-person venue: 2 cross-sectional studies (1 fair ROB²³; 1 good ROB²⁵) and 1 moderate ROB cohort study.²¹ For this review, index costs are defined as the cost of only the initial tele-urgent care visit, with no additional costs for subsequent care resulting from the visit. Total cost calculations included the index costs plus additional costs from follow-up care such as medications or testing (eg, imaging, bloodwork). Overall, with the exception of 1 instance where the total annual spending was moderately increased for tele-urgent care users over nonusers,²¹ index costs and total costs across studies were lower for tele-urgent-type visits compared with other settings. Of note, the computed index visit costs for tele-urgent care were similar for all 3 studies: \$45,²⁵ \$49,²³ and \$39-\$40.³ Total costs across studies by site of urgent care had more variability, likely due to inconsistent inclusion of laboratory, imaging, and pharmacy costs. Yet 1 study demonstrated that net annual health care costs for low-acuity conditions (*ie*, respiratory illnesses) increased \$45 per tele-urgent care user compared with nonusers.

Next, we organize studies by index costs and then by total costs. A summary of results is shown in Table 5.

Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Index Cost

A good ROB cross-sectional study examined 59,945 on-demand visits for acute conditions (eg, colds, allergies, urinary tract infections).²³ This analysis included 4,635 video-based urgent care visits and 55,310 non-virtual visits. When accounting for the costs of the index visit only, video-based urgent care had a statistically significant lower cost than in-person retail clinic, urgent care centers, primary care clinic, and ED visits. Another fair ROB study, also cross-sectional, included 1,531 claims for video-based visits for low-acuity urgent conditions with 2,285 ED visits, 4,377 in-person urgent care visits, and 4,388 in-person primary care visits.²⁵ This study also found that index visits for on-demand acute conditions had a statistically significant greater cost at in-person venues compared with video-based urgent care visits. Both studies also reported the largest cost differences between video-based urgent care and ED visits (\$1,339 to \$1,355 more per visit for the ED).

One additional serious ROB cohort study examined 20.6 million in-person and telehealth acute care visits for treatment of low-acuity conditions at 2 time points, baseline and 8 years' follow-up.³ This study also reported that the index cost for tele-urgent care was lower than in-person urgent care delivered via the ED, in-person urgent care centers, and retail clinics. Over the 8-year

follow-up, index costs remained relatively stable for in-person urgent care (\$165 to \$162), retail clinic (\$74 to \$75), and tele-urgent care (\$40 to \$39). Yet the price per ED visit for a low-acuity condition increased by 79%, from \$914 per visit in 2008 to \$1,637 per visit in 2015.

Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Total Cost

A cross-sectional study described above examined 4,635 virtual (*ie*, tele-urgent) and 55,310 non-virtual visits. Retail clinic, urgent care, ED, and primary care provider visit costs were estimated to be \$36, \$153, \$1,735, and \$162 (respectively) more costly than virtual tele-urgent care visits in a 3-week episode, inclusive of pharmacy and subsequent medical visit costs.²³ Another cross-sectional study considered costs of 1,531 virtual visits for low-acuity urgent conditions with 2,285 ED visits, 4,377 in-person urgent care visits, and 4,388 in-person primary care visits.²⁵ The virtual visit average cost (\$428) was significantly lower than in-person visits at urgent care (\$661), primary care (\$706), and ED (\$3,403), including laboratory and imaging services, index visit cost, and total cost over a 21-day period.

One moderate ROB cohort study looked at 2012–2013 data for 981 state health plan enrollees who had a telehealth visit for low-acuity respiratory infections (tele-urgent care condition), matching those to 1,962 enrollees served by a different care setting in the same period of time.²¹ While telehealth users increased annual spending by \$45 (95% CI \$10 to \$79) compared with nonusers per person, the *total* average spending per episode was less for a telehealth visit (\$79) compared with a physician office visit (\$146) or an ED visit (\$1,734). In this study, total cost included the evaluation and management coding the day of the visit and the evaluation and management coding of follow-up visits plus costs related to pharmacy, imaging, and testing.

Table 5. Summary of Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Health Care Cost

Study	Outcome Description	Results
<i>Index Cost</i>		
Gordon, 2017 ²³	Mean index visit cost	<i>Video-based urgent care</i> Mean cost: \$49
		<i>Retail health clinic</i> Mean cost: \$74 Relative ratio: 1.52 (95% CI 1.49 to 1.54)
		<i>In-person urgent care</i> Mean cost: \$134 Relative ratio: 2.75 (95% CI 2.70 to 2.79)
		<i>In-person primary care</i> Mean cost: \$109 Relative ratio: 2.25 (95% CI 2.21 to 2.28)
		<i>Emergency department</i> Mean cost: \$1404 Relative ratio: 28.87 (95% CI 28.39 to 29.36)

Study	Outcome Description	Results
Lovell, 2019 ²⁵	Mean index visit cost	<p><i>Video-based urgent care</i> Mean cost: \$45.0</p> <p><i>In-person urgent care:</i> Mean cost: \$135.7 Relative ratio: 3.01 (95% CI 2.92 to 3.10)</p> <p><i>In-person primary care</i> Mean cost: \$114.4 Relative ratio: 2.54 (95% CI 2.46 to 2.62)</p> <p><i>Emergency department</i> Mean cost: \$1,383.9 Relative ratio: 30.74 (95% CI 29.67 to 31.81)</p>
Poon, 2018 ³	Inflation-adjusted average prices per index visit (per person per year)	<p><i>Tele-urgent care via video</i> Mean cost in 2008: \$40 Mean cost in 2015: \$39</p> <p><i>In-person urgent Care</i> Mean cost in 2008: \$165 Mean cost in 2015: \$162</p> <p><i>Retail clinics</i> Mean cost in 2008: \$74 Mean cost in 2015: \$75</p> <p><i>Emergency department</i> Mean cost in 2008: \$914 Mean cost in 2015: \$1,637</p>
Total Cost		
Gordon, 2017 ²³	Index visit costs plus any follow-up cost of pharmacy and subsequent medical visit costs during 3-week episode post-index visit	<p><i>Video-based urgent care</i> Mean cost: \$339</p> <p><i>In-person urgent care clinic</i> Mean cost: \$492 Relative ratio: 1.45 (95% CI NR)</p> <p><i>Retail health clinic</i> Mean cost: \$375 Relative ratio: 1.11 (95% CI NR)</p> <p><i>Primary care clinic</i> Mean cost: \$501 Relative ratio: 1.48 (95% CI NR)</p> <p><i>Emergency department</i> Mean cost: \$2,074</p>

Study	Outcome Description	Results
		Relative ratio: 6.12 (95% CI NR)
Lovell, 2019 ²⁵	Index cost plus all following medical visits, prescriptions, laboratory tests, and imaging within the 21 days of index visit	<p><i>Video-based urgent care</i> Mean cost: \$428.9</p> <p><i>Primary care</i> Mean cost: \$706.6 Relative ratio: 1.65 (95% CI 1.26 to 2.04)</p> <p><i>Urgent care</i> Mean cost: \$661.4 Relative ratio: 1.54 (95% CI 1.18 to 1.91)</p> <p><i>Emergency department</i> Mean cost: \$3,403.0 Relative ratio: 7.93 (95% CI 5.78 to 10.09)</p>
Ashwood, 2017 ²¹	Index visit plus evaluation and management coding the day of the visit, the evaluation and management coding follow-up plus costs related to pharmacy, imaging, and testing	<p><i>Tele-health users (ie, tele-urgent care)</i> \$79 (95% CI \$75 to \$86)</p> <p><i>Physician office</i> \$146 (95% CI \$140 to \$150)</p> <p><i>Emergency department</i> \$1,734 (95% CI \$1,447 to \$2,021)</p>

Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Health Care Access: Key Point

- Limited evidence was identified on the effects of tele-urgent care on access to health care. In a single study, patients' satisfaction with the timeliness (*ie*, wait time) for telephone advice did not differ by organizational structure of telephone-delivered urgent care (external "deputizing" physicians vs local cooperative physicians).

Detailed Findings

Timeliness

We aligned our concept of health care access with that of the US Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion's Healthy People 2020 objectives³⁵ and defined access as the ability to provide health care when the need is recognized (*ie*, timeliness) and satisfaction with provider services and communication (*ie*, services). We identified only 1 serious ROB cohort study that reported on timeliness of health care access measured as satisfaction with wait times.²⁷ This study compared 2 different models of telephone-delivered consultation serving an overlapping area in London, England. Patients were sent a survey within 7 days of their interaction with either a commercial deputizing physician service (*ie*, tele-urgent care) or a local GP cooperative service.²⁷ In a sub-analysis of patients who only received telephone advice for self-care, satisfaction with wait times for telephone advice did not differ between patients interacting with a GP cooperative physician (n=595) or an external commercial physician service (n=93) (Table 6).

Services

One RCT reported on patient satisfaction with the communication of the GP or the deputizing doctor.²² Patients were slightly more satisfied with the communication provided by the practice GP, with a mean satisfaction score of 68.9 (95% CI 66.5 to 71.4), compared to the deputizing physician who did not have a prior relationship with the patient, with a mean satisfaction score of 62.9 (95% CI 61.1 to 64.7). However, the p value for the difference in between these groups is significant ($p = 0.0002$).

Table 6. Summary of Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Health Care Access

Study	Outcome Description	Results
<i>Timeliness</i>		
Salisbury, 1997 ²⁷	Patients' satisfaction with wait time for telephone advice only	<i>Telephone advice by cooperative physician</i> Weighted mean score: 3.26 (95% CI 3.10 to 3.42)
		<i>Telephone advice by deputizing service</i> Weighted mean score: 3.29 (95% CI 3.17 to 3.40)
		Adjusted mean regression estimate 0.08 (SE 0.11) $p = 0.457$
<i>Services</i>		
Cragg, 1997 ²²	Satisfaction with provider communication	<i>Practice doctors</i> Mean score 68.9 (95% CI 66.5 to 71.4)
		<i>Deputizing doctors</i> Mean score 62.9 (95% CI 61.1 to 64.7)
		$p = 0.0002$

Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Case Resolution: Key Points

- Evidence from 1 study suggested that local, practice-based telephone triage services have higher case resolution outcomes and refer fewer patients to emergency or primary care services compared with regional/national telephone-based urgent care services.
- Adding additional review of calls to telephone-based urgent care services originally triaged to the ED by either a physician advisor or a non-physician clinical advisor produced more case resolution on the first contact than calls assessed by a non-clinical call handler.

Detailed Findings

Two studies reported on case resolution (*ie*, the health issue or concern was resolved during initial contact with the tele-urgent care system).^{22,28} Both studies were conducted in the UK and assessed different ways to organize tele-urgent care. In these studies, people who contacted remote triage services received 1 of 3 possible resolutions to their call: they were triaged to either emergency services, primary care services (including urgent care visits, home visits, or primary

care clinic visits whether after-hours, the same day, or on a future date), or they achieved resolution of their health concern during the initial contact. Table 7 summarizes the results of these studies by these 3 groupings of case resolution status.

The first study, with an overall ROB rating of some concerns, was an RCT and compared a commercial deputized physician group (*ie*, tele-urgent care) versus local practice physicians.²² Deputizing physicians resolved only 1.4% of calls in the initial contact compared to 20.8% in the practice physician arm. Practice physicians also triaged fewer calls to a home visit (74.9% vs 94.8%) or the ED (0.4% vs 1.3%) than did deputizing doctors.

The next study was a fair ROB interrupted time series study that described the impact of an enhanced clinical assessment service to a national tele-urgent care service (*ie*, NHS 111).²⁸ During the intervention period, callers who would have been triaged to ED attendance by non-clinical call handlers were immediately transferred to either an emergency physician (*ie*, tele-urgent care condition) or a non-physician clinical advisor (*ie*, nurses or paramedics with a scope of practice that includes assessment, treatment, advice, and diagnosis). Evaluation over the telephone by either of these clinician types reduced the number of callers sent to the ED (75% by physicians or 81% by a non-physician clinical advisor). There was a 22.4% (95% CI 19.0% to 25.7%) difference in the number of cases resolved through on-call advice for self-care between the physician advisors (38.1%) and the non-physician clinical advisor (15.7%). Of the cases resolved by in-person care, physician advisors triaged fewer people to out-of-hours GP clinics but more to the minor injuries units or walk-in centers or in-hours GP clinics than the non-physician clinical advisor).

Table 7. Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Type of Case Resolution

Study	Outcome Description	Results
<i>Telephone advice only</i>		
Cragg, 1996 ²²	Resolved during initial contact without referral	<i>Deputized physician</i> 15 of 1082 (1.4%)
		<i>Practice physician</i> 216 of 1,037 (20.8%)
Sen, 2019 ²⁸	Received advice of self-care	<i>Physician</i> 594 (38.1%)
		<i>Non-physician clinical advisor</i> 165 (15.7%)
		<i>Percent difference</i> 22.4% (95% CI 19.0 to 25.7)
<i>Outpatient care</i>		
Cragg, 1996 ²²	Referred to primary care services (<i>ie</i> , home visit, GP visit)	<i>Deputized physician</i> 1,053 of 1,082 (97.3%)
		<i>Practice physician</i> 817 of 1,037 (78.8%)

Sen, 2019 ²⁸	Referred by GP out of hours	<i>Physician</i> 70 (4.5%)
		<i>Non-physician clinical advisor</i> 441 (42.1%)
		<i>Percent difference</i> 37.6% (95% CI 34.3 to 40.8)
Referred by GP in hours	<i>Physician</i> 156 (10.0%)	
	<i>Non-physician clinical advisor</i> 7 (0.5%)	
	<i>Percent difference</i> 9.5% (95% CI 7.7% to 11.0%)	
Referred to minor injuries unit/walk-in center	<i>Physician</i> 225 (14.4%)	
	<i>Non-physician clinical advisor</i> 101 (9.6%)	
	<i>Percent difference</i> 4.8% (95% CI 2.2% to 7.4%)	
Emergency services care		
Cragg, 1996 ²²	Referred to emergency services	<i>Deputized physician</i> 14 of 1,082 (1.3%)
		<i>Practice physician</i> 4 of 1,037 (0.4%)
Sen, 2019 ²⁸	Referred to ED via ambulance	<i>Physician</i> 112 (7.5%)
		<i>Non-physician clinical advisor</i> 100 (9.5%)
		<i>Percent difference</i> 2.0% (95% CI to 0.6 to 3.4)
Referred to ED via own transport	<i>Physician</i> 284 (18.2%)	
	<i>Non-physician clinical advisor</i> 94 (9.0%)	
	<i>Percent difference</i> 9.2% (95% CI 6.6 to 11.9)	

Effects of Tele-urgent Care on Patient Safety

No eligible KQ 1 studies reported outcomes related to patient safety.

Quality of Evidence for Key Question 1

ROB assessments for the KQ 1 included studies are summarized in Figures 3-6. The ROB for the single RCT was rated as some concerns due to bias in all factors except selective reporting of results (Figure 3).²² For the nonrandomized controlled designs, the 2 controlled before-and-after studies were both judged to have issues with potential confounding (Figure 4).^{24,31} Of those studies, 1 had an issue with selection of participants and serious concerns for missing data,²⁴ and the other had additional risk of bias considerations related to outcome measurement and deviations for intended outcomes.³¹ For the 3 cohort studies, 1 was rated moderate ROB²¹ and 2 were rated serious ROB.^{3,27} The moderate ROB cohort study displayed concerns related to confounding and selection of participants.²¹ The other 2 serious ROB cohorts^{3,27} displayed the following concerns: serious confounding bias (n=2), serious concerns for selection of participants (n=1), serious concerns for missing data (n=1), measurement of outcomes (n=1).²⁷

Of the cross-sectional studies, 4 were rated as good ROB^{25,26,30,32} and 3 as fair ROB^{23,28,29} (Figure 5). Patterns that led to judgments of more concerns for ROB included measurement and adjustment for key confounding variables (n=3), section of subjects from same population (n=1), and at least a 50% participation rate (n=1) (Figure 6).

Figure 3. Risk of Bias Assessment for the Included Cluster-randomized Trial





Figure 4. Risk of Bias Assessment for Nonrandomized Studies of Interventions

A



B




Figure 5. Risk of Bias Assessment for Cross-sectional Studies

		Risk of bias domains														
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	D8	D9	D10	D11	D12	D13	D14	Quality Rating
Study	Sen et al., 2019	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	?	+	+	+	?	?	-	Fair
	Tranberg et al., 2018	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	-	?	?	+	Good
	Shipman et al., 2000	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	+	?	?	-	Fair
	Gordon et al., 2017	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	+	?	-	-	+	-	Fair
	Wilson et al., 2001	+	+	+	?	-	?	?	?	?	-	+	-	?	-	Good
	McKinley et al., 2002	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	+	-	?	+	Good
	Lovell et al., 2019	+	+	+	+	-	?	+	?	+	-	+	-	+	+	Good


Domains:

1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?
2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined?
3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?
4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?
5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?
6. For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?
7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?
8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?
9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?
10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?
11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?
12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?
13. Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?
14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?

Judgement

- No
- Cannot Determine; Not Applicable; Not Reported
- Yes

Figure 6. Risk of Bias Assessment Across Included Cross-sectional Studies



KEY QUESTION 2

A. Among adults, what are the adverse effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions (ie, inappropriate treatment, misdiagnosis, delayed diagnosis, patient deaths, provider burnout)?

B. Do the adverse effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions differ by (1) provider characteristics (ie, specialty, amount of telehealth experience, training) or (2) mode of delivery (ie, telephone, video, web, short message service)?

Characteristics of Included Studies

Three studies were identified that addressed KQ 2.³⁶⁻³⁸ Study designs included 1 cluster RCT,³⁶ 1 cohort,³⁷ and 1 cross-sectional.³⁸ The sample size of studies ranged from 298 to 1,167,468 with a median of 14,492 participants. The cluster RCT was rated as moderate ROB,³⁶ the cohort was rated as fair,³⁷ and the cross-sectional was rated as some concerns.³⁸

Key Points

- Few studies reported the adverse effects of interest. We found no studies that addressed delayed diagnosis or provider burnout. All included studies had ROB concerns.
- One moderate ROB retrospective cohort study found similar or better guideline-concordant antibiotic use for acute upper respiratory infections when treatment was delivered via tele-urgent care compared to in-person primary care or ED visits.
- One fair ROB cross-sectional study reported a small proportion of clinical safety complaints resulting from telephone-based after-hours care, many of which were not validated on objective review.

Detailed Findings

We sought to describe the adverse effects of tele-urgent care for low-acuity conditions, defined as inappropriate treatment, misdiagnosis, delayed diagnosis, and provider burnout. We identified 3 studies that addressed these adverse effects.³⁶⁻³⁸ One study was a fair ROB cross-sectional study.³⁷ Another was a moderate ROB retrospective cohort study.³⁸ The last study was an RCT rated as having some concerns for ROB and used a comparator arm that mapped to our definition of tele-urgent care.³⁶ Two studies were conducted in the United Kingdom^{36,38} and 1 in the United States.³⁷ None of the relevant studies for this outcome reported analyses by a priori subgroups of interest (*ie*, provider characteristics, mode of delivery) to address KQ 2B. The types of adverse effects from tele-urgent care that were reported included receipt of inappropriate treatment and misdiagnosis (both objective and patient reported) and adverse clinical outcome (*eg*, deaths). We found no eligible studies that reported on delayed diagnosis or provider burnout as an adverse effect of tele-urgent care.

