1 2	Opportunities to Address Specialty Care Deserts and the Digital Divide: VA's Virtual Hub-and-Spoke Cardiology Clinic			
3 4	Rebecca Tisdale, MD, MPA <sup>1,2,3</sup> ; Colin Purmal, MD <sup>4,5,6</sup> ; Neil Kalwani, MD, MPP; <sup>1,2,3</sup> Alexander			
5	Sandhu, MD, MS; <sup>3</sup> Paul Heidenreich, MD, MS; <sup>1,2,3</sup> Donna Zulman, MD, MS; <sup>1,2,3</sup> Tanvir Hussain,			
6 7	MD, MBA, MSc, MHS <sup>4,3,0</sup>			
8				
9	<sup>1</sup> Medical Service, Veterans Affairs Palo Alto Healthcare System, Palo Alto, CA			
10	<sup>2</sup> Center for Innovation to Implementation (Ci2i), Veterans Health Administration, Menlo Park,			
11	CA			
12	<sup>3</sup> Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA			
13	<sup>4</sup> Veterans Affairs San Francisco Healthcare System, San Francisco, CA			
14	<sup>5</sup> Sierra Pacific Network, Veterans Health Administration, San Francisco, CA			
15	<sup>6</sup> Department of Medicine, UCSF School of Medicine, San Francisco, CA			
16				
17				
18				
19 20	Running title: VA's Virtual Hub-and-Spoke Cardiology Model			
21	Address Correspondence to:			
22	Rebecca Tisdale, MD, MPA			
23	VA Palo Alto Health Care System (152-MPD)			
24	Health Services Research and Development (HSR&D)			
25	Center for Innovation to Implementation (Ci2i)			
26	795 Willow Road			
27	Building 324			
28	Menlo Park, CA 94025			
29	Tel: +1 650 269-5193			
30	Email: rtisdale@stanford.edu			
31				
32	Abstract word count: 306			
33	Article word count including Title Page, Abstract, Text, References, Tables and Figures Legends:			
34	3,209			
35	Number of references: 16			
36	Number of tables: 2			
37	Number of figures: 4			
38	Key words: Cardiovascular disease, virtual care, telehealth			
39				

- 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 user.
- 53
- 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  $\geq$ 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

75	Access to specialty care, including cardiology, in the Veterans Health Administration (VHA)			
76	varies widely across geographic regions. <sup>1–3</sup> Given the high prevalence of cardiovascular disease			
77	and associated morbidity and mortality among Veterans, <sup>4</sup> 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, <sup>5</sup> 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 cardiology <sup>6</sup> as across the VHA <sup>7</sup> 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

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

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; <sup>12</sup> 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, <sup>6,7</sup> 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	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.

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 $\geq$ 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).

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).
175 176 177 178 179 180	<i>Encounters</i> 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]).

201

202

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. <sup>13</sup> 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. <sup>14</sup> 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.

The concern of the digital divide<sup>15</sup> is ever-present when considering use of virtual care: will a primarily virtual model of care inadvertently exclude groups frequently falling on the wrong side of the divide, such as those who are rural-dwelling or low-income? Based on these findings, this 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 in the United States are interested in conducting visits via telehealth,<sup>16</sup> yet disparities in use by 232 age have been widely demonstrated in VHA both in general and in cardiology.<sup>6,7</sup> Establishing the 233 234 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

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

not aim to definitively answer this question, the fact that total cardiology encounters remained constant in the region over the study period suggests that there was not a strong demand-creation effect of the CRH model. However, to date CRH patients comprise only a small fraction of total regional patients using cardiology services, so continued attention to this question will be 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, meaning we cannot fully conclude whether CRH affects consumption of this costly form of care. 265 266 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 implementation experience, "...some CRH design elements and experiences are unique to the 271 272 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 highly relevant to other health care systems."<sup>8</sup> 274

## *Conclusions*

The Cardiology CRH program represents a virtual-predominant model of care, implemented over a relatively short period of time, that has served over 800 patients to date in the VHA region serving Northern California, Nevada, and the Pacific Islands. These data from the first two years of program implementation suggest that the program reached many of the most historically marginalized sub-populations of Veterans, including women, rural-dwellers, and low-income Veterans, at similar or higher rates compared to conventional cardiology care in the region. A notable exception was older individuals, who used CRH care at much lower rates; further work will examine the extent to which patient preference versus other factors drove this dynamic. 

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.			

#### 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 Ohl ME, Carrell M, Thurman A, et al. Availability of healthcare providers for rural veterans 3. 311 eligible for purchased care under the Veterans Choice Act. BMC Health Serv Res 312 2018;18(1):315. 313 Hinojosa R. Veterans' Likelihood of Reporting Cardiovascular Disease. J Am Board Fam 4. 314 Med 2019;32(1):50-7. 315 Axon RN, Gebregziabher M, Everett CJ, Heidenreich P, Hunt KJ. Dual health care system 5. use is associated with higher rates of hospitalization and hospital readmission among 316 317 veterans with heart failure. Am Heart J 2016;174:157-63. Tisdale RL, Ferguson J, Van Campen J, et al. Disparities in virtual cardiology visits among 318 6. 319 Veterans Health Administration patients during the COVID-19 pandemic. JAMIA Open 320 2022;5(4):00ac103. 321 Ferguson JM, Jacobs J, Yefimova M, Greene L, Heyworth L, Zulman DM. Virtual care 7. 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 Kleinfeld S, Burgos-Chapman I, Filips J, Gould C. Utilizing Telehealth to Meet the Needs 9. 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: https://jcsm.aasm.org/doi/10.5664/jcsm.10488 337

Wang ZJ, Dhanireddy P, Prince C, Larsen M, Schimpf M, Pearman G. 2019 Survey of
 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.
- Wray CM. Post-Emergency Department Virtual Care—More Questions Than Answers.
   JAMA Netw Open 2022;5(10):e2237790.
- 15. Rogers EM. The Digital Divide. Convergence 2001;7(4):96–111.
- Li KY, Marquis LB, Malani PN, et al. Perceptions of telehealth among older U.S. adults
  during the COVID-19 pandemic: A national survey. J Telemed Telecare
  2023;1357633X231166031.

#### Tables

# 

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) <sup>a</sup>
	N=804	N=19,583	
Used VVC <sup>b</sup>	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

<sup>a</sup> Standardized mean differences calculated via Cramer's V for categorical variables and via Cohen's d for continuous variables and binary categorical variables. <sup>b</sup> Indicates use of VVC during study period.

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

	Adjusted Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval
CPH User Status		
Never used CRH	(ref)	(ref)
Used CRH	29.73	(1138, 77.66)
Ago voors optogorical	29.15	(11.58, 77.00)
Age, years, categoricar	(nof)	(maf)
15-44		
45-64	0.80	(0.12, 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	1.20	(130, 221)
, arvular meant Disease	1./0	(1.50, 2.21)

# 361 Figures with Figure Legends

### 

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



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

# 





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



376 Figure 3. Cardiology Encounters Over Time by Encounter Modality, VHA Sierra Pacific Region<sup>a</sup>