

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

1 Impact of patient engagement on the design of a mobile health technology for cardiac surgery
2

3 Anna M. Chudyk, MSc, PhD,¹ Sandra Ragheb, BN,² David E. Kent, BKin, MSc,^{3,4} Todd A.
4 Duhamel, PhD,^{3,5} Carole Hyra,⁶ Mudra G. Dave,^{3,4} Rakesh C. Arora, BA, MD, PhD, FRCSC,
5 FACS,^{4,7} Annette S.H. Schultz, RN, PhD.^{8,9}

6 ¹ Department of Family Medicine, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba,
7 Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

8 ² Max Rady College of Medicine, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba,
9 Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

10 ³ Faculty of Kinesiology and Recreation Management, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB

11 ⁴ Cardiac Sciences Program, St. Boniface Hospital, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

12 ⁵ Institute of Cardiovascular Sciences, St. Boniface General Hospital, Albrechtsen Research
13 Centre, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

14 ⁶ Healthy Heart Patient and Caregiver Researcher group, Institute of Cardiovascular Sciences, St.
15 Boniface General Hospital, Albrechtsen Research Centre, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

16 ⁷ Department of Surgery, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, Max Rady College of Medicine,
17 University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

18 ⁸ College of Nursing, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg,
19 Manitoba, Canada.

20 ⁹ St. Boniface Research Centre, Health Services & Structural Determinants of Health Research,
21 Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

22

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

23 **Corresponding author:** Dr. Anna Chudyk, Asper Clinical Research Institute: Room CR3023 -

24 369 Tache Avenue, Winnipeg MB, R2H 2A6, Phone: 204.235.3705, Email:

25 anna.chudyk@umanitoba.ca

26 **Word count:** 2974

27

28

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

29 **ABSTRACT**

30 **Objective**

31 The aims of this study were to describe the impact of patient engagement on the initial design
32 and content of a mobile health (mHealth) technology that supports enhanced recovery protocols
33 (ERPs) for cardiac surgery.

34 **Methods**

35 Engagement occurred at the level of consultation and took the form of an advisory panel.
36 Patients that underwent cardiac surgery (2017-2018) at St. Boniface Hospital (Winnipeg,
37 Manitoba) and consented to be contacted about future research, and their caregivers, were
38 approached for participation. A qualitative exploration was undertaken to determine advisory
39 panel members' key messages about, and the impact of, patient engagement on mHealth
40 technology design and content.

41 **Results**

42 Ten individuals participated in the advisory panel. Key design-specific messages centered around
43 access, tracking, synchronization, and reminders. Key content-specific messages centered around
44 roles of cardiac surgery team members and medical terms, educational videos, information
45 regarding cardiac surgery procedures, travel before/after surgery, nutrition (i.e., what to eat),
46 medications (i.e., drug interactions), resources (i.e., medical devices), and physical activity (i.e.,
47 addressing fears and providing information, recommendations, and instructions). These key
48 messages were a rich source of information for mHealth technology developers and were
49 incorporated as supported by the existing capabilities of the underlying technology platform.

50

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

51 **Conclusions**

52 Patient engagement facilitated the development of a mHealth technology whose design and
53 content were driven by the lived experiences of cardiac surgery patients and caregivers. The
54 result was a detail-oriented and patient-centered mHealth technology that helps to empower and
55 inform patients and their caregivers about the patient journey across the perioperative period of
56 cardiac surgery.

57

58 **Structured abstract word count:** 253

59

60 **KEY WORDS:** patient and public involvement, patient engagement, cardiac surgery, mobile
61 health, enhanced recovery protocols

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

62 **KEY QUESTIONS**

63 **What is already known about this subject?**

64 Enhanced recovery protocols (ERPs) have been proposed as a clinical strategy to effectively
65 address complex and multi-system vulnerabilities, like those commonly present in older adults
66 undergoing cardiac surgery. Mobile health (mHealth) technologies have the potential to improve
67 delivery and patient experience with ERPs, but their development in the academic research
68 setting is often limited by a lack of end-user (e.g., i.e., patient and caregiver) involvement.