The first study was an RCT comparing a physician-led to a nurse-led telephone consultation intervention for out-of-hours care among primary care clinics in England.³⁶ For the purposes of this outcome, only the physician-led condition met our definition of tele-urgent care. In this arm, a practice receptionist took patient details and passed them along to the doctor on call who then provided tele-urgent care. Adverse events of interest included death within 7 days. There were 67 deaths among the patient calls responded to by a general provider (n=7,308).

One retrospective cohort study reported on receipt of inappropriate treatment.³⁷ Specifically, they compared the quality of antibiotic management in the context of acute respiratory infection between patients receiving care from tele-urgent care visits versus matched patients receiving care via in-person primary care or urgent care visits. Patients were matched based on age, sex, chronic conditions, location, insurance, and diagnostic category. They incorporated data from 39,974 tele-urgent visits, 1,084,056 primary care visits, and 212,837 urgent care visits. Of note, this study was limited to adults between 18 and 64 years of age who had pharmaceutical benefits. The study authors considered inappropriate treatment as a potential adverse effect of tele-urgent care; in the case of acute respiratory infection, this was defined as (1) guideline non-concordant antibiotic use, (2) unnecessary antibiotic use, or (3) no antibiotic use (when they *may* be indicated). Guideline non-concordant antibiotic use was lower among patients treated by tele-urgent compared with primary care (13% vs 15%, $p < 0.001$) or urgent care (13% vs 14%, $p < 0.001$). Unnecessary antibiotic use was the same between tele-urgent and primary care (24% for each) and higher for urgent care (26%, $p < 0.001$). No antibiotic use (when they *may* be

indicated) was higher for tele-urgent than both primary care (17% vs 16%, $p < 0.001$) and urgent care (17% vs 14%, $p < 0.001$).


The last study reported on patient complaints of receipt of inappropriate treatment and misdiagnosis.³⁸ Study authors conducted a retrospective cohort study (no comparison group) of patient contacts with an out-of-hours service provider in Ireland that included 445,598 telephone contacts. Out of these contacts, 234 patients registered 298 patient service complaints. One hundred twenty-six complaints (42%) were related to clinical care, of which 76 were clinical safety concerns (*eg*, dissatisfaction with physical exam) and 50 were quality-of-care concerns (*eg*, not receiving antibiotics as expected). Authors report that of the 45 complaints about diagnosis, 5 were confirmed as objective misdiagnoses, and 7 of 49 complaints about prescriptions were found to be prescription errors. Level of harm related to these complaints was classified as none/minimal in 102 (81%), minor in 19 (15%), moderate 4 (4%), major in 1 (1%), and catastrophic in 0 cases.

Quality of Evidence for Key Question 2


All studies identified for KQ 2 had ROB concerns (Figure 7). The moderate ROB cluster RCT had concerns related to potential deviations from intended interventions.³⁶ The cohort, rated as fair, had biases related to potential confounding and missing data.³⁷ The cross-sectional was rated as some concerns and had issues related to sample size justification, measurement and dose of exposure, and measurement and adjustment for potential confounding variables.³⁸

Figure 7. Risk of Bias Assessment Across Included KQ 2 Studies

A



B



C

Study	Risk of bias domains														Quality Rating
	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	D8	D9	D10	D11	D12	D13	D14	
Wallace et al., 2018	+	+	?	+	-	+	?	-	-	?	+	?	+	-	Fair

Domains:

1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?
2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined?
3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?
4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?
5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?
6. For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?
7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?
8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?
9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?
10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?
11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?
12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?
13. Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?
14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?

Judgement

- No
- Cannot Determine; Not Applicable; Not Reported
- Yes

DISCUSSION

The COVID-19 pandemic has underscored the need for timely and accessible health care that fits the level of illness severity. Challenges abound as patients and health care providers alike continue to seek alternative ways to access and deliver appropriate and high-quality urgent care in the context of the current public health crisis. The promise of tele-urgent care is to decrease barriers and improve access to needed low-acuity health care.³⁹ Also, expanding access to urgent care via virtual modalities may allow more appropriate utilization of scarce and costly in-person emergency department services for high-acuity health conditions.^{3,4} Yet there are many unanswered questions about the effects of tele-urgent care on key clinical and health system outcomes. Thus, we sought to evaluate the effectiveness of tele-urgent care (KQ 1A) and adverse effects of tele-urgent care (KQ 2A) and explore differences in these key metrics by provider characteristics and tele-urgent care modality (KQ 1B, KQ 2B). To assess the effectiveness of tele-urgent care, we examined its impact on outcomes meaningful to VHA operations partners and vetted with our panel of technical experts.

Our systematic review is innovative in that it included a definition of “tele-urgent care” that sought to distinguish tele-urgent care systems from other virtual care services that are focused solely on evaluation and triage and do not include treatment by a prescribing provider (eg, virtual after-hours advice services, remote triage systems). We also sought to examine both objective and patient-reported outcomes and include a wide variety of experimental and observational designs, including cross-sectional studies. As such, we identified 4 experimental studies (1 RCT, 1 cluster RCT, 2 controlled before-and-after) and 12 observational studies (4 cohorts, 8 cross-sectional). No studies specifically addressed Veterans or were conducted in VHA.

KEY QUESTION 1 SUMMARY

We identified 13 studies that evaluated tele-urgent care across 5 outcomes of interest (ie, health care utilization, patient satisfaction, cost, health care access, and case resolution). Six studies

reported health care utilization, 7 reported patient satisfaction, 4 reported cost, 2 reported health care access, 2 reported case resolution, and none reported patient safety. They consisted of 1 RCT, 2 controlled before-and-after studies, 7 cross-sectional studies, and 3 cohort studies. Overall, we found limited evidence on the impact of tele-urgent care on health care access (2 studies), case resolution (2 studies), and patient safety (no studies). None of the studies that met KQ 1 eligibility criteria provided analysis by provider characteristics (*ie*, specialty, amount of telehealth experience, training), and studies did not provide sufficient information to conduct study-level subgroup analysis. There were insufficient studies to explore the role of tele-urgent care by mode (*ie*, telephone, video) for any outcome. As a result, we were unable to address KQ 1B.

Next, we briefly summarize findings on the 3 outcomes prioritized by VHA operations partners as the most important for decision-making. Table 8 summarizes the COE ratings for these 3 outcomes.

Health Care Utilization

Six studies assessed the impact of tele-urgent care on health care utilization. Most had at least moderate ROB. Two studies suggested that the introduction of tele-urgent care may increase overall (*ie*, “new utilization”) health care utilization (very low COE). Four studies assessed subsequent health care utilization (*ie*, outpatient visits, ED, inpatient stays) after initial index tele-urgent care with no evidence that subsequent outpatient utilization significantly differs by organizational level of the virtual care (*ie*, local vs regional systems) or by profession of the initial staff conducting the triage portion of the tele-urgent care interaction (*eg*, nonclinical call handler, nurse vs general practitioner). When comparing the initial site of urgent care on subsequent health care utilization, care sought virtually consistently demonstrated lower subsequent health care utilization than care initially sought in the ED. Yet no clear pattern emerged when comparing urgent care initially sought via virtual mode or other, in-person venues (*eg*, urgent care centers, retail health clinics) outside the ED. It is important to note that most studies did not control for condition severity, which likely affects inferences about the impact of tele-urgent care on subsequent health care utilization. The COE for the impact of tele-urgent care on subsequent health care utilization was, at most, rated low.

Patient Satisfaction

Seven studies of varied quality reported on patient satisfaction with tele-urgent care. Differences in patient satisfaction were not consistently observed by triage decision of tele-urgent care interaction (telephone care management for self-care vs clinic visit vs home visit) or by relationship of the care provider to the clinic organization (external “deputizing” physicians vs practice-based and/or cooperative physicians). Generally, patients expressed the greatest satisfaction when the care they received matched their expectations for care. Overall COE for this outcome was rated as low or very low.

Health Care Cost

Four US-based studies assessed the cost of delivering tele-urgent care. All but 1 cross-sectional study were rated as moderate to serious ROB considerations. Across included studies, index costs (low COE) and total costs (very low COE) for care associated with tele-urgent visits for low-acuity conditions were lower for tele-urgent visits compared with in-person urgent care (*eg*,

ED, in-person urgent care centers). Yet 1 study supported that tele-urgent care may increase overall health care spending via increased access to on-demand care for low-acuity conditions.

Certainty of Evidence for Key Outcomes

We conducted COE ratings for the outcomes identified by our stakeholders as critical to decision-making. These assessments reflect the degree of confidence we have in our summary findings. For each outcome of interest, we present the COE by the utilization type (*eg*, overall, outpatient, emergency department), the overall satisfaction with care received by tele-urgent care systems, and the index visit cost and total costs (Table 8).

We identified very low COE that tele-urgent care reduces subsequent ED utilizations. The evidence reporting no effect of tele-urgent care on subsequent outpatient care utilization was low certainty for randomized studies and very low certainty for observational studies. We found very low COE that tele-urgent care systems reduced subsequent hospitalization. The evidence reporting mixed effects of tele-urgent care systems on overall trends in health care utilization was determined to be very low certainty. We have low certainty for randomized studies and very low certainty for observational studies that tele-urgent care has no effect or reduces patient satisfaction. We identified low COE that tele-urgent care reduces index visit costs compared to in-person care. The evidence reporting mixed effects of tele-urgent care on total costs was evaluated to be very low certainty.

Table 8. Certainty of Evidence for Primary Outcomes of Effects of Tele-urgent Care

Outcome	Number of Studies (Patients or Encounters)	Range of Effects	Certainty of Evidence (Rationale)
<i>Utilization</i>			
ED utilization	3 observational (5349,689)	One study reported 0.1% to 5.2% fewer ED visits, 1 study reported RRs between 1.29 (95% CI 0.75 to 1.82) and 5.53 (95% CI 3.34 to 7.71) times less risk for ED visits, and 1 study reported 0.1% decrease in ED use	Very low certainty (rated down for serious risk of bias)
Outpatient care	1 randomized (2,152)	2.5% decrease in outpatient visits	Low certainty (rated down for serious risk of bias and serious imprecision)
	3 observational (349,689)	One study reported range from 2.5% increase to 6.1% decrease in outpatient visits, 1 study reported a 2.5% (95% CI -3.5% to 8.5%) increase in outpatient visits, and 1 study reported RRs between 0.85 (95% CI 0.77 to 0.93) and 1.50 (95% CI 1.35 to 1.64) times less risk for primary care visits	Very low certainty (rated down for very serious inconsistency and serious imprecision)

Outcome	Number of Studies (Patients or Encounters)	Range of Effects	Certainty of Evidence (Rationale)
Hospitalization	2 observational (72,526)	One study reported a range of 0.1% to 0.8% decrease in hospitalization, and 1 study reported RRs between 1.57 and 6.74 times less risk for hospitalization	Very low certainty (rated down for serious inconsistency and very serious imprecision)
Overall health care utilization	2 observational (20,602,943)	One study reported a range of 3.9% to 9.6% decrease in other forms of health care utilization, and 1 study reported that 88.2% of the telehealth visits were additional visits attributable to introduction of tele-urgent care	Very low certainty (rated down for serious risk of bias and very serious inconsistency and serious imprecision)
Patient Satisfaction			
Total satisfaction	1 randomized (2,152)	61.8% (95% CI 59.9 to 63.7) satisfaction with deputizing service vs 70.7% (95% CI 68.1 to 73.2) satisfaction with practice doctors	Low certainty (rated down for serious risk of bias, serious indirectness)
	6 observational (41,505)	One study reported no significant difference between GP cooperatives, practice-based, and deputizing services for out of hours care; 1 study reported a mean difference of -0.12 (p=0.041) between deputizing services and cooperatives; 1 study reported an OR of 0.97 (95% CI 0.69 to 1.37) for excellent patient satisfaction before compared to after NHS 111; 1 study reported higher dissatisfaction (OR 6.43, 95% CI 3.35 to 12.32) when patients expected to receive in-person care but received tele-phone advice; another study reported that there was greater satisfaction associated with cooperative vs deputizing service (p = 0.02); and the last study reported that patients were more dissatisfied with telephone care vs clinic or home visit (p <0.001)	Very low certainty (rated down for serious indirectness)
Cost			
Index	2 observational (72,526)	One study reported a range relative decrease in cost between 28.87 (95% CI 28.39 to 29.36) and 1.52 (95% CI 1.49 to 1.54), and another study reported a relative decrease in cost ranging from 2.54 (95% CI 2.46 to 2.62) to 30.74 (95% CI 29.67 to 31.81)	Low certainty (rated down for observational study designs)

Outcome	Number of Studies (Patients or Encounters)	Range of Effects	Certainty of Evidence (Rationale)
Total	4 observational (20,675,469)	One study reported a range of \$3 decrease to \$723 increase in cost compared to \$1 decrease in tele-urgent care during the same period. One study reported a range of 1.11 to 6.12 relative decrease in cost. Another study reported an annual spending increase of \$45 (95% CI 1.49 to 1.54) per person comparing between tele-urgent users and non-users. The last study reported a relative decrease in cost between 1.54 (95% CI 1.18 to 1.91) and 7.93 (95% CI 5.78 to 10.09)	Very low certainty (rated down for serious risk of bias and for serious inconsistency)

KEY QUESTION 2 SUMMARY

We found little evidence on the adverse effects prioritized by VHA operations partners (*ie*, inappropriate treatment, misdiagnosis, delayed diagnosis, provider burnout). We identified only 3 studies in total that met our prespecified eligibility criteria; none addressed provider burnout. All included studies had ROB concerns. One moderate ROB retrospective cohort study explored inappropriate treatment outcomes and found similar or better guideline-concordant antibiotic use for acute upper respiratory infections when treatment was delivered via direct-to-consumer telemedicine compared to in-person primary care or ED visits. For misdiagnosis and delayed diagnosis, one fair ROB cross-sectional study reported a small proportion of clinical safety complaints resulting from telephone-based after-hours care, many of which were not validated on objective review. None of the studies that met KQ 2 eligibility criteria provided analysis by provider characteristics (*ie*, specialty, amount of telehealth experience, training), and studies did not provide sufficient information to conduct study-level subgroup analysis. There were insufficient studies to explore the role of tele-urgent care by mode (*ie*, telephone, video) for any outcome. As a result, we were unable to address KQ 2B.

PRIOR SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

Most prior systematic reviews on virtual care that were conceptually similar to this topic differed in their focus on initial assessment of acute, undifferentiated, or unscheduled care (*ie*, remote triage), telephone modality only, or non-urgent conditions.^{40,41} Six prior reviews focused on similar outcomes but were not able to conduct quantitative synthesis due to high heterogeneity of interventions, outcomes, and designs. One systematic review evaluated patient satisfaction with remote triage but only included telephone-delivered advice.⁴² Another sought to include diverse remote triage modalities but only identified those delivered by telephone.⁴⁰ These prior reviews reported mixed findings, with 1 review reporting the majority of included studies *did not* demonstrate a decrease in primary care, while another found that most studies demonstrated a decrease in primary care utilization.⁴² When comparing the initial site of urgent care on subsequent health care utilization, care sought virtually consistently demonstrated lower subsequent health care utilization than care initially sought in the emergency department. Yet no

clear pattern emerged when comparing tele-urgent care to urgent care sought at in-person venues (*ie*, urgent care centers, retail health clinics, primary care clinics).

For overall patient satisfaction with care, 1 prior review found high levels of satisfaction with virtual care.⁴³ Two other reviews reported mixed results that are more consistent with our interpretation of the data that patients expressed the greatest satisfaction when the care they received matched their expectations for care (*eg*, receiving in-person care when they expected to receive in-person care).^{40,41} For costs, 1 prior review reported that remote triage did not significantly differ in total costs from in-person primary care or by organizational level of the remote triage system (*ie*, local vs national triage system).⁴⁰ In contrast, our review found that index costs and total costs for care associated with tele-urgent visits for low-acuity conditions were lower for tele-urgent-type visits compared with similar types of visits for in-person settings (*eg*, ED, in-person urgent care centers). Consistent with our finding, other reviews found little data on safety outcomes and adverse events. Of note, 1 review concluded that the safety and quality of remote triage appeared to be linked to the context of the broader system in which the virtual care system was rooted, including policy priorities, health care costs, demographic and cultural factors, and technical infrastructure.³⁹ Likely, this applies to tele-urgent care systems as well; we were unable to address this finding in our review.

CLINICAL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Demand for telehealth has been increasing—even before the COVID-19 pandemic. Tele-urgent care, as a subset of services deliverable by virtual approaches at a distance, may be an appropriate means for delivering high-quality care for low-acuity conditions. Given that findings from this review were often from European systems of care, the applicability to the VA system versus other US systems of care is fairly strong. Centralized payment and delivery models found in European countries are most similar to our VA system of care and have lessons for us to learn. There was, however, little cohesion across studies of tasks within care models or standardization in how costs are measured.

Patient satisfaction with tele-urgent care appeared somewhat lower when telephone consultation was a part of tele-urgent care delivery. This suggests that in-person clinic- and home-based care modes may offer the face-to-face experience patients are seeking when reaching out for their urgent care needs. Notably, no included studies were conducted via video visits. Historically, patient satisfaction with video visits has been higher than telephone visits. Video calls may be the answer to optimizing patient satisfaction for virtual visits, but the United States is still hampered by internet broadband challenges in both urban and rural locales, not to mention the personal financial resources needed to purchase devices workable with a video platform. Additionally, video may feel intrusive compared to telephone communication alone. The VA system, if it pivots to long-term tele-urgent care offerings, will need to continue shoring up patients' access by underwriting devices or adding more robust assessments of local broadband to mitigate those challenges.

While the costs of tele-urgent care were not measured uniformly across the included studies, they generally included direct care services plus laboratory, imaging, and pharmacy costs. According to the included studies, virtual visits cost less than other in-person modes of care. However, the introduction of tele-urgent care likely introduces new costs related to staff training, patient preparation for a virtual encounter, technical support, and clinical workflow acclimation.

Delivering care at a distance requires accurate history-taking, adequate assessment with limited means, optimized communication and rapport building, and impeccable professional credentialing. Proactively managing patient expectations of tele-urgent care while compelling staff to follow evidence-based guidelines can improve rates of inappropriate treatment and other adverse outcomes that may be more likely to occur when care is conducted virtually. New systems of care, and providers' initial discomfort with them, could result in higher costs due to using more resources.

Last, patient safety in the tele-urgent care setting is particularly underexplored, with the identified literature providing little guidance. Importantly, 1 included European study had a large sample and examined numerous practice sites and practitioners.³⁶ A key to that system's success appears to be right-sizing care through a nurse-led triage enhanced by software systems followed by direct hand-off to practitioners for on-call treatment, in-person care, or emergency services. If any health care system in the United States is structured for centralized triage and in-network referral, it is the VA health care system.

LIMITATIONS

Our review has several strengths, including a protocol-driven design, a comprehensive search, inclusion of broad observation and experimental designs, and careful quality assessment via established risk of bias tools. Both our review and the literature, however, have limitations. Overall, the number of identified studies for many outcomes was small, and most of the literature had design limitations that affected study quality. None of the studies that met eligibility criteria provided analysis by provider characteristics (*ie*, specialty, amount of telehealth experience, training), and studies did not provide sufficient information to conduct study-level subgroup analysis. There were insufficient studies to explore the role of tele-urgent care by mode (*ie*, telephone, video) for any outcome. As a result, we were unable to address the differential impact of tele-urgent care by these moderators. Other limitations are detailed below.

