

40 Abstract

41
42 Background: Access to specialty care, including cardiology, in the Veterans Health
43 Administration (VHA) varies widely across geographic regions. VHA's clinical resource hub
44 (CRH) model of care offers mostly-virtual specialty care to individuals in low access regions and
45 has recently been implemented in cardiology. How implementation of this predominantly virtual
46 cardiology program affects the reach of cardiology specialty care in VHA is not known. This
47 study describes the association between patient characteristics and use of CRH cardiology care in
48 VHA's Sierra Pacific region (Northern California, Nevada, and the Pacific Islands).

49
50 Methods: We compared patients who used CRH cardiology services between 7/15/2021 and
51 3/31/2023 to non-CRH Sierra Pacific cardiology patients, then used multivariate logistic
52 regression to estimate the association between patient-level factors and odds of being a CRH
53 user.

54
55 Results: There were 804 CRH users over the study period with 1,961 CRH encounters, and
56 19,583 non-CRH users with 83,489 encounters. Among CRH users, 8% were women and 41%
57 were ≥ 75 years, compared to 5% and 49% respectively among non-CRH users. Similar
58 proportions in both groups were rural (26% for both CRH and non-CRH), highly-disabled (48%
59 CRH, 47% non-CRH), and low-income (21% CRH, 20% non-CRH). In multivariate logistic
60 models, adjusted odds of using CRH were higher for women (adjusted odds ratio [AOR] 1.70
61 [95% CI 1.46-1.98]) and lower for older Veterans (AOR 0.33 for ≥ 75 [95% CI 0.23-0.48]).
62 Highly rural Veterans also had higher adjusted odds of using CRH (AOR 1.88 [95% CI 1.30-
63 2.69]).

64
65 Conclusions: The Sierra Pacific CRH cardiology program served a disproportionately high
66 number of women and highly rural Veterans and similar proportions of highly-disabled and low-
67 income Veterans as conventional VA care in its first two years of operation. This predominately-
68 virtual model of cardiology care may be an effective strategy for overcoming access barriers for
69 certain individuals, though targeted efforts may be required to reach older Veterans.

70
71

72 Introduction

73

74

75 Access to specialty care, including cardiology, in the Veterans Health Administration (VHA)

76 varies widely across geographic regions.¹⁻³ Given the high prevalence of cardiovascular disease

77 and associated morbidity and mortality among Veterans,⁴ maintaining access to cardiology care

78 is essential. As there are unique and disproportionately high risks of dual use of VHA and

79 community care for Veterans with cardiovascular disease,⁵ maintaining access to VHA-based

80 cardiology care is a particular priority.

81

82 Virtual care (new or follow-up patient visits, delivered by phone or video) expanded significantly

83 during the COVID-19 pandemic in cardiology⁶ as across the VHA⁷ and other healthcare systems.

84 In this post-public health emergency phase of the pandemic, patient familiarity with these

85 modalities of care provides opportunities for new ways of using virtual care, including to

86 improve access to specialty care in non-emergency settings.

87

88 VHA's clinical resource hub (CRH) model of care offers mostly-virtual care to individuals in low

89 access regions. The CRH cardiology program was first implemented in July 2021 in VA's Sierra

90 Pacific region, which serves Northern California, Nevada, and the Pacific Islands (see Box).

Box 1. VHA’s Clinical Resource Hub (CRH) program

The Palo Alto VHA site serves as the *hub* for specialty care, including cardiology, for VHA’s CRH program in the Sierra Pacific region. *Spoke* site-specific contracts known as Telehealth Service Agreements detail the relationship between the Palo Alto-based CRH clinical team and other individual sites; the spoke sites implementing CRH cardiology in 2021-2023 in this region were VA’s Sierra Nevada (Reno), Southern Nevada (Las Vegas), and Northern California (Sacramento) sites. The services available via CRH at each spoke site (e.g., which subspecialty clinics, such as heart failure or women’s health cardiology) depend on the site’s needs and service gaps, and the program employs physicians, nurses, pharmacists, and administrative staff.

91

92

93 While the initial implementation and usage of the CRH model has been described in primary and
94 mental health^{8,9} and for certain specialties^{10,11}, expansion of the program for cardiology specialty
95 care has yet to be characterized. In this study, we will analyze the initial implementation of the
96 VISN 21 CRH cardiology program, describing program growth, sociodemographic
97 characteristics of users, and different modalities of care across the program.