69 **What does this study add?**

70 To our knowledge, this is one of the first studies to engage patients and caregivers in the
71 development of a mHealth technology that supports ERPs for cardiac surgery. This study
72 describes a process for engaging patients and caregivers as “co-producers” of a mHealth
73 technology to support delivery of ERPs during the perioperative period of cardiac surgery. It also
74 demonstrates that engaging patients and caregivers in research, through the formation of an
75 advisory panel, yields a rich source of information to guide the design and content of mHealth
76 technologies in cardiac research.

77 **How might this impact on clinical practice?**

78 In an era in which mHealth technologies are being increasingly looked to for the optimization of
79 healthcare delivery, this study underscores the utility of using patient and caregiver voices to
80 drive the development of patient-centered mHealth technologies to support clinical practice.

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

81 INTRODUCTION

82 Enhanced recovery protocols (ERPs) are evidence-based care pathways aimed at standardizing
83 perioperative care. In offering a multimodal and interdisciplinary approach to perioperative care,
84 they have been proposed as a clinical strategy to effectively address complex and multi-system
85 vulnerabilities,[1, 2] like those commonly present in older adults undergoing cardiac surgery.[3,
86 4] Mobile health (mHealth) refers to medical and public health practice supported by mobile
87 devices (e.g., smart phones, tablets, patient monitoring devices, etc.).[5] Mobile health
88 technologies, such as application-based platforms (a.k.a. “apps”), have the potential to enhance
89 the utility of ERPs through increasing the effectiveness of information delivery and patients’
90 (and caregivers’) retention of information regarding their health care plan.[6, 7] There is some
91 evidence to support the feasibility of using mHealth technology with cardiac surgery patients
92 during their inpatient recovery.[8] However, researchers’ efforts to design mHealth technologies
93 for the perioperative cardiac surgery setting (and in general) are commonly limited by their
94 failure to involve end-users (such as patients and caregivers) in research activities.[9]

95
96 Patients and caregivers may be involved in mHealth technology design studies as research
97 participants or collaborators. This latter approach, which involves the “co-production” of
98 research with patients and caregivers, is a form of participatory research commonly referred to as
99 patient engagement, patient and public involvement, patient involvement, or stakeholder
100 engagement in research. In this study, we use the term patient engagement in research, and
101 define it as the formation of meaningful and active collaborations between researchers and
102 patients (and informal caregivers) in research governance, priority setting, conduct, and/or
103 knowledge translation.[10] The importance of co-producing research with patients and

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

104 caregivers can be viewed both from a moral perspective (e.g., those affected by an issue should
105 be actively involved in the generation of solutions to it),[11, 12] as well as in terms of its
106 potential to improve the methodological quality, relevance, and/or uptake of research.[13, 14, 15]
107 Moreover, lack of attention to users' perspectives during the design phase is one of the
108 competing explanations for the relatively low uptake of mHealth technologies by patients.[9] An
109 important step towards a more wide spread adoption of patients and caregivers as co-producers
110 of mHealth technology research is one that facilitates a better understanding of processes for
111 engaging patients and caregivers in mHealth technology design in the research setting.

112
113 This study was set within the context of a Canadian clinical research hospital where our research
114 group is involved in the development and implementation of ERPs for cardiac surgery. One
115 component of this larger project aims to adapt a mHealth technology and determine its
116 effectiveness in improving knowledge delivery and patient adherence with ERPs during the
117 perioperative period of cardiac surgery. In this manuscript, we focus on the patient engagement
118 process employed to adapt the mHealth technology, which was guided by the Canadian Institutes
119 of Health Research's (CIHR's) Patient Engagement Framework [10] and our scoping review of
120 models and frameworks of patient engagement in health services research.[16] Given the novelty
121 of engaging patients as co-producers of mHealth technology in the academic research setting and
122 among most of our team members, this manuscript's aims were to describe the process and
123 impact of patient engagement on the initial design and content of a mHealth technology that
124 supports ERPs for cardiac surgery.

