

1 **Title:** Evaluation of a Rapid Implementation of Telemedicine for Delivery of Obstetric Care
2 During the COVID-19 Pandemic

3

4 **Running Title:** Evaluation of Telemedicine

5

6 **Authorship:**

7 Chinyere N. Reid, MBBS, MPH, CPH University of South Florida College of Public Health,

8 Chiles Center

9

10 Jennifer Marshall, PhD, CPH University of South Florida College of Public Health, Chiles

11 Center, Sunshine Education and Research Center

12

13 Kimberly Fryer, MD, MSCR Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of South

14 Florida, 2 Tampa General Circle, 6th Floor, Tampa, FL 33606, kfryer@usf.edu, 864-608-4099

15

16 **Keywords:** telemedicine, obstetric care, implementation, COVID-19

17 **Funding:** University of South Florida Internal Seed Grant

18 **Conflicts of Interest:** None of the authors have any conflicts of interest or competing financial
19 interests.

20

21 **Abstract**

22 **Objective:**

23 The aim of this evaluation was to assess the rapid implementation of obstetric
24 telemedicine during the COVID-19 pandemic using the Consolidated Framework in
25 Implementation Research (CFIR) evaluation framework.

26 **Study Design:**

27 Following one month of telemedicine implementation, obstetric providers at the
28 University of South Florida clinic completed qualitative surveys and in-depth interviews about
29 the implementation of obstetric telemedicine in the clinic guided by the CFIR evaluation
30 framework.

31 **Results:**

32 Overall, providers considered obstetric telemedicine comparable to traditional in-person
33 clinic visits and acknowledged that they were adequately prepared for the telemedicine
34 implementation. Advantages included the simplicity of implementation, reduced exposure to
35 COVID-19 infection, and convenience factors. Although obstetric telemedicine mostly met
36 patient needs, a lack of access to at-home monitoring devices, physical examinations, reliable
37 internet service, and privacy concerns posed as barriers.

38 **Conclusion:**

39 The implementation of the obstetric telemedicine care model was deemed a favorable,
40 safe alternative option for patients during the COVID-19 pandemic.

41

42

43

44 **Introduction**

45 The 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19), originating in Wuhan, China, subsequently
46 became a global pandemic infecting over 108 million people and resulting in over two million
47 deaths to date.¹ In the United States (US) more than 27 million people have tested positive for
48 COVID-19 and over 470,000 deaths have occurred.² In the initial stages of the COVID-19
49 pandemic, lockdowns, quarantines, and social distancing measures were implemented because of
50 the high transmissibility of the COVID-19 virus, shortage of personal protective equipment, and
51 the absence of curative treatments or a vaccine.

52 As a result, these measures impeded the provision and participation of traditional in-
53 person healthcare appointments. For obstetric patients, the need to limit infection exposure,
54 reduced access to childcare because of school closures, and restrictions to working from home
55 were barriers likely to prevent access to in-person obstetric care. Likewise, in response to the
56 COVID-19 pandemic, preventive social measures were likely to impact health-related policies
57 and practices thereby limiting the delivery of comprehensive obstetric care services.³ In order to
58 support the continuity of healthcare services during the COVID-19 pandemic while adhering to
59 pandemic restrictions, there was an increase in the adoption and utilization of telemedicine for
60 the delivery of healthcare services.

61 Telemedicine involves two-way audio and visual electronic communication between
62 patients and providers in real-time at different remote locations.⁴ The American Hospital
63 Association reported that in 2017, 76% of US hospitals connected patients remotely with
64 healthcare providers using video or other technology.⁵ Research has also shown that prior to the
65 COVID-19 pandemic, Radiology specialists had the highest utilization rates of telemedicine
66 (39.5%), while Obstetrician-Gynecologist specialists had among the lowest utilization rates of

67 telemedicine (9.3%) in their practices.⁶ Telemedicine has been shown to be advantageous for
68 both patients and healthcare providers, due to its ease of accessibility to attend office visits from
69 different geographical locations, reduced expenses related to travel costs and childcare costs,
70 increased time efficiency for consultations, and limited exposure to infectious diseases.⁷