Publication Bias

Given the small number of studies, statistical methods to detect publication bias are not useful. Other strategies, such as searching ClinicalTrials.gov for completed but unpublished studies, are not particularly effective ways to identify publication bias.⁴⁴ Thus, we did not conduct formal publication bias analysis.

Study Quality

We were also limited by the existing literature. We identified only 4 EPOC designs (2 RCTs and 2 controlled before-and after studies). The majority (n=8) were cross-sectional with many having significant ROB considerations. Inadequate measurement and adjustment for key confounding variables, section of sample; and missingness contributed to judgment of higher ROB across studies.

Heterogeneity

Tele-urgent care is a complex health intervention, which has innate heterogeneity. This review included a wide variety of study designs across key questions. For KQ 1, our review also included 3 different comparisons across outcomes: (1) impact by organization of the tele-urgent service (local vs regional systems), (2) impact by urgent care venue (*eg*, tele-urgent care services

vs in-person urgent care clinics), and triage decision of tele-urgent care (patient satisfaction only). We addressed this heterogeneity by clustering our narrative synthesis by outcome and then by comparison type. We gave more conceptual weight to higher quality designs.

Applicability of Findings to the VA Population

None of the included studies were conducted in VHA or specifically with Veterans. However, we limited eligibility to studies conducted in OECD countries, which improves applicability to VHA. As stated above, many of the included studies were conducted in the United Kingdom, which improves the applicability to the VHA system. All included studies of costs, however, were conducted in the United States. The findings presented here likely have applicability to any large health care system, such as the VHA, seeking to implement tele-urgent care systems.

RESEARCH GAPS/FUTURE RESEARCH

This comprehensive review of the literature identified several gaps in the current evidence that warrant future investigation. We used the framework recommended by Robinson et al to identify gaps in evidence and classify why these gaps exist (Table 9).⁴⁵ This approach considers the population, intervention, comparator, outcome, timing, and setting (PICOTS) to identify gaps and classifies them as due to (1) low strength of evidence or imprecise information, (2) biased information, (3) inconsistency or unknown consistency, and (4) not the right information.

Table 9. Evidence Gaps and Future Research

Evidence Gap	Reason	Type of Studies to Consider
<i>Population</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No studies that actively recruited Veterans 	Insufficient information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RCTs Quasi-experimental studies Prospective cohort studies
<i>Interventions</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do the effects of tele-urgent care differ by modality (eg, telephone vs video)? What type of type and amount of provider training and experience maximizes quality and minimizes costs? Is provider oversight sufficient or do providers have to conduct the tele-urgent care consultation? What impact does access to the electronic medical record have on tele-urgent care? Does tele-urgent care staff experience (eg, years conducting remote triage) matter more than staff type (eg, MD or RN)? How do expectations of tele-urgent care services influence overall patient satisfaction? What are the most important elements of patient satisfaction with tele-urgent care (eg, overall satisfaction, satisfaction with triage decisions)? 	Insufficient information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparative effectiveness trials of different types of interventions Dismantling studies Longitudinal studies Qualitative studies

Evidence Gap	Reason	Type of Studies to Consider
<i>Comparators</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few head-to-head comparisons of different modalities No head-to-head comparisons of different staff types by training and level of experience 	Insufficient information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cluster RCTs Comparative effectiveness trials
<i>Outcomes</i>		
Limited information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health care utilization Patient satisfaction Costs Health care access Case resolution Patient safety Adverse effects 	Insufficient information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cluster RCTs Prospective cohort studies Nonrandomized controlled before-and-after studies
<i>Setting</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited evidence from US setting, VA Health Care System 	Insufficient information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cluster RCTs Hybrid implementation designs Prospective or retrospective cohort studies Nonrandomized controlled before-and-after studies

CONCLUSIONS

In early 2020, as telehealth utilization increased, health care providers, patients, and health care organizations rapidly increased their appreciation for care delivered virtually. Rates of patient “no-shows”⁴⁶ and travel expenses and travel time decreased,⁴⁷ and health care access and scheduling was eased for many, including those with low income.⁹ Early in the COVID-19 pandemic, telehealth visits increased 154%,¹⁰ and subsequent data showed substantial decreases in ED visits.¹¹ Additionally, 76% of patients now view telehealth services favorably, compared to only 11% in 2019, and 58% of health care providers view telehealth more favorably now than before the COVID-19 pandemic.¹²

The promise of tele-urgent care is to improve access to timely health care for low-acuity conditions.³⁹ Yet there are many unanswered questions about the effects of tele-urgent care on key clinical and health systems outcomes, including costs. Our review provides evidence that tele-urgent care may not significantly increase subsequent utilization of health care services compared to in-person non-ED urgent care. Still, some limited evidence supports that the introduction of tele-urgent care increases overall health care utilization in a system via enhanced access to a convenient source of on-demand care. System leaders need to be attentive to both the intended and unintended consequences of incorporating tele-urgent care in the delivery of health services. Further examination is needed to assess whether and how tele-urgent care can be used to support efforts to attain the quadruple aim⁴⁸ of improving the patient care experience, improving the health of a population, reducing per capita health care costs, and improving the

work life of health care providers, including clinicians and staff. As we explore the value of tele-urgent care, it will be critical to weigh potential benefits against both financial costs for the health care system and human costs for increased and varying staffing demands.

REFERENCES

1. Uscher-Pines L, Pines J Fau - Kellermann A, Kellermann A Fau - Gillen E, et al. Emergency department visits for nonurgent conditions: systematic literature review. (1936-2692 (Electronic)).
2. Weinick RM, Burns Rm Fau - Mehrotra A, Mehrotra A. Many emergency department visits could be managed at urgent care centers and retail clinics. (1544-5208 (Electronic)).
3. Poon SJ, Schuur JD, Mehrotra A. Trends in Visits to Acute Care Venues for Treatment of Low-Acuity Conditions in the United States From 2008 to 2015. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2018;178(10):1342-1349.
4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Center for Health Statistics. Ambulatory Health Care Data. 2017. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/ahcd/web_tables.htm#2017. Accessed December 14, 2020.
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Using Telehealth to Expand Access to Essential Health Services during the COVID-19 Pandemic. 2020. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/telehealth.html>. Accessed December 14, 2020.
6. Bashshur RL, Howell JD, Krupinski EA, et al. The Empirical Foundations of Telemedicine Interventions in Primary Care. *Telemed J E Health*. 2016;22(5):342-75.
7. Wosik J, Fudim M, Cameron B, et al. Telehealth transformation: COVID-19 and the rise of virtual care. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2020;27(6):957-962.
8. Daniel H, Sulmasy LS, Health, et al. Policy recommendations to guide the use of telemedicine in primary care settings: an American College of Physicians position paper. *Ann Intern Med*. 2015;163(10):787-9.
9. Verma S. Early Impact of CMS Expansion of Medicare Telehealth During COVID-19. Health Affairs blog [online]. <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hblog20200715.454789/full/>. Accessed December 14, 2020.
10. Koonin LM, Hoots B, Tsang CA, et al. Trends in the Use of Telehealth During the Emergence of the COVID-19 Pandemic - United States, January-March 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(43):1595-1599.
11. Pikoulis E, Solomos Z, Riza E, et al. Gathering evidence on the decreased emergency room visits during the coronavirus disease 19 pandemic. *Public Health*. 2020;185:42-43.
12. Bestsenny O, Gilbert G, Harris A, et al. Telehealth: A quarter-trillion-dollar post-COVID-19 reality? 2020. Available at: <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/healthcare-systems-and-services/our-insights/telehealth-a-quarter-trillion-dollar-post-covid-19-reality#>. Accessed December 14, 2020.

13. Affairs DoV. Telehealth/Connected Care.
14. Clinical Contact Center ready to answer Veterans' questions. 2020.
15. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2009;62(10):1006-12.
16. Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care (EPOC). Suggested risk of bias criteria for EPOC reviews. EPOC Resources for review authors, 2017. Available at: <http://epoc.cochrane.org/resources/epoc-resources-review-authors> Accessed May 12, 2020.
17. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2019;366:l4898.
18. National Institutes of Health. NHLBI. Study quality assessment tools. Available at: <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools>. Accessed January 7, 2022.
19. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ*. 2016;355:i4919.
20. Hultcrantz M, Rind D, Akl EA, et al. The GRADE Working Group clarifies the construct of certainty of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2017;87:4-13.
21. Ashwood JS, Mehrotra A, Cowling D, et al. Direct-to-consumer telehealth may increase access to care but does not decrease spending. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2017;36(3):485-491.
22. Cragg DK, McKinley RK, Roland MO, et al. Comparison of out of hours care provided by patients' own general practitioners and commercial deputising services: a randomised controlled trial. I: The process of care. *BMJ*. 1997;314(7075):187-9.
23. Gordon AS, Adamson WC, DeVries AR. Virtual Visits for Acute, Nonurgent Care: A Claims Analysis of Episode-Level Utilization. *J Med Internet Res*. 2017;19(2):e35.
24. Knowles E, O'Cathain A, Turner J, et al. Effect of a national urgent care telephone triage service on population perceptions of urgent care provision: controlled before and after study. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(10):e011846.
25. Lovell T, Albritton J, Dalto J, et al. Virtual vs traditional care settings for low-acuity urgent conditions: An economic analysis of cost and utilization using claims data. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2019:1357633X19861232.
26. McKinley RK, Stevenson K, Adams S, et al. Meeting patient expectations of care: The major determinant of satisfaction with out-of-hours primary medical care? *Fam Pract*. 2002;19(4):333-338.

27. Salisbury C. Postal survey of patients' satisfaction with a general practice out of hours cooperative. *BMJ*. 1997;314(7094):1594-8.
28. Sen B, Clay H, Wright J, et al. Impact of Emergency Medicine Consultants and Clinical Advisors on a NHS 111 Clinical Assessment Service. *Emerg Med J*. 2019;36(4):208-212.
29. Shipman C, Payne F, Hooper R, et al. Patient satisfaction with out-of-hours services; how do GP co-operatives compare with deputizing and practice-based arrangements? *J Public Health Med*. 2000;22(2):149-54.
30. Tranberg M, Vedsted P, Bech BH, et al. Factors associated with low patient satisfaction in out-of-hours primary care in Denmark - a population-based cross-sectional study. *BMC Fam Pract*. 2018;19(1):15.
31. Turner J, O'Cathain A, Knowles E, et al. Impact of the urgent care telephone service NHS 111 pilot sites: a controlled before and after study. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3(11):e003451.
32. Wilson P, McConnachie A, O'Donnell CA, et al. Assessing dissatisfaction with an out of hours service: reasons and remedies. *Health Bulletin*. 2001;59(1):37-44.
33. McKinley RK, Cragg DK, Hastings AM, et al. Comparison of out of hours care provided by patients' own general practitioners and commercial deputising services: a randomised controlled trial. II: The outcome of care. *BMJ*. 1997;314(7075):190-3.
34. McKinley RK, Manku-Scott T, Hastings AM, et al. Reliability and validity of a new measure of patient satisfaction with out of hours primary medical care in the United Kingdom: development of a patient questionnaire. *BMJ*. 1997;314(7075):193-8.
35. Department of Health and Human Services. Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. Healthy People 2020: Access to health services. Available at: <https://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topics-objectives/topic/Access-to-Health-Services>. Accessed January 6, 2022.
36. Lattimer V, George S, Thompson F, et al. Safety and effectiveness of nurse telephone consultation in out of hours primary care: randomised controlled trial. The South Wiltshire Out of Hours Project (SWOOP) Group. *BMJ*. 1998;317(7165):1054-9.
37. Shi Z, Mehrotra A, Gidengil CA, et al. Quality Of Care For Acute Respiratory Infections During Direct-To-Consumer Telemedicine Visits For Adults. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2018;37(12):2014-2023.
38. Wallace E, Cronin S, Murphy N, et al. Characterising patient complaints in out-of-hours general practice: a retrospective cohort study in Ireland. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2018;68(677):e860-e868.
39. Lake R, Georgiou A, Li J, et al. The quality, safety and governance of telephone triage and advice services - an overview of evidence from systematic reviews. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2017;17(1):614.

40. Boggan JC, Shoup JP, Whited JD, et al. Effectiveness of Acute Care Remote Triage Systems: a Systematic Review. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2020;02:02.
41. Sexton V, Dale J, Bryce C, et al. Service use, clinical outcomes and user experience associated with urgent care services that use telephone-based digital triage: a systematic review. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(1):e051569.
42. Bunn F, Byrne G, Kendall S. The effects of telephone consultation and triage on healthcare use and patient satisfaction: a systematic review. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2005;55(521):956-961.
43. Richards DA, Meakins J, Godfrey L, et al. Survey of the impact of nurse telephone triage on general practitioner activity. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2004;54(500):207-210.
44. Adam GP, Springs S, Trikalinos T, et al. Does information from ClinicalTrials.gov increase transparency and reduce bias? Results from a five-report case series. *Syst Rev*. 2018;7(1):59.
45. Robinson KA, Saldanha IJ, McKoy NA. Development of a framework to identify research gaps from systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(12):1325-30.
46. Jeganathan S, Prasannan L, Blitz MJ, et al. Adherence and acceptability of telehealth appointments for high-risk obstetrical patients during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic. *Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM*. 2020;2(4):100233.
47. Vidal-Alaball J, Acosta-Roja R, Pastor Hernandez N, et al. Telemedicine in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Aten Primaria*. 2020;52(6):418-422.
48. Bodenheimer T, Sinsky C. From triple to quadruple aim: care of the patient requires care of the provider. *Ann Fam Med*. 2014;12(6):573-6.

APPENDIX A. SEARCH STRATEGIES

Database: MEDLINE (via Ovid)

Search Date: 2/13/2020

Note: Searching Ovid MEDLINE® ALL, 1946 to February 12, 2020

#1	Telephone/ OR exp Cell Phone/ OR exp Text Messaging/ OR exp Computers, Handheld/ OR exp Telemedicine/ OR exp Remote Consultation/ OR exp Mobile Applications/ OR exp Call Centers/	54357
#2	(telehealth OR tele-health OR Telemedicine OR tele-medicine OR Telecare OR tele-care OR Teleconsultation OR teleconsultations OR tele-consultation OR tele-consultations OR "remote consultation" OR "remote consultations" OR telenurse OR telenurses OR telenursing OR tele-nurse OR tele-nurses OR tele-nursing OR telephone OR telephones OR phone OR phones OR Cellphone OR cellphones OR "cell phone" OR "cell phones" OR smartphone OR smartphones OR "smart phone" OR "smart phones" OR "Mobile application" OR "mobile applications" OR "mobile apps" OR iPhone OR Android OR iPad OR Blackberry OR eHealth OR e-health OR mHealth OR m-health OR "video consultation" OR "video consultations" OR "web consultation" OR "web consultations" OR "online consultation" OR "online consultations" OR "internet consultation" OR "internet consultations" OR "video conference" OR "video conferences" OR "video conferencing" OR videoconference OR videoconferences OR videoconferencing OR "web conference" OR "web conferences" OR "web conferencing" OR webconference OR webconferences OR "online conference" OR "online conferences" OR "online conferencing" OR "internet conference" OR "internet conferences" OR "internet conferencing" OR "video chat" OR "video chats" OR webchat OR "web chat" OR webchats OR "web chats" OR "online chat" OR "online chats" OR "internet chat" OR "internet chats" OR "video meeting" OR "video meetings" OR "web meeting" OR "web meetings" OR "online meeting" OR "online meetings" OR "internet meeting" OR "internet meetings" OR "chat room" OR "chat rooms" OR "live chat" OR "health chat" OR "video message" OR "video messages" OR "video messaging" OR "video call" OR "video calls" OR teleconference OR teleconferences OR teleconferencing OR tele-conference OR tele-conferences OR tele-conferencing OR webex OR zoom OR skype OR ooVoo OR FaceTime OR Tango OR GoToMeeting OR "interactive voice response" OR IVR OR SMS OR "short message service" OR Virtual OR "web based" OR "call center" OR "call centers" OR "call centre" OR "call centres" OR "communication technology" OR "communication technologies").ti,ab.	203614
#3	("face to face" OR "in person" OR inperson OR in-person).ti,ab. AND (alternative OR alternatives).ti,ab.	1427
#4	(text OR texts).ti,ab. AND (message OR messages OR messaging).ti,ab.	4865
#5	(mobile OR cellular OR cell).ti,ab. ADJ3 (device OR devices OR app OR apps OR applications OR applications).ti,ab.	16020
#6	1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5	234615
#7	exp After-Hours Care/	1825
#8	(exp Ambulatory Care/ OR exp Ambulatory Care Facilities/ OR exp Triage/ OR exp Outpatients/ OR exp Outpatient Clinics, Hospital/) AND (urgent OR acute).ti,ab.	7696
#9	("walk in" OR walk-in).ti,ab. AND (clinic OR clinics).ti,ab.	638
#10	("low acuity" OR "same day" OR "urgent care" OR "urgent visit" OR "urgent visits" OR "urgent health care" OR "urgent healthcare" OR "acute care" OR "acute visit" OR "acute visits" OR "acute health care" OR "acute healthcare" OR ("after hours" OR "out of hours") AND (care OR urgent OR clinic OR clinics)) OR "unscheduled	53128

	care" OR "on demand" OR "direct to consumer" OR fast-track OR fast-tracked OR "fast track" OR "fast tracked").ti,ab.	
#11	7 or 8 or 9 or 10	61210
#12	6 and 11	2996
#13	exp Cohort Studies/ OR exp Follow-Up Studies/ OR exp Longitudinal Studies/ OR exp Prospective Studies/ OR exp Cross-Sectional Studies/ OR exp Controlled Before-After Studies/ OR exp Interrupted Time Series Analysis/ OR exp Evaluation studies as topic/	3112810
#14	"Randomized Controlled Trial".pt. OR "Controlled Clinical Trial".pt. OR "Clinical Trial".pt. OR "Observational Study".pt. OR "Evaluation Studies".pt. OR "Comparative Study".pt.	2733303
#15	(randomized OR randomised OR randomization OR randomisation OR placebo OR randomly OR trial OR trials OR groups OR "evaluation study" OR "evaluation studies" OR "intervention study" OR "intervention studies" OR cohort OR cohorts OR longitudinal OR longitudinally OR prospective OR prospectively OR follow-up OR "follow up" OR followup OR cross-sectional OR "cross sectional" OR "comparative study" OR "comparative studies"OR nonrandom OR "non-random" OR nonrandomized OR "non-randomized" OR nonrandomised OR "non-randomised" OR quasi-experiment* OR quazi-experiment* OR quasiexperiment* OR quaziexperiment* OR quasirandom* OR quazirandom* OR quasi-random* OR quazi-random* OR quasi-control* OR quazi-control* OR quasicontrol* OR quazicontrol*).ti,ab.	4862228
#16	controlled.ti,ab. AND (trial OR study).ti,ab.	427927
#17	("pre-post" OR "pre post" OR "posttest" OR "post-test" OR "post test" OR pretest OR "pre-test" OR "pre test" OR "repeated measure" OR "repeated measures").ti,ab.	71333
#18	(before.ti,ab. AND after.ti,ab.) OR (before.ti,ab. AND during.ti,ab.)	862396
#19	"time series".ti,ab. AND interrupt*.ti,ab.	2997
#20	"time points".ti,ab. AND (multiple OR one OR two OR three OR four OR five OR six OR seven OR eight OR nine OR ten OR month OR monthly OR day OR daily OR week OR weekly OR hour OR hourly).ti,ab.	62653
#21	13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20	8166940
#22	12 and 21	1840