98

99 Methods

100

101 This analysis was conducted as a clinical operations quality improvement project through the
102 VISN 21 Clinical Resource Hub leadership team and was therefore exempt from IRB approval.

103

104 Using VA's Corporate Data Warehouse, we constructed a cohort of all patients with at least one
105 evaluation & management (E&M) encounter in any CRH or conventional VHA cardiology clinic
106 in VA's Sierra Pacific region (encompassing Northern California, Nevada, and the Pacific
107 Islands) between 7/15/2021, when the first clinical resource hub site was first implemented, and
108 3/31/2023.

109

110 *Patient Characteristics*

111

112 We included the following patient-level sociodemographic data: age, sex, race/ethnicity
113 (American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Native Hawaiian/Pacific
114 Islander, White, or unknown), rurality (highly rural, rural, or urban), and home site for receiving
115 VHA care. We also included VHA enrollment priority as a proxy for social need, based on
116 VHA's enrollment priority classification system;¹² this program categorizes VHA patients
117 according to military service-related disability and income and influences whether patients pay
118 co-pays and what services they can access within VHA. As in prior published literature,^{6,7} we
119 condensed these enrollment priority categories to four: high disability, corresponding to
120 enrollment priority groups 1 and 4; low-moderate disability, including priority groups 2, 3, and 6;
121 low-income, including priority group 5; and no disability nor low-income status, wherein

122 patients pay co-pays for VHA care, including priority groups 7-8. Due to the hierarchical nature
123 of these groups, Veterans assigned to high- or low-moderate disability groups may also be low-
124 income.

125
126 We captured cardiovascular diagnoses based on primary diagnoses at cardiology visits, grouping
127 these into several categories representing the most commonly-coded primary diagnoses: heart
128 failure, ischemic heart disease, valvular heart disease, and atrial fibrillation/flutter. International
129 Classification of Disease (ICD)-10 codes are shown in Table S1.

130

131 *Encounter Characteristics*

132

133 We captured the primary diagnosis group assigned to a given encounter as described above, as
134 well as the encounter hub and spoke sites. We also collected data on encounter modality: phone,
135 video (either direct to the patient's home via VHA's video platform, or from the cardiology team
136 to a local clinic), or in person.

137

138

139 *Statistical Analysis*

140

141 We constructed a logistic regression model with primary outcome of adjusted odds of being a
142 CRH user, with all the covariates outlined above and with clustering by the patient's assigned
143 primary care site. We then constructed a separate logistic regression model of adjusted odds of
144 being a video care user.

145

146 Results

147

148 *Patients*

149

150 There were 804 CRH users over the study period with a total of 4,315 ambulatory cardiology
151 encounters, 1,961 of which were CRH encounters. Just over half of CRH users (403 of 804) had
152 non-CRH cardiology encounters in addition to CRH encounters. In addition, there were 19,583
153 non-CRH users with 83,489 ambulatory encounters, meaning CRH users comprised 4% of the
154 20,387 total patients using ambulatory cardiology services in the region over the study period.

155

156 Among CRH users, 8% were women and 41% were ≥ 75 years old, compared to 5% and 49%
157 respectively among non-CRH users. Similar proportions in both groups were rural or highly rural
158 (26% for both CRH and non-CRH), highly-disabled (48% CRH, 47% non-CRH), and low-
159 income (21% CRH, 20% non-CRH).

160

161 In a multivariate logistic model with clustering at patient's primary site, adjusted odds of using
162 CRH were lower for older Veterans (AOR 0.33 for ≥ 75 [95% CI 0.23-0.48]) and higher for
163 women (adjusted odds ratio [AOR] 1.70 [95% CI 1.46-1.98]). Highly rural Veterans also had
164 higher adjusted odds of using CRH (AOR 1.88 [95% CI 1.30-2.69]). There were few significant
165 differences by race/ethnicity, though patients of Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander race had higher
166 odds of using CRH (AOR 1.67 [95% CI 1.22-2.28]). Having a diagnosis of atrial
167 fibrillation/flutter or valvular heart disease was also associated with higher adjusted odds of
168 using CRH (AOR 1.54 [95% CI 1.29-1.83] and 1.93 [1.34-2.79], respectively).