125

126

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

127 **METHODS:**

128 This study was set in an academic, tertiary care centre that performs cardiac surgery (St.
129 Boniface Hospital, Winnipeg, Manitoba). Ethics approval for the study was obtained from the
130 University of Manitoba Research Ethics Board as well as the Research Review Committee at St.
131 Boniface Hospital. Patients and caregivers provided written consent and were compensated \$50
132 (for time and transportation) in addition to the cost of parking per meeting that they attended.
133 The Guidance for Reporting Involvement of Patients and the Public (GRIPP2) long-form
134 checklist guided the reporting of patient engagement in this article.[17]

135

136 **Overview of mHealth technology:**

137 The mHealth technology under development was an app-based platform hosted by BeeWell
138 Health ©.[18] For this study, the intention was to adapt and electronically format patient derived
139 content that addressed the cardiac surgery patient journey from initial surgery consent through to
140 the eight-week post-operative recovery period, for delivery via the mHealth technology. This
141 content sought to target three aspects of perioperative care (i.e., patient tailored education,
142 optimization of patient health, and patient engagement in care) and was focused on four domains
143 of information (i.e., nutrition, medications, resources and physical activity). A screenshot from
144 the mHealth technology is provided in Figure 1.

145

146 **Patient involvement**

147 The four domains of information targeted by our adaptation of the mHealth technology were
148 informed by our previous work (data unpublished) with cardiac surgery patients and caregivers.
149 Specifically, focus group sessions identified these areas as cardiac surgery patient and caregiver

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

150 priorities. Continued research (i.e., online and telephone surveys) validated these findings within
151 a larger patient and caregiver population. Patients and caregivers were involved as co-researchers
152 in the conduct of this study, as expanded upon below, and were all invited to co-author this
153 manuscript.

154 **Description of patient engagement process**

155 Patient engagement in research encompasses a wide range of activities and participation types, as
156 influenced by the characteristics of a given project (e.g., scope, time, and financial resources)
157 and the contributions patients are willing to offer (see Supplementary Material 1 for an overview
158 of patient engagement in research).[10, 13, 14, 19] In the present study, engagement took the
159 form of an advisory panel and occurred at the level of consultation.[19] The role of the advisory
160 panel was to inform the design and content of the mHealth technology. The advisory panel met
161 in-person three times, approximately two weeks apart. Each meeting was approximately three
162 hours in duration. Figure 2 displays an outline of activities that occurred at each meeting.

163
164 The activities that occurred within the meetings were not only developed to gather advisory
165 panel input on the design and content of the mHealth technology, but also to create/facilitate an
166 environment that supported the guiding principles that underlie patient engagement (i.e., mutual
167 respect, inclusiveness, co-building, support; see Supplementary Material 2 for information on the
168 employed approach to creating an environment that embodied these guiding principles).[10] The
169 primary method for obtaining panel members' input on the design and content of the mHealth
170 technology was group discussions. These discussions centered around two open-ended questions
171 -- "*what information stuck out as important during your patient journey*" and "*what information*
172 *do you wish you had known during your patient journey*". In addition, the scope of the

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

173 discussions was narrowed to the four domains of information (i.e., nutrition, medications,
174 resources and physical activity) identified through previous work, as well as to the content and
175 layout of information presented in a downloadable generic version of the mHealth technology. A
176 skilled facilitator (DEK) led the meetings based on a developed facilitation guide. A notetaker
177 (MD) and an audio recorder documented meeting proceedings.

178

179 **Recruitment**

180 Patients who underwent a cardiac surgery procedure within the previous two years (2017-2018)
181 at the study hospital and consented to be listed in a database of individuals interested in
182 participating in future research, and their caregivers, were approached for advisory panel
183 membership. Panel members were selectively chosen for diversity in sex and procedure type and
184 were excluded if they could not read and/or communicate in English. Recruitment was targeted
185 at 10-12 individuals based on ours and others' [20] experiences with group dynamics and group
186 size.