EMBASE (via Elsevier)

Search date: 2/13/2020

Note: Search EMBASE from the Results page

#1	'telephone'/exp OR 'mobile phone'/exp OR 'smartphone'/exp OR 'text messaging'/exp OR 'text message'/exp OR 'personal digital assistant'/exp OR 'telemedicine'/exp OR 'teleconsultation'/exp OR 'mobile application'/exp OR 'mobile health application'/exp OR 'call center'/exp	107,474
#2	(telehealth OR Telemedicine OR Telecare OR Teleconsultation OR teleconsultations OR 'remote consultation' OR 'remote consultations' OR telenurse OR telenurses OR telenursing OR telephone OR telephones OR phone OR phones OR Cellphone OR cellphones OR 'cell phone' OR 'cell phones' OR smartphone OR smartphones OR 'smart phone' OR 'smart phones' OR 'Mobile application' OR 'mobile applications' OR 'mobile apps' OR iPhone OR Android OR iPad OR Blackberry OR eHealth OR mHealth OR 'video consultation' OR 'video consultations' OR 'web consultation' OR 'web consultations' OR 'online consultation' OR 'online consultations' OR 'internet consultation' OR 'internet consultations' OR 'video conference' OR 'video conferences' OR 'video	282,025

	conferencing' OR videoconference OR videoconferences OR videoconferencing OR 'web conference' OR 'web conferences' OR 'web conferencing' OR webconference OR webconferences OR 'online conference' OR 'online conferences' OR 'online conferencing' OR 'internet conference' OR 'internet conferences' OR 'internet conferencing' OR 'video chat' OR 'video chats' OR webchat OR 'web chat' OR webchats OR 'web chats' OR 'online chat' OR 'online chats' OR 'internet chat' OR 'internet chats' OR 'video meeting' OR 'video meetings' OR 'web meeting' OR 'web meetings' OR 'online meeting' OR 'online meetings' OR 'internet meeting' OR 'internet meetings' OR 'chat room' OR 'chat rooms' OR 'live chat' OR 'health chat' OR 'video message' OR 'video messages' OR 'video messaging' OR 'video call' OR 'video calls' OR teleconference OR teleconferences OR teleconferencing OR webex OR zoom OR skype OR ooVoo OR FaceTime OR Tango OR GoToMeeting OR 'interactive voice response' OR IVR OR SMS OR 'short message service' OR Virtual OR 'web based' OR 'call center' OR 'call centers' OR 'call centre' OR 'call centres' OR 'communication technology' OR 'communication technologies'):ti,ab	
#3	('face to face' OR 'in person' OR inperson):ti,ab AND (alternative OR alternatives):ti,ab	2037
#4	(text OR texts):ti,ab AND (message OR messages OR messaging):ti,ab	6466
#5	((mobile OR cellular OR cell) NEAR/3 (device OR devices OR app OR apps OR applications OR applications)):ti,ab	18753
#6	1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5	325,982
#7	'out-of-hours care'/exp	390
#8	('ambulatory care'/exp OR 'outpatient department'/exp OR 'emergency health service'/exp OR 'outpatient'/exp) AND (urgent OR acute):ti,ab	34390
#9	('walk in' OR walk-in):ti,ab AND (clinic OR clinics):ti,ab	1007
#10	('low acuity' OR 'same day' OR 'urgent care' OR 'urgent visit' OR 'urgent visits' OR 'urgent health care' OR 'urgent healthcare' OR 'acute care' OR 'acute visit' OR 'acute visits' OR 'acute health care' OR 'acute healthcare' OR (('after hours' OR 'out of hours') AND (care OR urgent OR clinic OR clinics)) OR 'unscheduled care' OR 'on demand' OR 'direct to consumer' OR fasttrack OR fasttracked OR 'fast track' OR 'fast tracked'):ti,ab	81252
#11	7 or 8 or 9 or 10	112287
#12	6 and 11	6104
#13	'randomized controlled trial'/exp OR 'crossover procedure'/exp OR 'double blind procedure'/exp OR 'single blind procedure'/exp OR 'clinical study'/exp OR 'controlled study'/exp OR 'evaluation study'/exp OR 'intervention study'/exp OR 'cohort analysis'/exp OR 'follow up'/exp OR 'comparative effectiveness'/exp OR 'longitudinal study'/exp OR 'evaluation study'/exp OR 'prospective study'/exp OR 'time series analysis'/exp OR 'cross-sectional study'/exp	14,686,160
#14	(randomized OR randomised OR randomization OR randomisation OR placebo OR randomly OR trial OR trials OR groups OR 'evaluation study' OR 'evaluation studies' OR 'intervention study' OR 'intervention studies' OR cohort OR cohorts OR longitudinal OR longitudinally OR prospective OR prospectively OR follow-up OR 'follow up' OR followup OR cross-sectional OR 'cross sectional' OR 'comparative study' OR 'comparative studies' OR nonrandom OR 'non-random' OR nonrandomized OR 'non-randomized' OR nonrandomised OR 'non-randomised' OR quasiexperiment* OR quaziexperiment* OR quasirandom* OR quazirandom* OR quasicontrol* OR quazicontrol*):ti,ab	7030637
#15	controlled:ti,ab AND (trial OR study):ti,ab	586,417

#16	('pre-post' OR 'pre post' OR 'posttest' OR 'post-test' OR pretest OR 'pre test' OR 'repeated measure' OR 'repeated measures'):ti,ab	105841
#17	(before:ti,ab AND after:ti,ab) OR (before:ti,ab AND during:ti,ab)	1277121
#18	'time series':ti,ab AND interrupt*:ti,ab	3742
#19	'time points':ti,ab AND (multiple OR one OR two OR three OR four OR five OR six OR seven OR eight OR nine OR ten OR month OR monthly OR day OR daily OR week OR weekly OR hour OR hourly):ti,ab	101872
#20	13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19	17,216,081
#21	12 and 20	4,363
#22	#21 NOT [conference abstract]/lim	2,233

CINAHL Complete (via EBSCO)

Search date: 2/13/2020

#1	(MH "Telephone+") OR (MH "Cellular Phone+") OR (MH "Text Messaging") OR (MH "Smartphone") OR (MH "Videoconferencing+") OR (MH "Webcasts") OR (MH "Computers, Hand-Held+") OR (MH "Telemedicine+") OR (MH "Remote Consultation") OR (MH "Telenursing") OR (MH "Mobile Applications")	45381
#2	Tl(telehealth OR tele-health OR Telemedicine OR tele-medicine OR Telecare OR tele-care OR Teleconsultation OR teleconsultations OR tele-consultation OR tele-consultations OR "remote consultation" OR "remote consultations" OR telenurse OR telenurses OR telenursing OR tele-nurse OR tele-nurses OR tele-nursing OR telephone OR telephones OR phone OR phones OR Cellphone OR cellphones OR "cell phone" OR "cell phones" OR smartphone OR smartphones OR "smart phone" OR "smart phones" OR "Mobile application" OR "mobile applications" OR "mobile apps" OR iPhone OR Android OR iPad OR Blackberry OR eHealth OR e-health OR mHealth OR m-health OR "video consultation" OR "video consultations" OR "web consultation" OR "web consultations" OR "online consultation" OR "online consultations" OR "internet consultation" OR "internet consultations" OR "video conference" OR "video conferences" OR "video conferencing" OR videoconference OR videoconferences OR videoconferencing OR "web conference" OR "web conferences" OR "web conferencing" OR webconference OR webconferences OR "online conference" OR "online conferences" OR "online conferencing" OR "internet conference" OR "internet conferences" OR "internet conferencing" OR "video chat" OR "video chats" OR webchat OR "web chat" OR webchats OR "web chats" OR "online chat" OR "online chats" OR "internet chat" OR "internet chats" OR "video meeting" OR "video meetings" OR "web meeting" OR "web meetings" OR "online meeting" OR "online meetings" OR "internet meeting" OR "internet meetings" OR "chat room" OR "chat rooms" OR "live chat" OR "health chat" OR "video message" OR "video messages" OR "video messaging" OR "video call" OR "video calls" OR teleconference OR teleconferences OR teleconferencing OR tele-conference OR tele-conferences OR tele-conferencing OR webex OR zoom OR skype OR ooVoo OR FaceTime OR Tango OR GoToMeeting OR "interactive voice response" OR IVR OR SMS OR "short message service" OR Virtual OR "web based" OR "call center" OR "call centers" OR "call centre" OR "call centres" OR "communication technology" OR "communication technologies") OR AB(telehealth OR tele-health OR Telemedicine OR tele-medicine OR Telecare OR tele-care OR Teleconsultation OR teleconsultations OR tele-consultation OR tele-consultations OR "remote consultation" OR "remote consultations" OR telenurse OR telenurses OR telenursing OR tele-nurse OR tele-nurses OR tele-nursing OR telephone OR telephones OR phone OR phones OR Cellphone OR cellphones OR "cell phone" OR "cell phones" OR smartphone OR smartphones OR "smart phone" OR "smart	103446

	phones" OR "Mobile application" OR "mobile applications" OR "mobile apps" OR iPhone OR Android OR iPad OR Blackberry OR eHealth OR e- health OR mHealth OR m-health OR "video consultation" OR "video consultations" OR "web consultation" OR "web consultations" OR "online consultation" OR "online consultations" OR "internet consultation" OR "internet consultations" OR "video conference" OR "video conferences" OR "video conferencing" OR videoconference OR videoconferences OR videoconferencing OR "web conference" OR "web conferences" OR "web conferencing" OR webconference OR webconferences OR "online conference" OR "online conferences" OR "online conferencing" OR "internet conference" OR "internet conferences" OR "internet conferencing" OR "video chat" OR "video chats" OR webchat OR "web chat" OR webchats OR "web chats" OR "online chat" OR "online chats" OR "internet chat" OR "internet chats" OR "video meeting" OR "video meetings" OR "web meeting" OR "web meetings" OR "online meeting" OR "online meetings" OR "internet meeting" OR "internet meetings" OR "chat room" OR "chat rooms" OR "live chat" OR "health chat" OR "video message" OR "video messages" OR "video messaging" OR "video call" OR "video calls" OR teleconference OR teleconferences OR teleconferencing OR tele-conference OR tele-conferences OR tele-conferencing OR webex OR zoom OR skype OR ooVoo OR FaceTime OR Tango OR GoToMeeting OR "interactive voice response" OR IVR OR SMS OR "short message service" OR Virtual OR "web based" OR "call center" OR "call centers" OR "call centre" OR "call centres" OR "communication technology" OR "communication technologies")	
#3	(TI("face to face" OR "in person" OR inperson OR in-person) OR AB("face to face" OR "in person" OR inperson OR in-person)) AND (TI(alternative OR alternatives) OR AB(alternative OR alternatives))	3192
#4	(TI(text OR texts) OR AB(text OR texts)) AND (TI(message OR messages OR messaging) OR AB(message OR messages OR messaging))	2932
#5	(TI(mobile OR cellular OR cell) OR AB(mobile OR cellular OR cell)) AND (TI(device OR devices OR app OR apps OR applications OR applications) OR AB(device OR devices OR app OR apps OR applications OR applications))	158403
#6	1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5	274227
#7	((MH "Ambulatory Care") OR (MH "Ambulatory Care Facilities") OR (MH "Outpatient Service") OR (MH "Outpatients") OR (MH "Triage") OR (MH "Acute Care")) AND (TI(urgent) OR AB(urgent))	990
#8	(TI("walk in" OR walk-in) OR AB("walk in" OR walk-in)) AND (TI(clinic OR clinics) OR AB(clinic OR clinics))	744
#9	TI("low acuity" OR "same day" OR "urgent care" OR "urgent visit" OR "urgent visits" OR "urgent health care" OR "urgent healthcare" OR "acute care" OR "acute visit" OR "acute visits" OR "acute health care" OR "acute healthcare" OR "unscheduled care" OR "on demand" OR "direct to consumer" OR fast-track OR fast-tracked OR "fast track" OR "fast tracked") OR AB("low acuity" OR "same day" OR "urgent care" OR "urgent visit" OR "urgent visits" OR "urgent health care" OR "urgent healthcare" OR "acute care" OR "acute visit" OR "acute visits" OR "acute health care" OR "acute healthcare" OR "unscheduled care" OR "on demand" OR "direct to consumer" OR fast-track OR fast-tracked OR "fast track" OR "fast tracked")	48425
#10	(TI("after hours" OR "out of hours") OR AB("after hours" OR "out of hours")) AND (TI(care OR urgent OR clinic OR clinics) OR AB(care OR urgent OR clinic OR clinics))	1070
#11	7 or 8 or 9 or 10	50479
#12	6 and 11	5400

#13	(MH "Randomized Controlled Trials+") OR (MH "Intervention Trials") OR (MH "Double-Blind Studies") OR (MH "Clinical Trials+") OR (MH "Single-Blind Studies") OR (MH "Therapeutic Trials") OR (MH "Triple-Blind Studies") OR (MH "Prospective Studies+") OR (MH "Cross Sectional Studies") OR (MH "Interrupted Time Series Analysis") OR (MH "Controlled Before-After Studies") OR (MH "Nonrandomized Trials") OR (MH "Pretest-Posttest Design+") OR (MH "Comparative Studies+") OR (MH "Evaluation Research+")	966101
#14	TI(randomized OR randomised OR randomization OR randomisation OR placebo OR randomly OR trial OR trials OR groups OR "evaluation study" OR "evaluation studies" OR "intervention study" OR "intervention studies" OR cohort OR cohorts OR longitudinal OR longitudinally OR prospective OR prospectively OR follow-up OR "follow up" OR followup OR cross-sectional OR "cross sectional" OR "comparative study" OR "comparative studies" OR nonrandom OR "non-random" OR nonrandomized OR "non-randomized" OR nonrandomised OR "non-randomised" OR quasi-experiment* OR quazi-experiment* OR quasiexperiment* OR quaziexperiment* OR quasirandom* OR quazirandom* OR quasi-random* OR quazi-random* OR quasi-control* OR quazi-control* OR quasicontrol* OR quazicontrol*) OR AB (randomized OR randomised OR randomization OR randomisation OR placebo OR randomly OR trial OR trials OR groups OR "evaluation study" OR "evaluation studies" OR "intervention study" OR "intervention studies" OR cohort OR cohorts OR longitudinal OR longitudinally OR prospective OR prospectively OR follow-up OR "follow up" OR followup OR cross-sectional OR "cross sectional" OR "comparative study" OR "comparative studies" OR nonrandom OR "non-random" OR nonrandomized OR "non-randomized" OR nonrandomised OR "non-randomised" OR quasi-experiment* OR quazi-experiment* OR quasiexperiment* OR quaziexperiment* OR quasirandom* OR quazirandom* OR quasi-random* OR quazi-random* OR quasi-control* OR quazi-control* OR quasicontrol* OR quazicontrol*)	1332548
#15	(TI(controlled) OR AB(controlled) AND (TI(trial OR study) OR AB(trial OR study)))	168527
#16	TI("pre-post" OR "pre post" OR "posttest" OR "post-test" OR "post test" OR pretest OR "pre-test" OR "pre test" OR "repeated measure" OR "repeated measures") OR AB("pre-post" OR "pre post" OR "posttest" OR "post-test" OR "post test" OR pretest OR "pre-test" OR "pre test" OR "repeated measure" OR "repeated measures")	36293
#17	(TI(before AND after) OR AB(before AND after)) OR (TI(before AND during) OR AB(before AND during))	149392
#18	(TI("time series") OR AB("time series")) AND (TI(interrupt*) OR AB(interrupt*))	2311
#19	(TI("time points") OR AB("time points")) AND (TI(multiple OR one OR two OR three OR four OR five OR six OR seven OR eight OR nine OR ten OR month OR monthly OR day OR daily OR week OR weekly OR hour OR hourly) OR AB(multiple OR one OR two OR three OR four OR five OR six OR seven OR eight OR nine OR ten OR month OR monthly OR day OR daily OR week OR weekly OR hour OR hourly))	15792
#20	13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19	1757703
#21	12 and 20	2,622
#22	21 NOT PT (Abstract OR Book OR Book Chapter OR Book Review OR Case Study OR Commentary OR Editorial OR Letter OR Masters Thesis OR Pamphlet OR Pamphlet Chapter OR Poetry) AND Academic Journals	2,401

APPENDIX B. STUDY CHARACTERISTICS

Study Design Country # Enrolled/Units # of Arms Funding Key Question	Eligibility	Delivery Mode	Intervention Description	Population Mean Age (SD) Female % Race %	Outcomes Reported Outcome Timing	ROB
Ashwood, 2017 ²¹ Cohort USA 2,943 patients 2 arms California Health Care Foundation KQ 1	Enrollees of CalPERS Blue Shield of California HMO who had an acute respiratory infection visit at any time in the period April 2012 and November 2013	Telephone; Video; Application	Comparison of per episode spending for direct-to-consumer telehealth visits via Teledoc for acute respiratory infections versus in-person care settings.	Mean age: NR Sex: 61% Race: NR	Cost Health care utilization Timepoint not reported	Moderate
Cragg, 1997 ²² RCT United Kingdom 2,152 patients 2 arms MRC Health Services Research Board KQ 1 Companion: McKinley, 1997 ³³	Patients calling out of hours within the area of Manchester, Stockport, Leicester, and Salford	Telephone	This study compared out-of-hours care provided by a patient's own practice co-operative and care provided by a commercial deputizing service with providers unfamiliar to the patient. Patients were offered telephone advice, home visits, or an in-person visit at the primary care center.	Mean age: NR Sex: NR Race: NR	Patient satisfaction 24-120 hours Case resolution 1 year Health care utilization 1 year Cost 1 year Health care access 1 year	Some concerns
Gordon, 2017 ²³ Cross-sectional USA	Patients aged 65 years and younger, commercially insured, without	Video	Virtual health care for acute, non-urgent conditions (eg, colds, allergies, urinary tract	Median age adults: 39.3	Health care utilization 3 week period	Fair

Study Design Country # Enrolled/Units # of Arms Funding Key Question	Eligibility	Delivery Mode	Intervention Description	Population Mean Age (SD) Female % Race %	Outcomes Reported Outcome Timing	ROB
59,945 patients 5 arms Anthem KQ 1	serious/expensive comorbidities, with virtual visits for specific conditions (sinusitis, upper respiratory infection, urinary tract infection, conjunctivitis, bronchitis, pharyngitis, influenza, cough, dermatitis, digestive symptom, or ear pain) matched to those receiving care for similar conditions in other settings (retail clinic, urgent care, ED, PCP)		infections) provided by physicians via a live video visit platform. Data were collected from an insurance claims database. Virtual visits were compared to care delivered in person through retail health clinics, urgent care centers, and emergency departments.	Median age children: 8.4 Sex: 56% Race: NR	Cost 3-week period At index visit	
Knowles, 2016 ²⁴ Controlled before and after United Kingdom 2,8071 survey respondents 2 arms UK NHS KQ 1	Population survey sent to all residents (or their proxies) of 7 areas in pilot/control regions in the UK	Telephone	The UK National Health System (NHS) 111 telephone urgent care triage service. This service was introduced in 4 regions of England in 2010 and intended for people having a non-life-threatening health care episode. Non-clinical call handlers direct patients to appropriate in-person medical services or advice over the phone. The predecessor system (NHS Direct) included a nurse helpline and triage for some practices and was	Mean age: NR Sex: 49% Race: 86% White; 14% Other	Patient satisfaction Time point not reported	Moderate