169

170
171 The number of CRH patients increased over time (Figure 2), with some sites' growth rates
172 picking up more abruptly (e.g., Northern California) and others demonstrating a steadier increase
173 (Sierra Nevada, Southern Nevada). Initial CRH encounters for these sites were 7/29/2021
174 (Southern Nevada), 9/8/2021 (Sierra Nevada), and 9/21/2021 (Northern California).

175
176
177 *Encounters*

178
179
180 The total number of ambulatory cardiology encounters in the region remained approximately
181 constant over the study period (Figure 3); a slight uptick in total encounters took place in the first
182 quarter of 2023, mostly due to an increase in in-person encounters. Figure S1 shows the
183 breakdown in encounter modality among CRH sites over time. Figure 4 shows the growth in
184 CRH cardiology encounters over time at the three sites with most CRH encounters (Sierra
185 Nevada, or Reno; Southern Nevada, or Las Vegas; and Northern California, or Sacramento).

186
187 Modality

188
189 714 of the 1,961 CRH encounters (36%) were conducted via video, with the remainder (1,247, or
190 64%) conducted via telephone. For non-CRH encounters, 4% were conducted via video
191 (N=3,830), 42% via telephone (N=34,757), and just over half, or 54%, occurred in person
192 (N=44,902).

193
194 Ever using CRH was associated with much higher adjusted odds of ever using video care (AOR
195 29.73 [95% CI 11.38-77.66]) (Table 2). Age was associated with lower adjusted odds of video

196 care use according to a gradient, with an AOR of 0.44 (95% CI 0.37-0.53) for Veterans 75 years
197 or older. Living in a rural location was associated with higher adjusted odds of video care use
198 (AOR 1.27 [95% CI 1.06-1.52]), though this finding was not significant for those in highly rural
199 locations (AOR 1.30 [95% CI 0.82-2.05]).

200
201
202
203

204 Discussion

205

206

207 In just under two years of operation, this hub-and-spoke, primarily virtual cardiology clinic in

208 VHA's Sierra Pacific region served over 800 Veterans hailing from across the region in nearly

209 2,000 virtual encounters for evaluation and management of cardiovascular disease. The CRH

210 program served women and highly-rural-dwelling Veterans at higher rates and similar

211 proportions of highly-disabled and low-income Veterans compared to conventional cardiology

212 clinics in the same region; conversely, the CRH patient population skewed younger than the

213 conventional VHA clinic population. This suggests that such a predominately-virtual model of

214 specialty care may be an effective method for accessing care for many high-need groups,

215 although more targeted efforts may be required to reach older Veterans.

216

217 The reporting of these early results coincides with a shift in virtual care use from effectively a

218 requirement during the national emergency phase of the COVID-19 pandemic, to an option—for

219 patients and clinicians alike.¹³ This evolution brings both an opportunity and a mandate for

220 rigorous study of how, when, and for whom virtual care should be employed, and how telehealth

221 visits affect quality of care, resource use, and health outcomes.¹⁴ The current study is formative,

222 with a focus on examining patterns of use; this lays a foundation for follow-up studies delving

223 into the latter set of questions.

224

225 The concern of the digital divide¹⁵ is ever-present when considering use of virtual care: will a

226 primarily virtual model of care inadvertently exclude groups frequently falling on the wrong side

227 of the divide, such as those who are rural-dwelling or low-income? Based on these findings, this

228 particular program has reached historically marginalized groups in VHA, such as women,

229 racial/ethnic minority Veterans, or those who are highly disabled or low-income, at similar or
230 higher rates than the conventional model. A notable exception is among older individuals, who
231 used CRH at much lower rates than their younger counterparts. The majority of older individuals
232 in the United States are interested in conducting visits via telehealth,¹⁶ yet disparities in use by
233 age have been widely demonstrated in VHA both in general and in cardiology.^{6,7} Establishing the
234 source(s) of this discrepancy—whether due to true differences in interest in receiving care via a
235 primarily-virtual care model, lower rates of offering the CRH program to older individuals,
236 familiarity with navigating virtual technologies, or other factors—will be an important focus of
237 follow-up work.

238

239 We found that patients with diagnoses of atrial fibrillation/flutter or valvular heart disease had
240 higher adjusted odds of being CRH users, unlike patients with diagnoses of heart failure or
241 ischemic heart disease. This finding may reflect program-specific offerings (for example, clinics
242 or physicians in the hub site with particular expertise in managing these conditions, or
243 alternatively, a perceived lack of capacity to manage them at spoke sites), or a sense that these
244 conditions are more amenable to primarily virtual management. Planned qualitative work,
245 including interviews with program clinicians and administrators, will help to differentiate
246 between these possible drivers.