187

188 **Impact of patient engagement**

189 A qualitative exploration was undertaken to determine the impact of patient engagement on the
190 design and content of the mHealth technology. This included description of (a) the key messages
191 generated by the advisory panel, (b) how key messages were incorporated into the development
192 of the mHealth technology, and (c) feedback from the developers of the mHealth technology
193 about their experience with using the information generated by the advisory panel to guide
194 development of the mHealth technology.

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

195 **Data analysis**

196 Discussions that occur as part of patient engagement activities do not typically produce data that
197 are thematically analyzed,[21] as the purpose of patient engagement is to learn from patient
198 experiences, not interpret patient experiences through the researcher’s lens. Thus, “real-time
199 processing” of information takes place during discussions and the information that is gathered is
200 generally presented as a list of patient-made recommendations used to support project decision-
201 making.[21] Accordingly, the meeting facilitator (DEK) employed common techniques (e.g.,
202 summarization, reflection, asking clarifying questions) to identify advisory panel members’ key
203 messages during discussions. Two study team members (DEK and AMC) reviewed the research
204 assistant’s notes from all three meetings, along with transcripts from the second meeting, to
205 generate a list of key messages about design and content of the mHealth technology. These key
206 messages were presented by a study team member (DEK) to the developers of the mHealth
207 technology platform to guide the design and content of the mHealth technology.

208

209 **RESULTS:**

210 Ten individuals (six patients and four caregivers) participated in the advisory panel. Select
211 sociodemographic characteristics of advisory panel members are shown in Table 1. Each
212 caregiver (n=4) was a patient’s (n=4) spouse. Two of the patients did not have a caregiver attend
213 any of the advisory panel sessions. A summary of advisory panel members’ key messages about
214 the design and content of the mHealth technology follows.

215

216

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

217 **Table 1. Select sociodemographic characteristics of advisory panel members. All results are**
218 **presented as number (%) or median (25th percentile, 75th percentile).**

219

Variable	Patients (n=6)	Caregivers (n=4)
Age (years)	74 (72, 76)	N/A ^b
Female	3 (50%)	3 (75%)
Ethnicity		
White/Caucasian/European	5 (83%)	4 (100%)
First Nations/Inuit/Metis	1 (17%)	0 (0%)
Procedure type		
Aortic valve replacement	3 (50%)	N/A ^b
Aortic valve replacement/CABG ^a	1 (17%)	N/A ^b
Aortic valve replacement/ mitral valve replacement	1 (17%)	N/A ^b
mitral valve replacement	1 (17%)	N/A ^b

220 ^a Coronary artery bypass grafting

221 ^b Not applicable

222 **Key messages about mHealth technology design**

223 Key messages about the design features of the mHealth technology related to access, tracking,
224 synchronization, and reminders. Specific key messages about mHealth technology design are in
225 Table 2.

226

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

227 **Table 2. Key messages about mobile health (mHealth) technology design**

228

Key messages

- Ability to access information ahead of medical appointments
 - Ability to access information off-line
 - Ability to share access to the mHealth technology with caregivers and family
 - Ability to track prescribed medications and exercises that are assigned both in-hospital and during out-patient rehabilitation
 - Ability to schedule reminders to take medications
 - Ability to provide daily reminders about assigned exercises and general physical activity recommendations
 - Ability to synchronize information from medical devices
-

229

230 **Key messages about mHealth technology content**

231 During discussions of the study's two open-ended questions and of the generic version of the
232 mHealth technology, content-specific messages related to inclusion of key cardiac surgery team
233 members' contact information and descriptions of roles, key terms, educational videos,
234 information specific to cardiac surgery procedure, and about travel before/after surgery. When
235 discussing the study's pre-defined categories of information, key content-specific messages
236 about (a) nutrition related to what to eat, (b) medications included drug interactions, (c) resources
237 included medical devices, and (d) physical activity related to addressing fears, as well as
238 providing information, recommendations, and instructions, were generated by the advisory panel.
239 Specific key messages about mHealth technology content are in Table 3.