Study Design Country # Enrolled/Units # of Arms Funding Key Question	Eligibility	Delivery Mode	Intervention Description	Population Mean Age (SD) Female % Race %	Outcomes Reported Outcome Timing	ROB
Lattimer, 1998 ³⁶ Cluster RCT 14,492 visits England 2 arms BT and South and West Regional Health Authority KQ 2	Patient calls were included if they were made by registered patients who contacted the out of hours telephone consultation service for a general practice cooperative consisting of 19 practices (55 general practitioners) in Wiltshire, England during the trial period (Jan 1997 - Jan 1998).	Telephone	accessible at the time of the study. Patients in the intervention arm called the after-hours consultation service, gave their details to a receptionist, and then were directed to a nurse. The nurse conducted a systematic assessment of the caller's problem and recommended an appropriate course of action which included either management with nurse advice alone, contact with the general practitioner, or direct contact with emergency services. The control arm patient calls were directed by the receptionist directly to the GP who recommended telephone management or in-person care.	Mean age: <4 years old: 25% -24 years old: 21% -44 years old: 20% -64 years old: 12% -75 years old: 19% years old: Unknown 2% Sex: 58% Race: NR	Patient safety 7 days of call Increased resource cost Time point not reported	Some concerns
Lovell, 2019 ²⁵ Cross-sectional USA 12,581 visits	All virtual care claims and matched (1:4) ratio urgent care, primary care, and emergency department claims for patients under 65	Web-based; Video	Any Intermountain Health patient with access to high-speed internet can access the virtual visit program, which utilizes protocols.	Mean age: NR Sex: 66% Race: NR	Cost Over 21 days	Good

Study Design Country # Enrolled/Units # of Arms Funding Key Question	Eligibility	Delivery Mode	Intervention Description	Population Mean Age (SD) Female % Race %	Outcomes Reported Outcome Timing	ROB
4 arms Stated as unfunded KQ 1	years of age presenting with the 9 most common diagnoses addressed in virtual care, for patients covered by SelectHealth insurance company and occurring in April and March 2016		This is an on-demand direct-to-consumer video or telephone care service.			
McKinley, 2002 ²⁶ Cross-sectional England 2,263 patients 6 arms Consumers Association KQ 1	Patients who requested care after practice hours on weekdays and weekends during 9/29/97-12/6/97 were included. Exclusion criteria included 12 to 16-year-old patients, if the reason for the visit was to certify death, or if they were known to have died subsequently.	Telephone	Intervention arms included out-of-hours care provided by practices providing their own services, GP cooperatives, and a deputizing service. These 3 systems offered home visits, care at the primary care center, or telephone advice.	Age: Less than 12 years old: 45% Older than 65 years old: 17% Sex: 55% Race: NR	Patient satisfaction After requested care	Good
Poon, 2018 ³ Cohort USA 20.6 million visits 4 arms Funding NR KQ 1	All insured members of Aetna under age 65 with coverage in all study years 2008-2015	Mode NR	This study describes the changes in utilization and cost trends over 8 years during the advent of direct-to-consumer telemedicine for unscheduled low-acuity care.	Median age: 31.75 Sex: 58.5% Female Race: NR	Health care utilization Cost 8 years	Serious
Salisbury, 1997 ²⁷ Cohort England	Contacts with patients who requested out of hours care over an 8-week period	Telephone	Patients called for care through either their primary care co-operative or a	Mean age: NR Sex: NR Race: NR	Patient satisfaction	Serious

Study Design Country # Enrolled/Units # of Arms Funding Key Question	Eligibility	Delivery Mode	Intervention Description	Population Mean Age (SD) Female % Race %	Outcomes Reported Outcome Timing	ROB
1,555 visits 3 arms Kensington, Chelsea, and Westminster Medical Audit Advisory Group and Healthcall KQ 1	starting September 1, 1995, in a section of London served by a general practice out of hours cooperative or a commercial service		commercial "deputizing" service, which is a contracted service to handle out-of-hours calls for the primary care group. After requesting care, patients would have either a phone visit, a clinic visit, or an in-home visit.		Time point not reported	
Sen, 2019 ²⁸ Cross-sectional United Kingdom 10,315 patients 1 arm Funding none KQ 1	All callers to 111 service during study times excluding acute conditions such as assaults, foreign bodies, or penetrating trauma.	Telephone	The UK National Health Service 111 center call handlers triaged out of hours calls to in-person care or on-call consultation by a practitioner. For this study, patients who would have been advised to go to the ED by the clinical support software were passed to a clinical assessment service (CAS) and reviewed by either an EP (July to November 2016) or an NPCA (December 2016 to February 2017).	Mean age: NR Sex: NR Race: NR	Case resolution 7 months	Fair
Shi, 2018 ³⁷ Cohort USA 1,167,468 visits	Adults seeking care for acute respiratory infections between 18 to 64 years old who had pharmaceutical	Telephone	Claims data from a national insurer was used to compare care received via direct-to-consumer telemedicine visits to in-	Mean age: 18–34 years old: 33%	Inappropriate treatment At index	Moderate



Study Design Country # Enrolled/Units # of Arms Funding Key Question	Eligibility	Delivery Mode	Intervention Description	Population Mean Age (SD) Female % Race %	Outcomes Reported Outcome Timing	ROB
3 arms Funding none KQ 2	coverage at the time of their visit		person primary care and urgent care visits for respiratory infections. Telemedicine visits are usually video but may be limited to telephone audio-only.	35–44 years old: 32% 45–54 years old: 23% 55–64 years old: 13% Sex: 63% Female Race: NR		
Shipman, 2000 ²⁹ Cross-sectional England 1,288 patients 3 arms District Health Authority of NHS KQ 1	Surveyed patients were sampled from the GP co-operative and deputizing company from April 21, 1997, to May 25, 1997. Excluded patients included those who were very ill, patients with a second contact made during the study period, temporary residents, and, with the exception of children, patients whose contact was through a third party. Only those patients sampled from the GP co-operative have been included in the data extracted for this meta-analysis.	Telephone	This study evaluated patient satisfaction for care received via telephone and in-person by a GP co-operative, deputizing service, and practice-based GPs between 4/21/97 and 5/25/97. The co-operative consisted of 290 GPs. Of these, 110 used both a deputizing doctor service and a rotating GP co-operative.	Mean age: NR Sex: NR Race: NR	Patient satisfaction 1 week after out-of-hours consultation	Fair

Study Design Country # Enrolled/Units # of Arms Funding Key Question	Eligibility	Delivery Mode	Intervention Description	Population Mean Age (SD) Female % Race %	Outcomes Reported Outcome Timing	ROB
Tranberg, 2018 ³⁰ Cross-sectional Denmark 7213 contacts 3 arms Funded by Danish foundation TrygFonden KQ 1	Exclusion criteria included protection against research participation, previous inclusion of same patient, unknown postal, sensitive matters (eg, attempted suicide or terminal illness), and death.	Telephone	GP cooperatives provide out-of-hours primary care on a rotating basis. Calls are answered by GPs who can provide advice, write prescriptions, or triage patients to in person care at home, at a clinic, or at a hospital.	Percent of contacts per age category: 0–4 years old: 22% 5–18 years old: 16% 19–50 years old: 27% 51–75 years old: 24% > 75 years old: 12% Sex: 52% Female Race: NR	Patient satisfaction 12 months	Good
Turner, 2013 ³¹ Controlled before and after United Kingdom 277,163 calls 2 arms UK Department of Health KQ 1	Participants were all users of the emergency and urgent care systems in the intervention (Durham & Darlington, Nottingham, Lincolnshire, Luton) sites recorded in routine service activity data as having accessed and used a range of emergency or urgent care services during 2010-11 after the initiation of NHS 111 at those sites. The comparison rates of service use at the	Telephone	The United Kingdom National Health Service 111 program is a telephone triage service designed to manage all requests for urgent help by routing patient calls to the correct type of medical service (ie, on-call advice, ambulance services, health information, urgent care, primary care appointments) with 1 call.	Mean age: NR Sex: NR Race: NR	Health care utilization 12 months	Moderate

Study Design Country # Enrolled/Units # of Arms Funding Key Question	Eligibility	Delivery Mode	Intervention Description	Population Mean Age (SD) Female % Race %	Outcomes Reported Outcome Timing	ROB
<p>Wallace, 2018³⁸ Cross-sectional Ireland 298 visits 1 arm Health Research Board of Ireland KQ 2</p>	<p>control sites (North of Tyne, Norfolk, Leicester City) and the intervention sites were rates of use of these same services in the 2008-2010 period (for the intervention site comparisons) and 2008-2011 for the control site comparisons.</p>	<p>Telephone</p>	<p>Callers to the out-of-hours service in Dublin were triaged by nurses to receive home visits or center care with a GP. The study characterized patient complaints over a 5-year period.</p>	<p>Mean age: NR Sex: 58% Female Race: NR</p>	<p>Inappropriate treatment 7 years</p>	<p>Fair</p>
<p>Wilson, 2001³² Cross-sectional United Kingdom 1,115 patients 1 arm University of Glasgow, Scottish Office Department of Health KQ 1</p>	<p>Patients (or their care givers requesting on behalf) calling to request out of hours medical care in Glasgow</p>	<p>Telephone</p>	<p>This out-of-hours cooperative via Glasgow Emergency Medical Service served 952,000 patients across 6 locations. Callers received telephone advice, were offered a home visit, or received care at the primary care center (with free transport if required).</p>	<p>Mean age: NR Sex: NR Race: NR</p>	<p>Patient satisfaction Week after call</p>	<p>Good</p>



APPENDIX C. INTERVENTION CHARACTERISTICS

Study N # of Arms	Intervention Delivery Method (eg, Phone, Internet)	How Patient Enters Tele- urgent System	Type of System (eg, National, Private)	Who Answered Call? Delivered Care?	Intervention Components	Comparator Category
Ashwood, 2017 ²¹ 2,943 patients 2 arms	Telephone; Video; Application	Self-referred	Private Direct-to- consumer	Not reported MD providers	Comparison of per episode spending for direct-to-consumer telehealth visits via Teledoc for acute respiratory infections versus in-person care settings.	In-person care
Cragg, 1997 ²² 2,152 patients 2 arms	Telephone	Patient- initiated	Community/ regional health system; private	General Practitioner; deputizing doctor Practice doctors; deputizing doctor	This study compared out-of-hours care provided by a patient's own practice co-operative and care provided by a commercial deputizing service with providers unfamiliar to the patient. Patients were offered telephone advice, home visits, or an in-person visit at the primary care center.	Deputizing doctors
Gordon, 2017 ²³ 59,945 patients 5 arms	Video	Self-referred	Private Direct-to- consumer	Not reported Provider not reported	Virtual health care for acute, non-urgent conditions (eg, colds, allergies, urinary tract infections) provided by physicians via a live video visit platform. Data were collected from an insurance claims database. Virtual visits were compared to care delivered in person through retail health clinics, urgent care centers, and emergency departments.	ED, urgent care, retail clinics, PCP
Knowles, 2016 ²⁴ 2,8071 survey respondents 2 arms	Telephone	Triage	National health system	Non-clinical call handler General practitioner	The UK National Health System (NHS) 111 telephone urgent care triage service. This service was introduced in 4 regions of England in 2010 and intended for people having a non-life-threatening health care episode. Non-clinical call handlers direct patients to appropriate in-person medical services or advice over the phone. The predecessor system	The comparator was regions not participating in NHS 111

Study N # of Arms	Intervention Delivery Method (eg, Phone, Internet)	How Patient Enters Tele-urgent System	Type of System (eg, National, Private)	Who Answered Call? Delivered Care?	Intervention Components	Comparator Category
					(NHS Direct) included a nurse helpline and triage for some practices and was accessible at the time of the study.	
Lattimer, 1998 ³⁶ 14,492 visits 2 arms	Telephone	Triage	National health system and Community/regional health system	Non-clinical call handler General practitioner; nurse	Patients in the intervention arm called the after-hours consultation service, gave their details to a receptionist, and then were directed to a nurse. The nurse conducted a systematic assessment of the caller's problem and recommended an appropriate course of action which included either management with nurse advice alone, contact with the general practitioner, or direct contact with emergency services. The control arm patient calls were directed by the receptionist directly to the GP who recommended telephone management or in-person care.	During the control periods, the receptionist who answered the initial call took down patient details and then passed the call on to a GP.
Lovell, 2019 ²⁵ 12,581 visits 4 arms	Web-based; Video	Not reported	Direct-to-consumer Community/regional health system	Not reported Provider not reported	Any Intermountain Health patient with access to high-speed internet can access the virtual visit program, which utilizes protocols. This is an on-demand direct-to-consumer video or telephone care service.	The first comparator arm is care in urgent care centers. Comparators were selected for each of the three categories (ie, urgent care, primary care, or emergency department)
McKinley, 2002 ²⁶ 2,263 patients	Telephone	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Intervention arms included out-of-hours care provided by practices providing their own services, GP cooperatives, and a deputizing service. These 3 systems	Comparators included in-person care at practice, co-

Study N # of Arms	Intervention Delivery Method (eg, Phone, Internet)	How Patient Enters Tele- urgent System	Type of System (eg, National, Private)	Who Answered Call? Delivered Care?	Intervention Components	Comparator Category
6 arms				Provider not reported	offered home visits, care at the primary care center, or telephone advice.	operative, and hybrid co-operatives services.
Poon, 2018 ³ 20.6 million visits 4 arms	Mode not reported	Not reported	Private Direct-to-consumer	Not reported Provider not reported	This study describes the changes in utilization and cost trends over 8 years during the advent of direct-to-consumer telemedicine for unscheduled low-acuity care.	Emergency department use
Salisbury, 1997 ²⁷ 1,555 visits 3 arms	Telephone	Not clear	Community/regional health system; private	Not reported General practitioner	Patients called for care through either their primary care co-operative or a commercial "deputizing" service, which is a contracted service to handle out-of-hours calls for the primary care group. After requesting care, patients would have either a phone visit, a clinic visit, or an in-home visit.	Home visit or attending the primary care clinic
Sen, 2019 ²⁸ 10,315 patients 1 arm	Telephone	Triage	National health system	Non-clinical call handler Provider not reported	The UK National Health Service 111 center call handlers triaged out-of-hours calls to in-person care or on-call consultation by a practitioner. For this study, patients who would have been advised to go to the ED by the clinical support software were passed to a clinical assessment service (CAS) and reviewed by either an EP (July to November 2016) or an NPCA (December 2016 to February 2017).	NHS 111 telephone triage by non-clinicians using decision support tool (data from year prior to intervention using clinician triage and no decision support tool)
Shi, 2018 ³⁷ 1,167,468 visits	Video; Telephone	Patient-initiated	Private	Not reported Physician	Claims data from a national insurer was used to compare care received via direct-to-consumer telemedicine visits to in-person primary care and urgent care	Urgent care and primary care

Study N # of Arms	Intervention Delivery Method (eg, Phone, Internet)	How Patient Enters Tele- urgent System	Type of System (eg, National, Private)	Who Answered Call? Delivered Care?	Intervention Components	Comparator Category
3 arms			Direct-to-consumer		visits for respiratory infections. Telemedicine visits are usually video but may be limited to telephone audio-only.	
Shipman, 2000 ²⁹ 1,288 patients 3 arms	Telephone	Patient-initiated	National health system	Not reported General practitioner	This study evaluated patient satisfaction for care received via telephone and in-person by a GP co-operative, deputizing service, and practice based-GPs between 4/21/97 and 5/25/97. The co-operative consisted of 290 GPs. Of these, 110 used both a deputizing doctor service and a rotating GP co-operative.	Comparator groups included co-operative base and co-operative home
Tranberg, 2018 ³⁰ 7213 contacts 3 arms	Telephone	Triaged by GPs	National health system	General practitioners General practitioners	GP cooperatives provide out-of-hours primary care on a rotating basis. Calls are answered by GPs who can provide advice, write prescriptions, or triage patients to in-person care at home, at a clinic, or at a hospital.	Clinic consultation and home visits
Turner, 2013 ³¹ 277, 163 calls 2 arms	Telephone	Triage	National health system	Non-clinical call handler General practitioner	The United Kingdom National Health Service 111 program is a telephone triage service designed to manage all requests for urgent help by routing patient calls to the correct type of medical service (ie, on-call advice, ambulance services, health information, urgent care, primary care appointments) with one call.	Usual care without NHS 111 triage in non-participating regions with access to NHS Direct
Wallace, 2018 ³⁸ 298 visits 1 arm	Telephone	Triage	Community/regional health system	Nurse; general practitioner General practitioner	Callers to the out-of-hours service in Dublin were triaged by nurses to receive home visits or center care with a GP. The study characterized patient complaints over a 5-year period.	Not applicable

Study N # of Arms	Intervention Delivery Method (eg, Phone, Internet)	How Patient Enters Tele- urgent System	Type of System (eg, National, Private)	Who Answered Call? Delivered Care?	Intervention Components	Comparator Category
Wilson, 2001 ³² 1,115 patients 1 arm	Telephone	Self-referred	Community/ regional health system	Not reported General Practitioners	This out-of-hours cooperative via Glasgow Emergency Medical Service served 952,000 patients across 6 locations. Callers received telephone advice, were offered a home visit, or received care at the primary care center (with free transport if required).	No comparator

APPENDIX D. EXCLUDED STUDIES

Study	Exclusion Reason					
	Not OECD	Population	Intervention	Comparator	Outcomes	Design
Adriaenssens, 2017 ¹		X				
Akhtar, 2018 ²			X			
Albert, 2015 ³				X		
Allan, 2019 ⁴			X			
Allen-Davis, 1998 ⁵						X
Amarenco, 2007 ⁶			X			
Anderson, 2019 ⁷			X			
Anonymous, 1997 ⁸				X		
Atiyeh, 2014 ⁹	X					
Balas, 1997 ¹⁰						X
Ball, 2008 ¹¹			X			
Beard, 2017 ¹²			X			
Beech, 2000 ¹³			X			
Benger, 2004 ¹⁴			X			
Bhandari, 2014 ¹⁵			X			
Bjerring, 2012 ¹⁶			X			
Bladin, 2015 ¹⁷		X				
Blank, 2012 ¹⁸						X
Bolli, 2005 ¹⁹		X				
Brogan, 1998 ²⁰				X		
Brunett, 2015 ²¹					X	
Brunetti, 2013 ²²						X
Brunner, 2018 ²³			X			
Buja, 2015 ²⁴				X		
Bunn, 2005 ²⁵						X

Study	Exclusion Reason					
	Not OECD	Population	Intervention	Comparator	Outcomes	Design
Bury, 2006 ²⁶		X				
Calitri, 2015 ²⁷			X			
Campbell, 2013 ²⁸		X				
Campbell, 2015 ²⁹			X			
Campbell, 2009 ³⁰				X		
Cherry, 2009 ³¹			X			
Chess, 2018 ³²		X				
Cheung, 2019 ³³		X				
Cook, 2015 ³⁴			X			
Cook, 2010 ³⁵			X			
Cooper, 2005 ³⁶				X		
Costa, 2018 ³⁷	X					
Custer, 2003 ³⁸			X			
Dahlgren, 2017 ³⁹				X		
Dale, 1998 ⁴⁰		X				
Dale, 1997 ⁴¹				X		
Davis, 2019 ⁴²					X	
Derkx, 2008 ⁴³		X				
Dhruva, 2007 ⁴⁴		X				
Donaghy, 2019 ⁴⁵						X
Donley, 2017 ⁴⁶			X			
Duke, 2012 ⁴⁷		X				
Dunt, 2005 ⁴⁸						X
Dunt, 2006 ⁴⁹						X
Dunt, 2007 ⁵⁰						X
Eastwood, 2015 ⁵¹			X			
Eastwood, 2017 ⁵²			X			