247

248 For virtual care models designed to improve patient access to a given service, it is essential to
249 establish whether that model offloads the conventional model, as intended, or simply induces
250 more demand (e.g., patients whose cardiovascular diseases would have otherwise been cared for
251 in a primary care setting are instead referred for cardiology care). While the current study does

252 not aim to definitively answer this question, the fact that total cardiology encounters remained
253 constant in the region over the study period suggests that there was not a strong demand-creation
254 effect of the CRH model. However, to date CRH patients comprise only a small fraction of total
255 regional patients using cardiology services, so continued attention to this question will be
256 important as the program grows.

257

258 *Limitations*

259

260 Within the current data and study design, we are limited in interpretation of various aspects of
261 our findings. For example, although we can capture which CRH users have also used
262 conventional care, our data lacks the granularity to understand how and when this is the case;
263 subsequent qualitative work will further elucidate these care patterns. At present our data is
264 limited to encounters within VHA and does not extend to VA-purchased care in the community,
265 meaning we cannot fully conclude whether CRH affects consumption of this costly form of care.
266 This question, and characterization of other important facets of care associated with the program,
267 such as patient, caregiver, and clinician satisfaction, clinical outcomes, and drivers of more and
268 less successful program implementation, are left for future work. Finally, this analysis focused on
269 a particular region and healthcare system, and therefore may not be fully generalizable to other
270 healthcare settings—although as Burnett et al (2023) note in their publication on the early CRH
271 implementation experience, “...some CRH design elements and experiences are unique to the
272 VHA system, [but] overall experience with telehealth hubs—including attempts to improve
273 capacity for service provision, increase access, and deployment of telehealth services—is likely
274 highly relevant to other health care systems.”⁸

275

276 *Conclusions*

277

278 The Cardiology CRH program represents a virtual-predominant model of care, implemented over

279 a relatively short period of time, that has served over 800 patients to date in the VHA region

280 serving Northern California, Nevada, and the Pacific Islands. These data from the first two years

281 of program implementation suggest that the program reached many of the most historically

282 marginalized sub-populations of Veterans, including women, rural-dwellers, and low-income

283 Veterans, at similar or higher rates compared to conventional cardiology care in the region. A

284 notable exception was older individuals, who used CRH care at much lower rates; further work

285 will examine the extent to which patient preference versus other factors drove this dynamic.

286

287 **Acknowledgments:** The authors thank the Virtual Access QUERI team for supporting this
288 evaluation, including Cindie Slightam, MPH and Camila Chaudhary, MPH, from VA Palo Alto
289 Health Care System, for providing project management support and Liberty Greene, MEd and
290 James Van Campen, MS for data consulting. Preliminary results of this work will be presented at
291 the American Heart Association Scientific Sessions, November 13, 2023.

292
293 **Funding:** This work was supported by the Veterans Administration (VA) Office of Academic
294 Affairs Advanced Fellowship in Health Services Research (RT) and by a pilot grant from the VA
295 Palo Alto Center for Innovation to Implementation (RT). Views expressed are those of the
296 authors and the contents do not represent the views of the US Department of Veterans Affairs or
297 the United States Government. The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study;
298 collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval
299 of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

300
301

302 **Disclosures:** All authors have no competing interests to disclose.