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

240 **Table 3. Key messages about mobile health technology content**

Key messages

- Definitions of key terms
 - Cardiac surgery team contact information
 - Information about the functions of the different operating room personnel
 - Information specific to the different cardiac surgery procedures
 - Information about driving/travelling after cardiac surgery
 - Information about post-operative recovery, including why you might have a chest tube
 - Videos that explain the different cardiac surgery procedures
 - Instructions on what to eat during the perioperative period
 - Recipes geared towards those who are looking to adopt a more heart-healthy lifestyle
 - Potential drug interactions
 - Use of medical devices
 - Information that helps address fears around engaging in physical activity before and after cardiac surgery
 - Information about and instructions on the types of physical activities patients can and cannot engage in (specific to procedure and perioperative period)
 - Instructions on the physical activity and specific exercises a patient should do if they miss a cardiac rehabilitation session
 - Instructions on how to complete exercises assigned both in-hospital and during out-patient rehabilitation
 - General physical activity recommendations
-

241

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

242 **Impacts on mHealth technology design and content**

243 Key messages about the design and content of the mHealth technology were compiled and sent
244 to the mHealth technology developers by the study co-ordinator (DEK). The mHealth technology
245 developers incorporated key messages into the design and content of the mHealth technology, as
246 long as they could be supported by the existing functionalities of the underlying platform. For
247 example, the platform did not support the scheduling of reminders by users, identifying drug
248 interactions, or synchronization with other devices. Verbal and written feedback from the
249 technology developers indicated that the key messages were a richer source of information and
250 provided more guidance than typically received from past clients. In particular, the technology
251 developers noted that key messages resulted in: the integration of a vast range and volume of
252 information and resources, instead of ones primarily focused on surgical information; content
253 geared towards expectations management; and an expanded focus of the mHealth technology to
254 include caregivers and other family, so that these stakeholders may be directly included in the
255 provision of information, allowing them to be better informed, prepare along with the patient,
256 and be involved in recovery planning.

257

258 **DISCUSSION:**

259 Our findings demonstrate that engaging patients and caregivers in research, through the
260 formation of an advisory panel, yields a rich source of information to guide the design and
261 content of a mHealth technology developed for cardiac surgery patients. These findings are novel
262 since, despite the increased recognition of the importance of involving patients in research,
263 patient engagement remains underutilized in many health research areas, including mHealth
264 technology design [9] and cardiac surgery. Further, while patient input is more regularly sought
265 in the commercial technology arena, it is often obtained through focus groups and/or pilot testing

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

266 aimed at gathering proprietary data; it is rare that patients and caregivers are engaged as partners
267 and co-creators of the technology.

268
269 Several characteristics of the patient engagement activities likely contributed to the gathering of
270 useful information. First, the deliberate intention to create an environment that supported the
271 integration of patients into research, through activities that targeted the guiding principles that
272 underlie patient engagement [10] and as led by a skilled facilitator. Second, a mixture of broad
273 and focused open-ended questions was used, in order to gather spontaneous feedback, as well as
274 feedback related to categories of information based on our previous work. Interestingly, during
275 discussions of the broad, open-ended questions, topics raised tended to concern the potential
276 benefits of the mHealth technology. For example, some of the topics raised by the panel included
277 the technology's potential to change how patients and caregivers interact with information to
278 better support patient engagement with their health care plan (e.g., through the ability to access
279 information ahead of an appointment to prepare questions or know what to expect, by allowing
280 them to fact-check what they thought they heard during appointments without having to rely on
281 outside sources like internet searches) and the potential for caregivers to become more involved
282 in the patient's journey. Discussions of the more focused questions produced key messages more
283 directly related to the design and content of the mHealth technology. Third, advisory panel
284 members were selected based on undergoing cardiac surgery within the past two years, ensuring
285 accurate recall of their experience and elaboration on the information that they did and did not
286 receive as part of their patient-provider interaction. This would have had a positive impact on
287 their abilities to contribute to conversations. Further, the advisory panel met on multiple
288 instances, which gave advisory panel members the opportunity to reflect on the study questions
289 and their experiences alone or with caregivers and other individuals that supported them during

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

290 their patient journeys, and then to bring these reflections back to enrich discussions in
291 subsequent meetings. Finally, the advisory panel included both patients and their caregivers,
292 which provided a breadth of experiences, and turned out to be timely given patients' statements
293 around the potential of the mHealth technology to allow caregivers to be more involved in the
294 patient's journey.