Study	Exclusion Reason					
	Not OECD	Population	Intervention	Comparator	Outcomes	Design
Ebert, 2019 ⁵³			X			
Ekeland, 2018 ⁵⁴						X
Elliott, 2015 ⁵⁵				X		
Eminovic, 2004 ⁵⁶			X			
Evens, 1985 ⁵⁷		X				
Flynn, 1998 ⁵⁸				X		
Foster, 2019 ⁵⁹		X				
Foster, 2001 ⁶⁰			X			
Gallagher, 1998 ⁶¹					X	
Giesen, 2006 ⁶²			X			
Giesen, 2005 ⁶³						X
Giesen, 2011 ⁶⁴						X
Gillespie, 2016 ⁶⁵			X			
Glynn, 2004 ⁶⁶				X		
Goodyear-Smith, 2005 ⁶⁷			X			
Gould, 2009 ⁶⁸			X			
Gray, 2012 ⁶⁹		X				
Greenhalgh, 2018 ⁷⁰						X
Greenwald, 2019 ⁷¹				X		
Grol, 2006 ⁷²						X
Grove, 2019 ⁷³			X			
Halter, 2007 ⁷⁴				X		
Handy, 2005 ⁷⁵			X			
Hansen, 2011 ⁷⁶		X				
Hansen, 2011 ⁷⁷						X
Hansen, 2008 ⁷⁸					X	
Heidet, 2019 ⁷⁹					X	

Study	Exclusion Reason					
	Not OECD	Population	Intervention	Comparator	Outcomes	Design
Heravian, 2018 ⁸⁰						X
Hertzog, 2019 ⁸¹			X			
Holt, 2016 ⁸²			X			
Howard, 2007 ⁸³			X			
Howell, 2016 ⁸⁴						X
Hsu, 2010 ⁸⁵	X					
Huibers, 2012 ⁸⁶				X		
Huibers, 2013 ⁸⁷			X			
Huibers, 2014 ⁸⁸			X			
Huibers, 2011 ⁸⁹			X			
Huilgol, 2019 ⁹⁰			X			
Hulland, 1999 ⁹¹		X				
Infinger, 2013 ⁹²				X		
Jansen, 2019 ⁹³					X	
Jerant, 2005 ⁹⁴						X
Jiwa, 2002 ⁹⁵			X			
Jongeling, 2009 ⁹⁶			X			
Kahn, 2016 ⁹⁷						X
Keatinge, 2005 ⁹⁸		X				
Keizer, 2016 ⁹⁹						X
Kelly, 2010 ¹⁰⁰			X			
Killip, 2007 ¹⁰¹						X
Kinnersley, 2010 ¹⁰²					X	
Klaassen, 2016 ¹⁰³		X				
Kleinknecht-Dolf, 2015 ¹⁰⁴		X				
Knight, 2010 ¹⁰⁵						X
Krumperman, 2015 ¹⁰⁶			X			

Study	Exclusion Reason					
	Not OECD	Population	Intervention	Comparator	Outcomes	Design
Kumar, 2006 ¹⁰⁷			X			
Lambert, 2016 ¹⁰⁸		X				
Landrey, 2018 ¹⁰⁹			X			
Langabeer, 2016 ¹¹⁰			X			
Langabeer, 2017 ¹¹¹			X			
Lattimer, 2000 ¹¹²					X	
Lattimer, 2005 ¹¹³			X			
LaVela, 2013 ¹¹⁴			X			
Leask, 2019 ¹¹⁵			X			
Lee, 2019 ¹¹⁶			X			
Lee, 2003 ¹¹⁷		X				
Lee, 2002 ¹¹⁸		X				
Lessard, 2000 ¹¹⁹		X				
Mann, 2002 ¹²⁰						X
Manojlovich, 2015 ¹²¹						X
Martinez, 2018 ¹²²			X			
Matar, 2015 ¹²³		X				
McAfee, 2020 ¹²⁴	X					
McConnochie, 2006 ¹²⁵		X				
McDonnell, 2007 ¹²⁶				X		
McKinstry, 2002 ¹²⁷			X			
McKinstry, 2002 ¹²⁸	X					
McKinstry, 2009 ¹²⁹						X
McLean, 2019 ¹³⁰			X			
Mendenhall, 2018 ¹³¹			X			
Meng, 2015 ¹³²			X			
Meyer, 2020 ¹³³			X			

Study	Exclusion Reason					
	Not OECD	Population	Intervention	Comparator	Outcomes	Design
Miller, 2019 ¹³⁴						X
Mira, 1995 ¹³⁵			X			
Mohammed, 2012 ¹³⁶					X	
Montalto, 1998 ¹³⁷		X				
Moreno, 1989 ¹³⁸			X			
Morimura, 2011 ¹³⁹						X
Mukamel, 2019 ¹⁴⁰		X				
Mulcahy, 2017 ¹⁴¹				X		
Munro, 2000 ¹⁴²			X			
Munroe, 1982 ¹⁴³			X			
Murdoch, 2015 ¹⁴⁴						X
Navratil-Strawn, 2014 ¹⁴⁵			X			
Neimanis, 2009 ¹⁴⁶			X			
Nord, 2019 ¹⁴⁷				X		
Noroxe, 2017 ¹⁴⁸					X	
North, 2010 ¹⁴⁹			X			
North, 2011 ¹⁵⁰						X
O'Cathain, 2007 ¹⁵¹			X			
O'Cathain, 2014 ¹⁵²					X	
Palen, 2012 ¹⁵³			X			
Pallawala, 2001 ¹⁵⁴	X					
Pathipati, 2016 ¹⁵⁵			X			
Payne, 2001 ¹⁵⁶		X				
Perry, 1990 ¹⁵⁷			X			
Philips, 2015 ¹⁵⁸			X			
Player, 2018 ¹⁵⁹				X		
Pope, 2017 ¹⁶⁰						X

Study	Exclusion Reason					
	Not OECD	Population	Intervention	Comparator	Outcomes	Design
Rahmqvist, 2011 ¹⁶¹						X
Rastogi, 2019 ¹⁶²			X			
Ray, 2019 ¹⁶³		X				
Reitz, 2007 ¹⁶⁴						X
Richards, 2004 ¹⁶⁵			X			
Richards, 2004 ¹⁶⁶						X
Richards, 2002 ¹⁶⁷			X			
Richards, 2007 ¹⁶⁸				X		
Ricke, 1995 ¹⁶⁹		X				
Ritter, 2010 ¹⁷⁰				X		
Rogove, 2012 ¹⁷¹					X	
Roivainen, 2020 ¹⁷²					X	
Rudin, 2019 ¹⁷³			X			
Sabin, 1998 ¹⁷⁴						X
Sandvik, 2010 ¹⁷⁵		X				
Schlachta, 2016 ¹⁷⁶	X					
Schmid, 2017 ¹⁷⁷			X			
Scott-Jones, 2008 ¹⁷⁸				X		
Shah, 2013 ¹⁷⁹					X	
Simpson, 2000 ¹⁸⁰		X				
Smith, 2001 ¹⁸¹				X		
Smits, 2019 ¹⁸²			X			
Smits, 2016 ¹⁸³			X			
Smits, 2018 ¹⁸⁴					X	
Stoves, 2010 ¹⁸⁵			X			
Stuart, 2000 ¹⁸⁶			X			
Studnek, 2012 ¹⁸⁷			X			

Study	Exclusion Reason					
	Not OECD	Population	Intervention	Comparator	Outcomes	Design
Thilsted, 2018 ¹⁸⁸					X	
Turnbull, 2008 ¹⁸⁹				X		
Uscher-Pines, 2018 ¹⁹⁰					X	
Uscher-Pines, 2015 ¹⁹¹	X					
Valero, 1999 ¹⁹²		X				
Van Donk, 2017 ¹⁹³			X			
Van Uden, 2005 ¹⁹⁴			X			
Varley, 2016 ¹⁹⁵					X	
Verzantvoort, 2018 ¹⁹⁶			X			
Walker, 2000 ¹⁹⁷	X					
Wallace, 2008 ¹⁹⁸			X			
Warren, 2015 ¹⁹⁹			X			
Westall, 2015 ²⁰⁰	X					
Win, 2016 ²⁰¹						X
Woods, 2013 ²⁰²			X			
Wootton, 2000 ²⁰³				X		
Zinger, 2019 ²⁰⁴			X			

REFERENCES IN APPENDIX D

1. Adriaenssens J, Hamelink A, Bogaert PV. Predictors of occupational stress and well-being in First-Line Nurse Managers: A cross-sectional survey study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*. 2017;73:85-92.
2. Akhtar M, Van Heukelom PG, Ahmed A, et al. Telemedicine Physical Examination Utilizing a Consumer Device Demonstrates Poor Concordance with In-Person Physical Examination in Emergency Department Patients with Sore Throat: A Prospective Blinded Study. *Telemedicine Journal & E-Health*. 2018;24(10):790-796.
3. Albert SM, Agimi Y, Martich GD. Interest in mental health care among patients making eVisits. *American Journal of Managed Care*. 2015;21(12):867-872.
4. Allan JL, Johnston DW, Powell DJH, et al. Clinical decisions and time since rest break: An analysis of decision fatigue in nurses. *Health Psychology*. 2019;38(4):318-324.
5. Allen-Davis JT, Parker R, McGregor J, Beck A, McClatchey MW. Assessment of vulvovaginal complaints: agreement between phone and office management. *Primary Care Update for Ob/Gyns*. 1998;5(4):152.
6. Amarenco P, Nadjjar M. Telemedicine for improving emergent management of acute cerebrovascular syndromes. *International Journal of Stroke*. 2007;2(1):47-50.
7. Anderson E, Rätsep M, Panov L, et al. Main causes of using primary care services and distribution of work between family doctor and family nurse in 2017. *Eesti Arst*. 2019;98(9):495-503.
8. Anonymous. Nurse telephone triage in out of hours primary care: a pilot study. South Wiltshire Out of Hours Project (SWOOP) Group. *BMJ*. 1997;314(7075):198-199.
9. Atiyeh B, Dibo SA, Janom HH. Telemedicine and burns: an overview. *Annals of Burns & Fire Disasters*. 2014;27(2):87-93.
10. Balas EA, Jaffrey F, Kuperman GJ, et al. Electronic communication with patients. Evaluation of distance medicine technology. *JAMA*. 1997;278(2):152-159.
11. Ball GE. Out-of-hours emergency dental services in Scotland--a national model. *British Dental Journal*. 2008;205(9):485-487.
12. Beard M, Orlando JF, Kumar S. Overcoming the tyranny of distance: An audit of process and outcomes from a pilot telehealth spinal assessment clinic. *Journal of Telemedicine & Telecare*. 2017;23(8):733-739.
13. Beech B, Parry L, Valiani D. A pilot project to determine the demand for and utility of an out-of-hours psychiatric service run by on-call psychiatric nurses in an A&E department. *Journal of Psychiatric & Mental Health Nursing (Wiley-Blackwell)*. 2000;7(6):547-553.

14. Benger JR, Noble SM, Coast J, Kendall JM. The safety and effectiveness of minor injuries telemedicine. *Emerg Med J*. 2004;21(4):438-445.
15. Bhandari N, Shi Y, Jung K. Seeking health information online: does limited healthcare access matter? *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2014;21(6):1113-1117.
16. Bjerring OS, Fristrup C, Mortensen MB. Telephone hotline is an important part of overall patient management in upper gastrointestinal malignancies. *Danish Medical Journal*. 2012;59(8):A4487.
17. Bladin CF, Moloczij N, Ermel S, et al. Victorian Stroke Telemedicine Project: implementation of a new model of translational stroke care for Australia. *Internal Medicine Journal*. 2015;45(9):951-956.
18. Blank L, Coster J, O'Cathain A, et al. The appropriateness of, and compliance with, telephone triage decisions: a systematic review and narrative synthesis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing (John Wiley & Sons, Inc.)*. 2012;68(12):2610-2621.
19. Bolli S, Melle GV, Laubscher B. After-hours paediatric telephone triage and advice: the Neuchatel experience. *European Journal of Pediatrics*. 2005;164(9):568-572.
20. Brogan C, Pickard D, Gray A, Fairman S, Hill A. The use of out of hours health services: a cross sectional survey. *BMJ*. 1998;316(7130):524-527.
21. Brunett PH, DiPiero A, Flores C, Choi D, Kum H, Girard DE. Use of a voice and video internet technology as an alternative to in-person urgent care clinic visits. *Journal of Telemedicine & Telecare*. 2015;21(4):219-226.
22. Brunetti ND, De Gennaro L, Dellegrottaglie G, Procacci V, Di Biase M. Fast and furious: Telecardiology in acute myocardial infarction triage in the emergency room setting. *European Research in Telemedicine*. 2013;2(2):75-78.
23. Brunner J, Chuang E, Washington DL, et al. Patient-Rated Access to Needed Care: Patient-Centered Medical Home Principles Intertwined. *Womens Health Issues*. 2018;28(2):165-171.
24. Buja A, Toffanin R, Rigon S, et al. Out-of-hours primary care services: demands and patient referral patterns in a Veneto region (Italy) Local Health Authority. *Health Policy*. 2015;119(4):437-446.
25. Bunn F, Byrne G, Kendall S. The effects of telephone consultation and triage on healthcare use and patient satisfaction: a systematic review. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2005;55(521):956-961.
26. Bury G. General practice out-of-hours co-operatives - Population contact rates. *Irish Medical Journal*. 2006;99(3).

27. Calitri R, Warren FC, Wheeler B, et al. Distance from practice moderates the relationship between patient management involving nurse telephone triage consulting and patient satisfaction with care. *Health & Place*. 2015;34:92-96.
28. Campbell JL, Britten N, Green C, et al. The effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of telephone triage of patients requesting same day consultations in general practice: study protocol for a cluster randomised controlled trial comparing nurse-led and GP-led management systems (ESTEEM). *Trials [Electronic Resource]*. 2013;14:4.
29. Campbell JL, Fletcher E, Britten N, et al. The clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of telephone triage for managing same-day consultation requests in general practice: a cluster randomised controlled trial comparing general practitioner-led and nurse-led management systems with usual care (the ESTEEM trial). *Health Technology Assessment (Winchester, England)*. 2015;19(13):1-212, vii-viii.
30. Campbell J, Roland M, Richards S, Dickens A, Greco M, Bower P. Users' reports and evaluations of out-of-hours health care and the UK national quality requirements: a cross sectional study. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2009;59(558):e8-15.
31. Cherry A, Friel R, Dowden B, et al. Managing demand: telephone triage in acute maternity services. *British Journal of Midwifery*. 2009;17(8):496-500.
32. Chess D, Whitman JJ, Croll D, Stefanacci R. Impact of after-hours telemedicine on hospitalizations in a skilled nursing facility. *American Journal of Managed Care*. 2018;24(8):385-388.
33. Cheung L, Leung TI, Ding VY, et al. Healthcare Service Utilization under a New Virtual Primary Care Delivery Model. *Telemedicine Journal & E-Health*. 2019;25(7):551-559.
34. Cook EJ, Randhawa G, Guppy A, Large S. A study of urgent and emergency referrals from NHS Direct within England. *BMJ Open*. 2015;5(5).
35. Cook R, Thakore S, Morrison W, Meikle J. To ED or not to ED: NHS 24 referrals to the emergency department. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. 2010;27(3):213-215.
36. Cooper D, Arnold E, Smith G, et al. The effect of deprivation, age and sex on NHS Direct call rates. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2005;55(513):287-291.
37. Costa G, Cabral O, Santana E, Lima G, Figueiredo I. Mobile emergency care service: A time-course assessment and characterization of demand. *International Emergency Nursing*. 2018;41:45-50.
38. Custer M, O'Rourke KM, Roddy M, King R, Sprinkle L, Horne E. The impact of a nursing triage line on the use of emergency department services in a military hospital. *Military Medicine*. 2003;168(12):981-985.
39. Dahlgren K, Holzmann MJ, Carlsson AC, Wandell P, Hasselstrom J, Ruge T. The use of a Swedish telephone medical advice service by the elderly - a population-based study. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care*. 2017;35(1):98-104.

40. Dale J, Crouch R, Lloyd D. Primary care: nurse-led telephone triage and advice out-of-hours. *Nursing Standard*. 1998;12(47):41-45.
41. Dale J, Williams S, Crouch R, Patel A. A study of out-of-hours telephone advice from an A&E department. *British Journal of Nursing*. 1997;6(3):171-174.
42. Davis CB, Marzec LN, Blea Z, et al. Antibiotic Prescribing Patterns for Sinusitis Within a Direct-to-Consumer Virtual Urgent Care. *Telemedicine Journal & E-Health*. 2019;25(6):519-522.
43. Derkx HP, Rethans JJ, Muijtjens AM, et al. Quality of clinical aspects of call handling at Dutch out of hours centres: cross sectional national study. *BMJ*. 2008;337:a1264.
44. Dhruva VN, Abdelhadi SI, Anis A, et al. ST-Segment Analysis Using Wireless Technology in Acute Myocardial Infarction (STAT-MI) Trial. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2007;50(6):509-513.
45. Donaghy E, Atherton H, Hammersley V, et al. Acceptability, benefits, and challenges of video consulting: a qualitative study in primary care. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2019;69(686):e586-e594.
46. Donley E, McClaren A, Jones R, Katz P, Goh J. Evaluation and Implementation of a Telepsychiatry Trial in the Emergency Department of a Metropolitan Public Hospital. *Journal of Technology in Human Services*. 2017;35(4):292-313.
47. Duke M, Botti M, Hunter S. Effectiveness of pain management in hospital in the home programs. *Clinical Journal of Pain*. 2012;28(3):187-194.
48. Dunt D, Day SE, Kelaher M, Montalto M. Impact of standalone and embedded telephone triage systems on after hours primary medical care service utilisation and mix in Australia. *Australia & New Zealand Health Policy*. 2005;2:30.
49. Dunt D, Day SE, Kelaher M, Montalto M. The impact of standalone call centres and GP cooperatives on access to after hours GP care: a before and after study adjusted for secular trend. *Family Practice*. 2006;23(4):453-460.
50. Dunt D, Wilson R, Day SE, Kelaher M, Gurrin L. Impact of telephone triage on emergency after hours GP Medicare usage: a time-series analysis. *Australia & New Zealand Health Policy*. 2007;4:21.
51. Eastwood K, Morgans A, Smith K, Stoelwinder J. Secondary triage in prehospital emergency ambulance services: a systematic review. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. 2015;32(6):486-492.
52. Eastwood K, Smith K, Morgans A, Stoelwinder J. Appropriateness of cases presenting in the emergency department following ambulance service secondary telephone triage: a retrospective cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(10):e016845.