303

304 **References**

- 305 1. Gurewich D, Shwartz M, Erin B-W, Heather D, Rosen AK. Did Access to Care Improve
306 Since Passage of the Veterans Choice Act? *Med Care* 2021;59(6 Suppl 3):S270–8.
- 307 2. Mattocks KM, Kroll-Desrosiers A, Kinney R, Elwy AR, Cunningham KJ, Mengeling MA.
308 Understanding VA’s Use of and Relationships With Community Care Providers Under the
309 MISSION Act. *Med Care* 2021;59(6 Suppl 3):S252–8.
- 310 3. Ohl ME, Carrell M, Thurman A, et al. Availability of healthcare providers for rural veterans
311 eligible for purchased care under the Veterans Choice Act. *BMC Health Serv Res*
312 2018;18(1):315.
- 313 4. Hinojosa R. Veterans’ Likelihood of Reporting Cardiovascular Disease. *J Am Board Fam*
314 *Med* 2019;32(1):50–7.
- 315 5. Axon RN, Gebregziabher M, Everett CJ, Heidenreich P, Hunt KJ. Dual health care system
316 use is associated with higher rates of hospitalization and hospital readmission among
317 veterans with heart failure. *Am Heart J* 2016;174:157–63.
- 318 6. Tisdale RL, Ferguson J, Van Campen J, et al. Disparities in virtual cardiology visits among
319 Veterans Health Administration patients during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMIA Open*
320 2022;5(4):ooac103.
- 321 7. Ferguson JM, Jacobs J, Yefimova M, Greene L, Heyworth L, Zulman DM. Virtual care
322 expansion in the Veterans Health Administration during the COVID-19 pandemic: clinical
323 services and patient characteristics associated with utilization. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*
324 2020;ocaa284.
- 325 8. Burnett K, Stockdale SE, Yoon J, et al. The Clinical Resource Hub Initiative: First-Year
326 Implementation of the Veterans Health Administration Regional Telehealth Contingency
327 Staffing Program. *J Ambulatory Care Manage* 2023;46(3):228.
- 328 9. Kleinfeld S, Burgos-Chapman I, Filips J, Gould C. Utilizing Telehealth to Meet the Needs
329 of Rural Veterans: Introduction the VA’s Clinical Resource Hubs Geriatric Mental Health
330 Programs. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2023;31(3, Supplement):S3–4.
- 331 10. Serper M, Agha A, Garren PA, et al. Multidisciplinary teams, efficient communication,
332 procedure services, and telehealth improve cirrhosis care: A qualitative study. *Hepatol*
333 *Commun* 2023;7(6):e0157.
- 334 11. Chun VS, Whooley MA, Williams K, et al. Veterans Health Administration TeleSleep
335 Enterprise-Wide Initiative 2017–2020: bringing sleep care to our nation’s veterans. *J Clin*
336 *Sleep Med* [Internet] 2023 [cited 2023 Jul 6]; Available from:
337 <https://jcs.m.aasm.org/doi/10.5664/jcs.m.10488>
- 338 12. Wang ZJ, Dhanireddy P, Prince C, Larsen M, Schimpf M, Pearman G. 2019 Survey of
339 Veteran Enrollees’ Health and Use of Health Care. 2020;207.

- 340 13. Goettsche K, DellaCava E. Telehealth As an Option, Not a Requirement-Who May Benefit,
341 and How Do We Decide? *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2023;31(3, Supplement):S3.
- 342 14. Wray CM. Post–Emergency Department Virtual Care—More Questions Than Answers.
343 *JAMA Netw Open* 2022;5(10):e2237790.
- 344 15. Rogers EM. The Digital Divide. *Convergence* 2001;7(4):96–111.
- 345 16. Li KY, Marquis LB, Malani PN, et al. Perceptions of telehealth among older U.S. adults
346 during the COVID-19 pandemic: A national survey. *J Telemed Telecare*
347 2023;1357633X231166031.
- 348
349