295
296 With the increase of older adults being offered cardiac surgery, there is an urgent need to provide
297 a high-level of patient-centered value and quality in our perioperative management. The use of
298 evidence-based ERPs has resulted in more rapid and optimal recovery than with traditional
299 perioperative methods (i.e. improved survivorship) in cardiac surgery patients.[22] While
300 published guidelines provide an important framework from which to develop clinical
301 pathways,[23] implementation remains challenging and therefore the protocols are underutilized.
302 It is anticipated that the approach of involving patients and caregivers in the development stage
303 will enable the healthcare team to focus on patient-caregiver value in the development and
304 subsequent implementation phase that will ideally translate to a sustainable process. To this end,
305 the findings from the current work have provided a deeper understanding of patient and caregiver
306 needs pertaining to information delivery about various aspects of peri-operative care and the
307 potential role of mHealth platforms in supporting these recommendations. The impact of this
308 mHealth technology on knowledge delivery and patient adherence with ERPs during the
309 perioperative period of cardiac surgery will be explored in future work.

310

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

311 **Limitations**

312 This study has some limitations to mention. Logistical constraints shaped our patient engagement
313 approach. For example, while we engaged patients and caregivers at specific time points within
314 the study, we did not continually involve them throughout the project as full research co-
315 investigators. Had there been continual engagement, there would have been other points of input
316 and the nature of advisory panel members' relations with the study would have been different
317 (see Supplementary Material 1). That said, it is important to note that advisory panel members
318 were invited to be co-authors on this manuscript, both to further support the establishment of
319 authentic research partnerships and to ensure that the manuscript accurately reflects their voices
320 and ideas. We also plan to engage advisory panel members further in the re-evaluation and
321 revision of the mHealth technology prior to its adoption as a standard of care tool to be used
322 within the Cardiac Sciences Program at St. Boniface Hospital.

323

324 **Conclusions**

325 Patient engagement facilitated the development of a mHealth technology whose design and
326 content were driven by the lived experiences of cardiac surgery patients and caregivers. The
327 result was a detail-oriented and patient-centered mHealth technology that helps to empower and
328 inform patients and their caregivers across the perioperative period of cardiac surgery.
329 Consequently, this mHealth technology has the potential to enhance the delivery and patient
330 experience with ERPs, and ultimately to support better health outcomes.

331

332

333

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

334 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

335 We acknowledge the contributions of Drs. Arora and Schultz as co-senior authors on this
336 manuscript, as well as of Drs. Chudyk and Schultz as bringing expertise in patient engagement
337 approaches to the larger research project and this manuscript. We would like to thank the
338 members of the Healthy Heart Patient Researchers group for their partnership in this research
339 endeavor, which include Carole Dobson, Carole Hyra, Wayne Dobson and seven other members.
340 Further information about this study, and our other work in the area of patient engagement in
341 research, can be found at www.patientengagementinresearch.ca.

342

343 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

344 Mses. Dave, Hyra and Ragheb; Mr. Kent; and Drs. Chudyk, Duhamel, and Schultz have no
345 competing interests to disclose. Dr. Arora reports grants from Pfizer Canada Inc., as well as other
346 (i.e., honoraria) from Mallinckrodt Pharmaceuticals, Abbott Nutrition, and Edwards
347 Lifesciences, outside the submitted work. None of the Authors have any formal relationship
348 (financial or non-financial) with the industry partner in this study.