53. Ebert JF, Huibers L, Christensen B, Lippert FK, Christensen MB. Do callers to out-of-hours care misuse an option to jump the phone queue? *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care*. 2019;37(2):207-217.
54. Ekeland AG, Hansen AH, Bergmo TS. Clinical Videoconferencing as eHealth: A Critical-Realist Review and Qualitative Meta-Synthesis. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2018;20(10):50-50.
55. Elliott AM, McAteer A, Heaney D, Ritchie LD, Hannaford PC. Examining the role of Scotland's telephone advice service (NHS 24) for managing health in the community: analysis of routinely collected NHS 24 data. *BMJ Open*. 2015;5(8):e007293.
56. Eminovic N, Wyatt JC, Tarpey AM, Murray G, Ingrams GJ. First evaluation of the NHS direct online clinical enquiry service: a nurse-led web chat triage service for the public. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2004;6(2):e17.
57. Evens S, Curtis P, Talbot A, Baer C, Smart A. Characteristics and perceptions of after-hours callers. *Family Practice*. 1985;2(1):10-16.
58. Flynn DM. Telephone triage as a strategy to ensure 24-hour access to medical care after the closure of supporting medical activity. *Military Medicine*. 1998;163(10):702-706.
59. Foster CB, Martinez KA, Sabella C, Weaver GP, Rothberg MB. Patient Satisfaction and Antibiotic Prescribing for Respiratory Infections by Telemedicine. *Pediatrics*. 2019;144(3):09.
60. Foster J, Dale J, Jessopp L. A qualitative study of older people's views of out-of-hours services. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2001;51(470):719-723.
61. Gallagher M, Huddart T, Henderson B. Telephone triage of acute illness by a practice nurse in general practice: outcomes of care. *British Journal of General Practice*. 1998;48(429):1141-1145.
62. Giesen P, Franssen E, Mokkink H, van den Bosch W, van Vugt A, Grol R. Patients either contacting a general practice cooperative or accident and emergency department out of hours: a comparison. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. 2006;23(9):731-734.
63. Giesen P, Mokkink H, Ophey G, Drijver R, Grol R, Van Den Bosch W. How urgent is the presented morbidity at the out of hours primary care center? *Huisarts en Wetenschap*. 2005;48(5):207-210.
64. Giesen P, Smits M, Huibers L, Grol R, Wensing M. Quality of after-hours primary care in the Netherlands: a narrative review. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2011;155(2):108-113.
65. Gillespie SM, Shah MN, Wasserman EB, et al. Reducing Emergency Department Utilization Through Engagement in Telemedicine by Senior Living Communities. *Telemedicine journal and e-health : the official journal of the American Telemedicine Association*. 2016;22(6):489-496.

66. Glynn LG, Byrne M, Newell J, Murphy AW. The effect of health status on patients' satisfaction with out-of-hours care provided by a family doctor co-operative. *Family Practice*. 2004;21(6):677-683.
67. Goodyear-Smith F, Wearn A, Everts H, Huggard P, Halliwell J. Pandora's electronic box: GPs reflect upon email communication with their patients. *Informatics in Primary Care*. 2005;13(3):195-202.
68. Gould ON, West S, Mancuso M. The perceived functions of alternative primary care options among adults in eastern Canada. *Hospital Topics*. 2009;87(4):1-7.
69. Gray L, Dakin L, Counsell S, Edwards H, Wootton R, Martin-Khan M. 'Online' geriatric assessment procedure for older adults referred for geriatric assessment during an acute care episode for consideration of reliability of triage decisions. *BMC Geriatrics*. 2012;12:10.
70. Greenhalgh T, Shaw S, Wherton J, et al. Real-World Implementation of Video Outpatient Consultations at Macro, Meso, and Micro Levels: Mixed-Method Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2018;20(4):e150.
71. Greenwald PW, Stern M, Clark S, et al. A Novel Emergency Department-Based Telemedicine Program: How Do Older Patients Fare? *Telemedicine Journal & E-Health*. 2019;25(10):966-972.
72. Grol R, Giesen P, van Uden C. UpDate: international report. After-hours care in the United Kingdom, Denmark, and the Netherlands: new models: integrating telephone consultations, triaging, and physician visits or house calls offers a promising model for after-hours care. *Health Affairs*. 2006;25(6):1733-1737.
73. Grove BE, Ivarsen P, de Thurah A, Schougaard LM, Kyte D, Hjollund NH. Remote follow-up using patient-reported outcome measures in patients with chronic kidney disease: the PROKID study - study protocol for a non-inferiority pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2019;19(1):631.
74. Halter M, Marlow T, Mohammed D, Ellison GTH. A patient survey of out-of-hours care provided by Emergency Care Practitioners. *BMC Emergency Medicine*. 2007;7.
75. Handy P, Pattman R. Triage up front. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*. 2005;81(1):59-62.
76. Hansen EH, Hunskaar S. Understanding of and adherence to advice after telephone counselling by nurse: a survey among callers to a primary emergency out-of-hours service in Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation & Emergency Medicine*. 2011;19:48.
77. Hansen EH, Hunskaar S. Telephone triage by nurses in primary care out-of-hours services in Norway: an evaluation study based on written case scenarios. *BMJ Quality & Safety*. 2011;20(5):390-396.
78. Hansen EH, Hunskaar S. Development, implementation, and pilot study of a sentinel network ("The Watchtowers") for monitoring emergency primary health care activity in Norway. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2008;8:62.

79. Heidet M, Canoui-Poitrine F, Revaux F, et al. Factors affecting medical file documentation during telephone triage at an emergency call centre: a cross-sectional study of out-of-hours home visits by general practitioners in France. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2019;19(1):531.
80. Heravian A, Chang BP. Mental health and telemedicine in the acute care setting: Applications of telepsychiatry in the ED. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2018;36(6):1118-1119.
81. Hertzog R, Johnson J, Smith J, et al. Diagnostic Accuracy in Primary Care E-Visits: Evaluation of a Large Integrated Health Care Delivery System's Experience. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*. 2019;94(6):976-984.
82. Holt TA, Fletcher E, Warren F, et al. Telephone triage systems in UK general practice: analysis of consultation duration during the index day in a pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2016;66(644):e214-218.
83. Howard M, Goertzen J, Hutchison B, Kaczorowski J, Morris K. Patient satisfaction with care for urgent health problems: a survey of family practice patients. *Annals of Family Medicine*. 2007;5(5):419-424.
84. Howell T. ED Utilization by Uninsured and Medicaid Patients after Availability of Telephone Triage. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*. 2016;42(2):120-124.
85. Hsu MH, Chu TB, Yen JC, et al. Development and implementation of a national telehealth project for long-term care: a preliminary study. *Computer Methods & Programs in Biomedicine*. 2010;97(3):286-292.
86. Huibers L, Keizer E, Giesen P, Grol R, Wensing M. Nurse telephone triage: good quality associated with appropriate decisions. *Family Practice*. 2012;29(5):547-552.
87. Huibers L, Koetsenruijter J, Grol R, Giesen P, Wensing M. Follow-up after telephone consultations at out-of-hours primary care. *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine: JABFM*. 2013;26(4):373-379.
88. Huibers L, Moth G, Christensen MB, Vedsted P. Antibiotic prescribing patterns in out-of-hours primary care: a population-based descriptive study. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care*. 2014;32(4):200-207.
89. Huibers L, Smits M, Renaud V, Giesen P, Wensing M. Safety of telephone triage in out-of-hours care: a systematic review. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care*. 2011;29(4):198-209.
90. Huilgol YS, Miron-Shatz T, Joshi AU, Hollander JE. Hospital Telehealth Adoption Increased in 2014 and 2015 and Was Influenced by Population, Hospital, and Policy Characteristics. *Telemedicine journal and e-health : the official journal of the American Telemedicine Association*. 2019.

91. Hulland J, Avery AJ, Groom L, Boot D. Use of primary health care and accident and emergency (emergency department) services for children under 5 years outside normal office hours. *Ambulatory Child Health*. 1999;5(4):323-330.
92. Infinger A, Studnek JR, Hawkins E, Bagwell B, Swanson D. Implementation of prehospital dispatch protocols that triage low-acuity patients to advice-line nurses. *Prehospital Emergency Care*. 2013;17(4):481-485.
93. Jansen T, Verheij RA, Schellevis FG, Kunst AE. Use of out-of-hours primary care in affluent and deprived neighbourhoods during reforms in long-term care: an observational study from 2013 to 2016. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(3):e026426.
94. Jerant AF, Nesbitt TS. Heart failure disease management incorporating telemedicine: A critical review. *Journal of Clinical Outcomes Management*. 2005;12(4):207-217.
95. Jiwa M, Mathers N, Campbell M. The effect of GP telephone triage on numbers seeking same-day appointments. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2002;52(478):390-391.
96. Jongeling S, Chen MY, Bush MR, Bradshaw CS, Fairley CK. Risk profile of walk-in triage compared with an appointment-based phone-triage evening clinic. *International Journal of STD & AIDS*. 2009;20(2):135-137.
97. Kahn EN, La Marca F, Mazzola CA. Neurosurgery and Telemedicine in the United States: Assessment of the Risks and Opportunities. *World Neurosurgery*. 2016;89:133-138.
98. Keatinge D, Rawlings K. Outcomes of a nurse-led telephone triage service in Australia. *International Journal of Nursing Practice (Wiley-Blackwell)*. 2005;11(1):5-12.
99. Keizer E, Maassen I, Smits M, Wensing M, Giesen P. Reducing the use of out-of-hours primary care services: A survey among Dutch general practitioners. *European Journal of General Practice*. 2016;22(3):189-195.
100. Kelly M, Egbunike JN, Kinnersley P, et al. Delays in response and triage times reduce patient satisfaction and enablement after using out-of-hours services. *Family Practice*. 2010;27(6):652-663.
101. Killip S, Ireson CL, Love MM, Fleming ST, Katirai W, Sandford K. Patient safety in after-hours telephone medicine. *Fam Med*. 2007;39(6):404-409.
102. Kinnersley P, Egbunike JN, Kelly M, et al. The need to improve the interface between in-hours and out-of-hours GP care, and between out-of-hours care and self-care. *Family Practice*. 2010;27(6):664-672.
103. Klaassen B, van Beijnum BJB, Hermens HJ. Usability in telemedicine systems-A literature survey. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*. 2016;93:57-69.
104. Kleinknecht-Dolf M, Frei IA, Spichiger E, Muller M, Martin JS, Spirig R. Moral distress in nurses at an acute care hospital in Switzerland: results of a pilot study. *Nursing Ethics*. 2015;22(1):77-90.

105. Knight K, Endacott R, Kenny A. Ambiguous and arbitrary: The role of telephone interactions in rural health service delivery. *Australian Journal of Primary Health*. 2010;16(2):126-131.
106. Krumperman K, Weiss S, Fullerton L. Two Types of Prehospital Systems Interventions that Triage Low-Acuity Patients to Alternative Sites of Care. *Southern Medical Journal*. 2015;108(7):381-386.
107. Kumar S, Yogesan K, Hudson B, Tay-Kearney ML, Constable IJ. Emergency eye care in rural Australia: Role of internet. *Eye*. 2006;20(12):1342-1344.
108. Lambert D, Gale J, Hartley D, Croll Z, Hansen A. Understanding the Business Case for Telemental Health in Rural Communities. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*. 2016;43(3):366-379.
109. Landrey AR, Harder VS, Sandoval MB, King JG, Ziegelman DS, MacLean CD. Utilization Outcomes of a Pilot Primary Care Team Redesign. *Health Services Research & Managerial Epidemiology*. 2018;5:2333392818789844.
110. Langabeer JR, 2nd, Gonzalez M, Alqusairi D, et al. Telehealth-Enabled Emergency Medical Services Program Reduces Ambulance Transport to Urban Emergency Departments. *The Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2016;17(6):713-720.
111. Langabeer JR, Champagne-Langabeer T, Alqusairi D, et al. Cost-benefit analysis of telehealth in pre-hospital care. *Journal of telemedicine and telecare*. 2017;23(8):747-751.
112. Lattimer V, Sassi F, George S, et al. Cost analysis of nurse telephone consultation in out of hours primary care: evidence from a randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2000;320(7241):1053-1057.
113. Lattimer V, Turnbull J, Burgess A, et al. Effect of introduction of integrated out of hours care in England: observational study. *BMJ*. 2005;331(7508):81-84.
114. LaVela SL, Gering J, Schectman G, Locatelli SM, Weaver FM, Davies M. Improving the quality of telephone-delivered health care: a national quality improvement transformation initiative. *Family Practice*. 2013;30(5):533-540.
115. Leask CF, Tennant H. Evaluation of an unscheduled care model delivered by advanced nurse practitioners in a primary-care setting. *Journal of Research in Nursing*. 2019;24(8):696-709.
116. Lee HY, Kim JY, Na KY, et al. The role of telehealth counselling with mobile self-monitoring on blood pressure reduction among overseas Koreans with high blood pressure in Vietnam. *Journal of Telemedicine & Telecare*. 2019;25(4):241-248.
117. Lee TJ, Baraff LJ, Guzy J, Johnson D, Woo H. Does telephone triage delay significant medical treatment?: Advice nurse service vs on-call pediatricians. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*. 2003;157(7):635-641.

118. Lee TJ, Guzy J, Johnson D, Woo H, Baraff LJ. Caller satisfaction with after-hours telephone advice: nurse advice service versus on-call pediatricians. *Pediatrics*. 2002;110(5):865-872.
119. Lessard JA, Knox R. Telehealth in a rural school-based health center. *Journal of School Nursing*. 2000;16(2):38-41.
120. Mann T, Colven R. A picture is worth more than a thousand words: enhancement of a pre-exam telephone consultation in dermatology with digital images. *Academic Medicine*. 2002;77(7):742-743.
121. Manojlovich M, Adler-Milstein J, Harrod M, et al. The Effect of Health Information Technology on Health Care Provider Communication: A Mixed-Method Protocol. *JMIR Research Protocols*. 2015;4(2):e72.
122. Martinez KA, Rood M, Jhangiani N, Kou L, Boissy A, Rothberg MB. Association between Antibiotic Prescribing for Respiratory Tract Infections and Patient Satisfaction in Direct-to-Consumer Telemedicine. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2018;178(11):1558-1560.
123. Matar R, Renapurkar R, Obuchowski N, Menon V, Piraino D, Schoenhagen P. Utility of hand-held devices in diagnosis and triage of cardiovascular emergencies. Observations during implementation of a PACS-based system in an acute aortic syndrome (AAS) network. *Journal of cardiovascular computed tomography*. 2015;9(6):524-533.
124. McAfee JL, Vij A, Warren CB. Store-and-forward teledermatology improves care and reduces dermatology referrals from walk-in clinics: A retrospective descriptive study. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*. 2020;82(2):499-501.
125. McConnochie KM, Connors GP, Brayer AF, et al. Differences in Diagnosis and Treatment Using Telemedicine Versus In-Person Evaluation of Acute Illness. *Ambulatory Pediatrics*. 2006;6(4):187-195.
126. McDonnell A, Esmonde L, Morgan R, et al. The provision of critical care outreach services in England: findings from a national survey. *Journal of Critical Care*. 2007;22(3):212-218.
127. McKinstry B, Walker J, Campbell C, Heaney D, Wyke S. Telephone consultations to manage requests for same-day appointments: a randomised controlled trial in two practices. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2002;52(477):306-310.
128. McKinstry B, Walker J, Campbell C, Heaney D, Wyke S, Wallace P. Telephone consultations may be useful for people who request same-day appointments, but do not reduce workload. *Evidence-Based Healthcare*. 2002;6(4):154-155.
129. McKinstry B, Watson P, Pinnock H, Heaney D, Sheikh A. Telephone consulting in primary care: a triangulated qualitative study of patients and providers. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2009;59(563):e209-218.

130. McLean KA, Mountain KE, Shaw CA, et al. Can a smartphone-delivered tool facilitate the assessment of surgical site infection and result in earlier treatment? Tracking wound infection with smartphone technology (TWIST): protocol for a randomised controlled trial in emergency surgery patients. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(10):e029620.
131. Mendenhall MA, Dyehouse K, Hayes J, et al. Practice transformation: Early impact of the oncology care model on hospital admissions. *Journal of Oncology Practice*. 2018;14(12):E739-E745.
132. Meng D, Palen TE, Tsai J, McLeod M, Garrido T, Qian H. Association between secure patient-clinician email and clinical services utilisation in a US integrated health system: a retrospective cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2015;5(11):e009557.
133. Meyer AND, Giardina TD, Spitzmueller C, Shahid U, Scott TMT, Singh H. Patient Perspectives on the Usefulness of an Artificial Intelligence-Assisted Symptom Checker: Cross-Sectional Survey Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2020;22(1):e14679.
134. Miller D, Loftus AM, O'Boyle PJ, et al. Impact of a telephone-first consultation system in general practice. *Postgraduate Medical Journal*. 2019;95(1129):590-595.
135. Mira M, Cooper C, Maandag A. Contrasts between metropolitan and rural general practice in the delivery of after-hours care. *Australian Family Physician*. 1995;24(6):1064-1067.
136. Mohammed MA, Clements G, Edwards E, Lester H. Factors which influence the length of an out-of-hours telephone consultation in primary care: a retrospective database study. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2012;12:430.
137. Montalto M. How safe is hospital-in-the-home care? *Medical Journal of Australia*. 1998;168(6):277-280.
138. Moreno CA. Utilization of medical services by single-parent and two-parent families. *Journal of Family Practice*. 1989;28(2):194-199.
139. Morimura N, Aruga T, Sakamoto T, et al. The impact of an emergency telephone consultation service on the use of ambulances in Tokyo. *Emergency Medicine Journal*. 2011;28(1):64-70.
140. Mukamel DB, Ladd H, Amin A, Sorkin DH. Patients' preferences over care settings for minor illnesses and injuries. *Health Services Research*. 2019;54(4):827-838.
141. Mulcahy D, O'Callaghan C, Hannigan A. Nurse Triage in an Irish Out-of-hours General Practice Co-Operative. *Irish Medical Journal*. 2017;110(3):530.
142. Munro J, Nicholl J, O'Cathain A, Knowles E. Impact of NHS direct on demand for immediate care: observational study. *BMJ*. 2000;321(7254):150-153.
143. Munroe D, Natale P. After-hours call in a primary care nursing practice. *Nurse Practitioner*. 1982;7(5):24-27.

144. Murdoch J, Varley A, Fletcher E, et al. Implementing telephone triage in general practice: a process evaluation of a cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMC Family Practice*. 2015;16:47.
145. Navratil-Strawn JL, Ozminkowski RJ, Hartley SK. An economic analysis of a nurse-led telephone triage service. *Journal of Telemedicine & Telecare*. 2014;20(6):330-338.
146. Neimanis I, Kaczorowski J, Howard M. After-hours services in capitation-funded primary care practice: use and satisfaction. *Canadian Family Physician*. 2009;55(10):1008-1009.e1001-1006.
147. Nord G, Rising KL, Band RA, Carr BG, Hollander JE. On-demand synchronous audio video telemedicine visits are cost effective. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2019;37(5):890-894.
148. Noroxe KB, Huibers L, Moth G, Vedsted P. Medical appropriateness of adult calls to Danish out-of-hours primary care: a questionnaire-based survey. *BMC Family Practice*. 2017;18(1):34.
149. North F, Varkey P, Bartel GA, Cox DL, Jensen PL, Stroebel RJ. Can an office practice telephonic response meet the needs of a pandemic? *Telemedicine Journal & E-Health*. 2010;16(10):1012-1016.
150. North F, Varkey P, Laing B, Cha SS, Tullidge-Scheitel S. Are e-health web users looking for different symptom information than callers to triage centers? *Telemedicine Journal & E-Health*. 2011;17(1):19-24.
151. O'Cathain A, Knowles E, Munro J, Nicholl J. Exploring the effect of changes to service provision on the use of unscheduled care in England: population surveys. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2007;7:61.
152. O'Cathain A, Knowles E, Turner J, Nicholl J. Acceptability of NHS 111 the telephone service for urgent health care: cross sectional postal survey of users' views. *Family Practice*. 2014;31(2):193-200.
153. Palen TE, Ross C, Powers JD, Xu S. Association of online patient access to clinicians and medical records with use of clinical services. *JAMA*. 2012;308(19):2012-2019.
154. Pallawala PM, Lun KC. EMR based telegeriatric system. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*. 2001;61(2-3):229-234.
155. Pathipati AS, Ko JM. Implementation and evaluation of Stanford Health Care direct-care teledermatology program. *SAGE Open Medicine*. 2016;4.
156. Payne F, Shipman C, Dale J. Patients' experiences of receiving telephone advice from a GP co-operative. *Family Practice*. 2001;18(2):156-160.
157. Perry JR, Caine N. General practitioners' knowledge about patients and use of medical records in out of hours calls. *British Journal of General Practice*. 1990;40(334):190-193.