350 **Tables**

351

352 Table 1. Characteristics of Cardiology Patients, CRH Users (N=804) and Non-Users (N=19,583)

	CRH Users	CRH Non-Users	Effect Size Estimate (Cramer's V or Cohen's d) ^a
	N=804	N=19,583	
Used VVC^b	438 (54.5)	1,633 (8.3)	-0.81
Age, years (mean [SD])	69.5 (12.8)	72.7 (11.1)	-0.05
Age, years, categorical			0.05
18-44	50 (6.2)	515 (2.6)	-
45-64	168 (20.9)	2,998 (15.3)	-
65-74	253 (31.5)	6,470 (33.0)	-
75+	333 (41.4)	9,600 (49.0)	-
Race			0.03
American Indian or Alaska Native	15 (1.9)	275 (2.6)	-
Asian	20 (2.5)	765 (3.9)	-
Black or African American	79 (9.8)	2,011 (10.3)	-
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	28 (3.5)	503 (2.6)	-
Unknown/Missing	87 (10.8)	1,979 (10.1)	-
White	574 (71.4)	14,036 (71.7)	-
Ethnicity			0.01
Hispanic or Latino	55 (6.8)	1,569 (8.0)	-
Not Hispanic or Latino	695 (86.4)	16,837 (86.0)	-
Unknown/Missing	54 (6.7)	1,177 (6.0)	-
Sex			
Female	67 (8.3)	840 (4.3)	-0.18
Male	737 (91.7)	18,743 (95.7)	0.01
Rurality			0.02
Urban	592 (73.6)	14,574 (74.4)	-
Rural	197 (24.5)	4,745 (24.2)	-
Highly Rural	8 (1.0)	191 (1.0)	-
Missing	7 (0.9)	74 (0.4)	-
Enrollment Priority			0.02
No special priority	113 (14.1)	2,650 (13.5)	-
Low/moderate disability	137 (17.0)	3,644 (18.6)	-
High disability	387 (48.1)	9,246 (47.2)	-
Low income	165 (20.5)	3,941 (20.1)	-
Missing	2 (0.2)	102 (0.5)	-
Diagnoses			
Atrial Fibrillation/Flutter	320 (39.8)	6,300 (32.2)	-0.02
Heart Failure	153 (19.0)	3,405 (17.4)	-0.10
Ischemic Heart Disease	261 (32.5)	8,137 (41.6)	-0.17
Valvular Heart Disease	161 (20.0)	2,530 (12.9)	0.12

353 ^a Standardized mean differences calculated via Cramer's V for categorical variables and via Cohen's d for
 354 continuous variables and binary categorical variables.

355 ^b Indicates use of VVC during study period.

356 Table 2. Adjusted Odds of Using Video Care During Study Period Among All Cohort Patients
 357 (N=20,387)


	Adjusted Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval
CRH User Status		
Never used CRH	(ref)	(ref)
Used CRH	29.73	(11.38, 77.66)
Age, years, categorical		
18-44	(ref)	(ref)
45-64	0.80	(0.72, 0.89)
65-74	0.57	(0.49, 0.66)
75+	0.44	(0.37, 0.53)
Race		
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.27	(0.96, 1.67)
Asian	0.68	(0.50, 0.92)
Black or African American	0.78	(0.48, 1.25)
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0.83	(0.64, 1.08)
Unknown	0.90	(0.79, 1.03)
White	(ref)	(ref)
Ethnicity		
Hispanic or Latino	0.91	(0.68, 1.22)
Not Hispanic or Latino	(ref)	(ref)
Unknown	1.12	(0.92, 1.37)
Gender		
Female	1.20	(1.01, 1.42)
Male	(ref)	(ref)
Rurality		
Urban	(ref)	(ref)
Rural	1.27	(1.06, 1.52)
Highly Rural	1.30	(0.82, 2.05)
Missing	1.81	(0.65, 5.04)
Enrollment Priority		
No special priority	(ref)	(ref)
Low/moderate disability	1.02	(0.87, 1.21)
High disability	1.13	(0.93, 1.36)
Low income	0.81	(0.70, 0.94)
Missing	0.54	(0.25, 1.13)
Diagnoses		
Atrial Fibrillation/Flutter	1.23	(1.09, 1.40)
Heart Failure	1.37	(0.92, 2.03)
Ischemic Heart Disease	1.25	(1.01, 1.54)
Valvular Heart Disease	1.70	(1.30, 2.21)

358
 359
 360

361 **Figures with Figure Legends**

362

363 **Figure 1: Adjusted Odds of Being a Clinical Resource Hub (CRH) Cardiology User**




364

365 Figure 1 represents the odds of using CRH adjusted for the sociodemographic and clinical
 366 characteristics shown and with clustering by the patient's assigned primary care site.

367

368

369 **Figure 2. Unique CRH Patients at Implementing Sites Over Time (Total N=804; N across sites
 370 depicted=688)**



371


372 Figure 2 shows patients seen in CRH clinics each quarter by site over the study period.

373

374


375

376 Figure 3. Cardiology Encounters Over Time by Encounter Modality, VHA Sierra Pacific Region^a



377
 378 Figure 3 depicts cardiology encounters in the VHA Sierra Pacific region (VISN 21) over the
 379 study period, including all CRH and non-CRH VA-based encounters.
 380

381 Figure 4. CRH Cardiology Encounters at Implementing Sites Over Time



382
 383 Figure 4 depicts CRH cardiology encounters in the VHA Sierra Pacific region (VISN 21) over
 384 the study period at implementing sites.
 385