349

350 **FUNDING**

351 This work was supported by a GFT research grant from the Department of Surgery (University
352 of Manitoba). Funding for the development of the study's mHealth technology included in-kind
353 contributions from BeeWell Health ©. The Authors had full control over the data and the company
354 has not seen a version of this publication prior to submission. Dr. Chudyk's postdoctoral
355 fellowship was supported by the Department of Family Medicine (University of Manitoba).

356

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

357

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

358 **CC BY**

359 No.

360

361 **PREPRINTS**

362 This manuscript was deposited as a preprint immediately prior to its submission to Heart.

363

364 **DATA AVAILABILITY**

365 No data available as advisory panel members were not made aware beforehand that recordings of
366 meeting proceedings would be publicly available.

367

368 **ABBREVIATIONS**

369 CABG: Coronary artery bypass grafting

370 CIHR: Canadian Institutes of Health Research

371 ERPs: Enhanced recovery protocols

372 GRIPP2: Guidance for Reporting Involvement of Patients and the Public

373 mHealth: Mobile health

374 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

375

376 Figure 1. Screenshot from the mobile health technology.

377 Figure 2. Outline of activities by meeting.

378

379

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

380 **REFERENCES**

- 381 1 Miller TE, Thacker JK, White WD, et al. Reduced length of hospital stay in colorectal
382 surgery after implementation of an enhanced recovery protocol. *Anesth Analg* 2014;**118**:1052-61.
- 383 2 Ljungqvist O, Scott M, Fearon KC. Enhanced Recovery After Surgery: A Review. *JAMA*
384 *Surg* 2017;**152**:292-8.
- 385 3 Bell SP, Saraf AA. Epidemiology of Multimorbidity in Older Adults with Cardiovascular
386 Disease. *Clin Geriatr Med* 2016;**32**:215-26.
- 387 4 Nicolini F, Agostinelli A, Vezzani A, et al. The evolution of cardiovascular surgery in
388 elderly patient: a review of current options and outcomes. *Biomed Res Int* 2014;**2014**:736298.
- 389 5 World Health Organization. mHealth: New horizons for health through mobile
390 technologies. *Global Observatory for eHealth series - Volume 3*. Geneva, Switzerland 2011.
- 391 6 Daniel M, Agewall S, Caidahl K, et al. Effect of Myocardial Infarction With
392 Nonobstructive Coronary Arteries on Physical Capacity and Quality-of-Life. *Am J Cardiol*
393 2017;**120**:341-6.
- 394 7 Gustafsson UO, Hausel J, Thorell A, et al. Adherence to the enhanced recovery after
395 surgery protocol and outcomes after colorectal cancer surgery. *Arch Surg* 2011;**146**:571-7.
- 396 8 Cook DJ, Manning DM, Holland DE, et al. Patient engagement and reported outcomes in
397 surgical recovery: effectiveness of an e-health platform. *Journal of the American College of*
398 *Surgeons* 2013;**217**:648-55.
- 399 9 Birnbaum F, Lewis D, Rosen RK, et al. Patient Engagement and the Design of Digital
400 Health. *Academic Emergency Medicine* 2015;**22**:754-6.

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

- 401 10 Canadian Institutes of Health Research. Strategy for Patient-Oriented Research - Patient
402 Engagement Framework. Available: <http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/48413.html>. [Accessed 5 Apr
403 2020].
- 404 11 Freire P. Pedagogy of the oppressed, New York (Herder & Herder) 1970. 1970.
- 405 12 Lewin K. Frontiers in group dynamics: II. Channels of group life; social planning and
406 action research. *Human relations* 1947;**1**:143-53.
- 407 13 Domecq JP, Prutsky G, Elraiyah T, et al. Patient engagement in research: a systematic
408 review. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2014;**14**:89.
- 409 14 Manafo E, Petermann L, Mason-Lai P, et al. Patient engagement in Canada: a scoping
410 review of the 'how' and 'what' of patient engagement in health research. *Health Res Policy Syst*
411 2018;**16**:5.
- 412 15 Boote J, Baird W, Beecroft C. Public involvement at the design stage of primary health
413 research: a narrative review of case examples. *Health Policy* 2010;**95**:10-23.
- 414 16 Chudyk AM, Waldman C, Horrill T, et al. Models and frameworks of patient engagement
415 in health services research: a scoping review protocol. *Res Involv Engagem* 2018;**4**:28.
- 416 17 Staniszewska S, Brett J, Simera I, et al. GRIPP2 reporting checklists: tools to improve
417 reporting of patient and public involvement in research. *BMJ* 2017;**358**:j3453.
- 418 18 Parsons A., Parsons S. Patient engagement simplified. Available: [Accessed September
419 20, 2018].
- 420 19 International Association for Public Participation. IAP2's Public Participation Spectrum.
421 Available: https://iap2.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/2018_IAP2_Spectrum.pdf. [Accessed
422 5 Apr 2020].