158. Philips H, Van Bergen J, Huibers L, et al. Agreement on urgency assessment between secretaries and general practitioners: an observational study in out-of-hours general practice service in Belgium. *Acta Clinica Belgica*. 2015;70(5):309-314.
159. Player M, O'Bryan E, Sederstrom E, Pinckney J, Diaz V. Electronic Visits For Common Acute Conditions: Evaluation Of A Recently Established Program. *Health Affairs*. 2018;37(12):2024-2030.
160. Pope C, Turnbull J, Jones J, Prichard J, Rowsell A, Halford S. Has the NHS 111 urgent care telephone service been a success? Case study and secondary data analysis in England. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(5):e014815.
161. Rahmqvist M, Ernesater A, Holmstrom I. Triage and patient satisfaction among callers in Swedish computer-supported telephone advice nursing. *Journal of Telemedicine & Telecare*. 2011;17(7):397-402.
162. Rastogi R, Martinez KA, Gupta N, Rood M, Rothberg MB. Management of Urinary Tract Infections in Direct to Consumer Telemedicine. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2019;30:30.
163. Ray KN, Shi Z, Poon SJ, Uscher-Pines L, Mehrotra A. Use of Commercial Direct-to-Consumer Telemedicine by Children. *Academic Pediatrics*. 2019;19(6):665-669.
164. Reitz GF, Stalenhoef P, Heg R, Beusmans G. Telephone triage in general practice. *Huisarts en Wetenschap*. 2007;50(13):656-659.
165. Richards DA, Godfrey L, Tawfik J, et al. NHS Direct versus general practice based triage for same day appointments in primary care: cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2004;329(7469):774.
166. Richards DA, Meakins J, Godfrey L, Tawfik J, Dutton E. Survey of the impact of nurse telephone triage on general practitioner activity. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2004;54(500):207-210.
167. Richards DA, Meakins J, Tawfik J, et al. Nurse telephone triage for same day appointments in general practice: multiple interrupted time series trial of effect on workload and costs. *BMJ*. 2002;325(7374):1214.
168. Richards SH, Pound P, Dickens A, Greco M, Campbell JL. Exploring users' experiences of accessing out-of-hours primary medical care services. *Quality & Safety in Health Care*. 2007;16(6):469-477.
169. Ricke J, Kleinholz L, Hosten N, et al. Telemedicine in rural areas. Experience with medical desktop-conferencing via satellite. *Journal of Telemedicine & Telecare*. 1995;1(4):224-228.
170. Ritter LA, Robinette TR, Cofano J. Evaluation of a statewide telemedicine program. *Californian Journal of Health Promotion*. 2010;8(1):1-9.

171. Rogove HJ, McArthur D, Demaerschalk BM, Vespa PM. Barriers to telemedicine: survey of current users in acute care units. *Telemedicine Journal & E-Health*. 2012;18(1):48-53.
172. Roivainen P, Hoikka MJ, Raatiniemi L, Silfvast T, Ala-Kokko T, Kääriäinen M. Telephone triage performed by nurses reduces non-urgent ambulance missions: A prospective observational pilot study in Finland. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*. 2020.
173. Rudin RS, Fanta CH, Qureshi N, et al. A Clinically Integrated mHealth App and Practice Model for Collecting Patient-Reported Outcomes between Visits for Asthma Patients: Implementation and Feasibility. *Applied clinical informatics*. 2019;10(5):783-793.
174. Sabin M. Telephone triage improves demand management effectiveness. *hfm (Healthcare Financial Management)*. 1998;52(8):49-51.
175. Sandvik H, Hunskar S. [Working style among regular general practitioners and other doctors in the out-of-hours services]. *Tidsskrift for Den Norske Laegeforening*. 2010;130(2):135-138.
176. Schlachta C, Nguyen N, Ponsky T, Dunkin B, Schlachta CM, Nguyen NT. Project 6 Summit: SAGES telementoring initiative. *Surgical Endoscopy*. 2016;30(9):3665-3672.
177. Schmid A, Hils S, Kramer-Zucker A, et al. Telemedically Supported Case Management of Living-Donor Renal Transplant Recipients to Optimize Routine Evidence-Based Aftercare: A Single-Center Randomized Controlled Trial. *American Journal of Transplantation*. 2017;17(6):1594-1605.
178. Scott-Jones J, Lawrenson R, Maxwell N. Sharing after hours care in a rural New Zealand community--a service utilization survey. *Rural & Remote Health*. 2008;8(4):1024.
179. Shah MN, Gillespie SM, Wood N, et al. High-intensity telemedicine-enhanced acute care for older adults: an innovative healthcare delivery model. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2013;61(11):2000-2007.
180. Simpson RG, Graham D, Martin K. Analysis of out of hours telephone consultation at the medical reception station Sennelager, British Forces Germany. *Journal of the Royal Army Medical Corps*. 2000;146(1):28-30.
181. Smith S, Lynch J, O'Doherty K, Bury G. Patients' views on out-of-hours care in general practice in Dublin. *Irish Journal of Medical Science*. 2001;170(3):192-194.
182. Smits M, Colliers A, Jansen T, Remmen R, Bartholomeeusen S, Verheij R. Examining differences in out-of-hours primary care use in Belgium and the Netherlands: a cross-sectional study. *European Journal of Public Health*. 2019;29(6):1018-1024.
183. Smits M, Hanssen S, Huibers L, Giesen P. Telephone triage in general practices: A written case scenario study in the Netherlands. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care*. 2016;34(1):28-36.

184. Smits M, Keizer E, Giesen P, Deilkas ECT, Hofoss D, Bondevik GT. Patient safety culture in out-of-hours primary care services in the Netherlands: a cross-sectional survey. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care*. 2018;36(1):28-35.
185. Stoves J, Connolly J, Cheung CK, et al. Electronic consultation as an alternative to hospital referral for patients with chronic kidney disease: a novel application for networked electronic health records to improve the accessibility and efficiency of healthcare. *Quality & Safety in Health Care*. 2010;19(5):e54-e54.
186. Stuart A, Rogers S, Modell M. Evaluation of a direct doctor-patient telephone advice line in general practice. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2000;50(453):305-306.
187. Studnek JR, Thestrup L, Blackwell T, Bagwell B. Utilization of prehospital dispatch protocols to identify low-acuity patients. *Prehospital Emergency Care*. 2012;16(2):204-209.
188. Thilsted SL, Egerod I, Lippert FK, Gamst-Jensen H. Relation between illness representation and self-reported degree-of-worry in patients calling out-of-hours services: a mixed-methods study in Copenhagen, Denmark. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8(9):e020401.
189. Turnbull J, Martin D, Lattimer V, Pope C, Culliford D. Does distance matter? Geographical variation in GP out-of-hours service use: An observational study. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2008;58(552):471-477.
190. Uscher-Pines L, Fischer S, Tong I, Mehrotra A, Malsberger R, Ray K. Virtual First Responders: the Role of Direct-to-Consumer Telemedicine in Caring for People Impacted by Natural Disasters. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2018;33(8):1242-1244.
191. Uscher-Pines L, Mulcahy A, Cowling D, Hunter G, Burns R, Mehrotra A. Antibiotic prescribing for acute respiratory infections in direct-to-consumer telemedicine visits. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2015;175(7):1234-1235.
192. Valero MA, Arredondo MT, del Noyal F, Rodriguez JM, Torres D. Using cable television networks for interactive home telemedicine services. *Journal of Telemedicine & Telecare*. 1999;5 Suppl 1:S91-92.
193. Van Donk P, Tanti ER, Porter JE. Triage and treat model of care: Effective management of minor injuries in the emergency department. *Collegian*. 2017;24(4):325-330.
194. Van Uden CJT, Ament AJHA, Hobma SO, Zwietering PJ, Crebolder HFJM. Patient satisfaction with out-of-hours primary care in the Netherlands. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2005;5.
195. Varley A, Warren FC, Richards SH, et al. The effect of nurses' preparedness and nurse practitioner status on triage call management in primary care: A secondary analysis of cross-sectional data from the ESTEEM trial. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*. 2016;58:12-20.
196. Verzantvoort NCM, Teunis T, Verheij TJM, van der Velden AW. Self-triage for acute primary care via a smartphone application: Practical, safe and efficient? *PLoS ONE [Electronic Resource]*. 2018;13(6):e0199284.

197. Walker J, Hill R, Green L. Tassie's tele-rific telehealth network: Linking primary health care services for better rural health outcomes. *Australian Journal of Primary Health - Interchange*. 2000;6(3-4):108-117.
198. Wallace DL, Jones SM, Milroy C, Pickford MA. Telemedicine for acute plastic surgical trauma and burns. *Journal of Plastic, Reconstructive & Aesthetic Surgery: JPRAS*. 2008;61(1):31-36.
199. Warren FC, Calitri R, Fletcher E, et al. Exploring demographic and lifestyle associations with patient experience following telephone triage by a primary care doctor or nurse: secondary analyses from a cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Quality & Safety*. 2015;24(9):572-582.
200. Westall C, Spackman R, Nadarajah CV, Trepte N. Are hospital admissions reduced by Acute Medicine consultant telephone triage of medical referrals? *Acute Medicine*. 2015;14(1):10-13.
201. Win AZ. Comparison of UK's Minor Ailments Scheme and US's retail clinic model: a narrative review. *Primary Health Care Research & Development*. 2016;17(6):622-627.
202. Woods LW, Snow SW. The impact of telehealth monitoring on acute care hospitalization rates and emergency department visit rates for patients using home health skilled nursing care. *Home Healthcare Nurse*. 2013;31(1):39-45.
203. Wootton R, McKelvey A, McNicholl B, et al. Transfer of telemedical support to Cornwall from a national telemedicine network during a solar eclipse. *Journal of Telemedicine & Telecare*. 2000;6 Suppl 1:S182-186.
204. Zinger ND, Blomberg SN, Lippert F, Collatz Christensen H. Satisfaction of 30 402 callers to a medical helpline of the Emergency Medical Services Copenhagen: a retrospective cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(10):e029801.

APPENDIX E. PEER REVIEW DISPOSITION

Question Text	Reviewer Number	Comment	Response
Are the objectives, scope, and methods for this review clearly described?	3	Yes	Thank you
	5	Yes	Thank you
	7	Yes	Thank you
	8	Yes	Thank you
	9	Yes	Thank you
Is there any indication of bias in our synthesis of the evidence?	3	No	Thank you
	5	No	Thank you
	7	No	Thank you
	8	No	Thank you
	9	No	Thank you
Are you aware of any <u>published</u> or <u>unpublished</u> studies that we may have overlooked?	3	No	Thank you
	5	No	Thank you
	7	No	Thank you
	8	No	Thank you
	9	No	Thank you
Additional suggestions or comments can be provided below. If applicable, please indicate the page and line numbers from the draft report.	3	An impressive review and critique of current literature evaluating the impact of virtual care strategies. It is not surprising that many of the outstanding questions were either not directly addressed or did not yield consistent answers given the heterogeneity of the systems evaluated. One topic of special interest is comparing video vs. telephone for clinical effectiveness, patient satisfaction, etc. The lack of data on this subject is not surprising. I have gathered unpublished data suggesting that patient confidence in the provider is enhanced by video BUT the video appointments were targeted to conditions that most benefit from video (skin and eye concerns mostly). The same data set showed better clinical resolution with video for these problems. Data on Video vs. phone for more general clinical problems would be most interesting but the demographics of patients electing each modality can be quite different limiting the accuracy of any conclusions that might be drawn. VA has the opportunity to make a valuable contribution to the literature on this subject in the future.	Thank you

<p>7 The objectives, scope and methods are clearly described and appropriate reporting guidelines followed. Appropriate methods were used to reduce bias in the study selection process, e.g. piloting and selection by two independent reviewers. Excluded studies and reasons were included in an appendix. For extra transparency, you could have reported how disagreements between reviewers were resolved and a measure of agreement, e.g. kappa (unless I missed this). Synthesis of the included studies was guided by a pre-determined analytical framework and a publicly available protocol.</p>	<p>Thank you. We have augmented our Methods description to explicate how reviewer disagreement were resolved.</p>
<p>You searched three relevant databases and reference lists of related systematic reviews. The search strategies reported appear thorough and overall you should have good coverage of the published literature (although the search could have been strengthened by looking at sources such as the Cochrane Library). You don't report any search for unpublished studies or grey literature so it's certainly possible some could have been overlooked, though I don't know of any specific examples.</p>	
<p>In summary: I haven't read the whole report in detail but it is methodologically strong and the conclusions follow from the evidence presented. The use of GRADE to assess certainty of evidence increases confidence in the findings, and applicability to the VHA system is explicitly considered</p>	
<p>8 Well-conceived, systematically conducted review of important emerging topic area.</p>	<p>Thank you.</p>
<p>9 Thank you for the opportunity to review this evidence review on a very important and timely topic. I found this review to be informative, well-organized, and well-written. I think it will make a significant contribution and lay foundation for future work. I have a handful of minor comments for the authors to consider.</p>	<p>We have edited this wording to improve clarity.</p>
<p>page 1, lines 26-27 paragraph 2 – the phrase “underutilization on non-physician providers” is somewhat vague. Do you mean underutilization of non-physician providers in primary care? I am wondering if your point is best made by saying there is a “shortage of primary care providers” as the composition of PCPs being physicians</p>	

	or non-physicians may be distracting and tangential, I think, to your main point.	
9	page 4 line 8- uses abbreviation COE which I don't think was previously defined.	We have clarified with adding low <i>certainty of evidence</i> (COE).
9	page 4 line 38 - there is a misplaced period after "health care" and I think there is a missing word. Also, I am not sure about the intended meaning of the phrase "deputizing physicians" and how that differs from "cooperative physicians."	We have defined "deputizing" in the text. Deputized physicians differ from cooperative physicians as they are non-affiliated physicians who take the afterhours calls and cooperative physicians are those part of an established provider network.
9	I am also unsure about why satisfaction with provider communication is included with "health care access" rather than "patient satisfaction".	We conceptualized "health care access" as informed by the U.S. Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion's Healthy People 2020 objectives. They defined health care access as the ability to provide health care when the need is recognized (<i>ie</i> , timeliness) and satisfaction with provider services and communication (<i>ie</i> , services).
9	page 4 lines 49-53 - I am perplexed by the sentence "An additional study of calls to telephone-based urgent care services originally triaged to the ED by either a physician advisor or a non-physician clinical advisor produced more case resolution on the first contact than calls assessed by a non-clinical call handler". I think the problem is the phrase "originally triaged to the ED" – so, the patient was seen in the ED, or diverted from the ED? (but if seen in the ED, then it was resolved there?) I think there is some information missing that is making this confusing.	This wording has been revised as "An additional study examined calls to a telephone-based urgent care where calls were triaged to the ED by the clinical support software. These same calls were then passed to an assessment service (prescribing provider: physician advisor or a non-physician clinical advisor) and produced more case resolution on the first contact than calls assessed initially by a non-clinical call handler then moved to a prescribing provider." From the study description, patients that would have been advised to go to the ED by the clinical support software were

		passed to a clinical assessment service.
9	page 5 – line 12 – typo – I think “them” should be “that”	Revised to “that.”
9	page 5 – line 14 – suggest changing “inappropriate care outcomes” to “inappropriate treatment outcomes” to stay consistent with language used elsewhere in the report	Changed to inappropriate “treatment” throughout
9	page 12 – use of Distiller. I am confused by the numbers- your results show that you identified 4, 311 unique articles which you then applied inclusion and exclusion criteria. From the methods on page 12 it looks like you used 2765 articles to train Distiller, and then used Distiller to review 2,357 articles – which adds up to 5,122. And, you report that Distiller SR was a “second reviewer” – but wasn’t it the only reviewer for the “remaining titles and abstracts” that had <50% probability of relevance?	Thank you, we updated the language to clarify that the AI reviewed references as the second reviewer after it was trained on almost the full database reviewed by one person. The references that the AI included were reviewed by two people at the full-text review level.
9	page 22 – title “Effects on Outpatient Care Utilization” might be better titled “Effects on Subsequent Outpatient Care Utilization” – as the initial telehealth utilization is outpatient care.	This was revised to “ <i>Effects on Subsequent Outpatient Care Utilization.</i> ”
9	Page 23- similarly, suggest section title be “Effects on Subsequent Emergency Department Utilization”	“Subsequent” was added.
9	page 23 – line 37 - extra work “in” and did you mean “NHS 111”?	Revised.
9	page 35 – As in executive summary, I am perplexed by the inclusion of patient satisfaction with communication in the section on access rather than in the patient satisfaction section.	We have revised this for clarity.
9	Figure 4B – needs better labels on the x axis – it took me a bit to realize that this represented % of studies. Figure 6 – also needs better label on the x axis	Thank you. These are standard figures for risk of bias in systematic reviews and the x axis is explained in the figure title.
9	page 42 – line 28 – “adverse effects prioritized by operations partners” – do you	We have deleted this phrase from the results section for

	mean those listed in the i.e. part of KQ2A? Would specify as it is not immediately obvious	adverse events to improve clarity.
9	page 42 – line 51 “subgroups of interest” – is this the same thing as “adverse effects prioritized by operations partners”, or something else?	We have clarified that these are from the key questions of the review.
9	page 42 – line 52 – “adverse clinical outcome (i., deaths)” – death is not listed in the i.e. for the question	Thank you. The key question includes this outcome of interest
9	page 42 – lines 53-56 – you don’t comment on whether there were any studies showing adverse effects of delayed diagnosis. Also, how is the distinction between misdiagnosis v. delayed diagnosis being made (since delayed diagnosis usually starts with a misdiagnosis and a misdiagnosis is usually only detected when the true diagnosis is found, delayed from the initial presentation)	We agree these are aligned outcomes and that misdiagnosis can lead to delayed diagnosis. In general, we seek conceptualize outcomes as defined by study authors, when possible. We only identified one study that defined misdiagnosis. We did not find any studies that reported on delayed diagnosis and have clarified this this in the report results.
9	page 43- line 24 – need to define/describe what is meant by “direct-to-consumer care”, and specify if the comparison is being made to in-person primary care v. primary care via telehealth v. both	Thank you. We have revised this description to improve clarity and removed “direct-to-consumer” language.
9	page 43 - lines 32-43 – was there a comparison group for this study (if not, I suggest noting this)	There was no comparison group and we have now noted this in the text.