mHealth technology for cardiac surgery

- 423 20 Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute. Patient Advisory Panels FAQs. Available:
424 <https://www.pcori.org/engagement/engage-us/pcoris-advisory-panels/pcori-advisory-panels-faqs>.
425 [Accessed 5 Apr 2020].
- 426 21 Doria N, Condran B, Boulos L, et al. Sharpening the focus: differentiating between focus
427 groups for patient engagement vs. qualitative research. *Res Involv Engagem* 2018;**4**:19.
- 428 22 Williams JB, McConnell G, Allender JE, et al. One-year results from the first US-based
429 enhanced recovery after cardiac surgery (ERAS Cardiac) program. *The Journal of thoracic and*
430 *cardiovascular surgery* 2019;**157**:1881-8.
- 431 23 Engelman DT, Ben Ali W, Williams JB, et al. Guidelines for Perioperative Care in
432 Cardiac Surgery: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery Society Recommendations. *JAMA Surg*
433 2019.
434

The image displays three mobile application screens for the REACH and RECOVER Study. The first screen is an overview page featuring a user profile placeholder, the title 'REACH and RECOVER Study Care Plan', and an 'Overview' section. It includes a 'Today' section with 'No tasks due' and a 'Progress' section showing a 92% completion rate for the care plan. The second screen is a 'Milestones' page with a tabbed interface (Milestones, Resources, Contact) and a list of four milestones, each marked as '100% complete'. The third screen is a 'Resources' page with a similar tabbed interface, listing various educational materials such as 'Meet Our Staff', 'Important Phone Numbers', 'Hospital Location & Maps', 'Out of Town Travelers', 'Medications', 'Written Education Resources', and 'Educational Videos'. All screens feature a bottom navigation bar with 'Home', 'Care Plan', and 'More' options.

Screen 1: Overview

REACH and RECOVER Study Care Plan

Overview

Today

No tasks due

Progress

92% REACH and RECOVER Study
92% of Care Plan Complete

Screen 2: Milestones

REACH and RECOVER Study

Milestones Resources Contact

- 1 Introduction 100% complete
- 2 The Cardiac Surgery Journey 100% complete
- 3 Learn About Your Heart 100% complete
- 4 Types of Surgery 100% complete

Screen 3: Resources

REACH and RECOVER Study

Milestones Resources Contact

- Meet Our Staff
- Important Phone Numbers
- Hospital Location & Maps
- Out of Town Travelers
- Medications
- Written Education Resources
- Educational Videos

Meeting 1

- Housekeeping
- Participant introductions
- Presentation of background information and research
- Co-creation of ground rules to guide interpersonal interactions
- Creation of timeline of perioperative experiences with cardiac surgery (i.e., patient journey) – including supports received and information that was given/missing
- Homework: Reflect on study's 2 open-ended questions in the context of own patient journey

Meeting 2

- Housekeeping
- Discussion of Meeting 1's homework
- Discussion of information relevant to nutrition, medications, physical activity, resources
- Homework: Download and explore generic version of the mobile health technology

Meeting 3

- Housekeeping
- Discuss Meeting 2's homework
- Watch video and live demonstration of generic version of the mobile health technology
- Re-discuss generic version of the mobile health technology