71 Although most studies have assessed the implementation of telemedicine in various
72 clinical settings without the guidance of theory,⁸⁻¹⁴ we aimed to assess the rapid implementation,
73 feasibility, and satisfaction of obstetric telemedicine during the COVID-19 pandemic using the
74 Consolidated Framework in Implementation Research (CFIR) evaluation framework.¹⁵

75 **Subjects and Methods**

76 *Overview*

77 This qualitative evaluation was developed using CFIR, which provides constructs that
78 have been associated with effective implementation.¹⁶ Key CFIR constructs guiding this
79 evaluation included Intervention Characteristics (Evidence Strength and Quality, Relative
80 Advantage, Adaptability, Complexity), Outer Setting (Patient Needs & Resources), Inner Setting
81 (Implementation Climate, Readiness for Implementation), Characteristics of Individuals
82 (Knowledge & Beliefs about the Intervention), and Processes (Engaging Intervention
83 Participants) related to the implementation of obstetric telemedicine.

84 *Data Collection*

85 We recruited obstetric providers delivering obstetric care visits via telemedicine at the
86 University of South Florida clinic from May to November 2020. Purposive sampling was used to
87 recruit obstetric providers via email who were provided with a link to complete an anonymous
88 online survey. Eligibility criteria included healthcare providers that currently provided obstetric

89 care at University of South Florida clinic. Nineteen participants completed the online survey out
90 of 31 total prenatal care providers in the practice (Table 1).

91 The anonymous online Qualtrics survey included a demographic questionnaire on
92 providers' age, race, and years in practice post residency or fellowship training, and open-ended
93 questions guided by key CFIR constructs.¹⁷ We selected eight key CFIR constructs most relevant
94 to implementation of obstetric telemedicine. Some open-ended survey questions included: "*What*
95 *advantages do telemedicine visits have compared to existing programs/in-patient visits?*"
96 (Intervention Characteristics); "*What barriers do you believe obstetric patients face in*
97 *participating in telemedicine visits?*" (Outer Setting); "*What was the general level of receptivity*
98 *in your clinic to implementing telemedicine visits?*" (Inner Setting); "*What steps were taken to*
99 *encourage patients to commit to using telemedicine visits?*" (Process) (full survey available on
100 request).

101 Following the completion of surveys, we invited providers meeting the inclusion criteria
102 to participate in semi-structured interviews to ascertain more in-depth feedback regarding their
103 experience in implementation of obstetric telemedicine. A total of 13 providers, some of whom
104 previously completed the anonymous online survey, participated in the in-depth interviews.
105 These interviews consisted of questions identical to those in the online survey, with opportunity
106 to expand upon answers. Interviews lasted approximately 20 to 30 minutes and were audio-
107 recorded and transcribed for data analysis. To preserve confidentiality, each transcript was
108 assigned a pseudonym. This study was reviewed and determined to be exempt as program
109 evaluation by the University of South Florida Institutional Review Board.

110 ***Data Analysis***

111 We developed an initial codebook based on *a priori* structural codes guided by CFIR.
112 This codebook was revised for clarity and the relevance of codes and definitions. Two evaluation
113 team members independently coded four transcripts to consensus (C.R. and K.F.), and a kappa
114 statistic of 0.8 was calculated, indicating good agreement between coders.¹⁸ Any coding
115 discrepancies were identified and discussed to achieve agreement on the final codebook. One
116 coder (C.R.) coded the remaining surveys and transcripts. A thematic analysis approach was used
117 to analyze the data¹⁹ and all coding and data analysis was conducted using MAXQDA 2020
118 software.²⁰ Recruitment of providers was ended once it was determined that data saturation was
119 achieved; participant comments were repeated from previous surveys/interviews and no new
120 information was being added. Additionally, trustworthiness was enhanced by conducting peer
121 debriefing (credibility), having two evaluation team members independently code at least ten
122 percent of the interviews with a good kappa (reliability), using provider quotes to represent
123 themes (confirmability), and by having audit trails throughout the process.^{21,22}

124 **Results**

125 The evaluation results from survey and interview participants (Table 1) are summarized
126 below along with representative quotes found in Table 2 (quote ID noted in parentheses), These
127 findings are aligned with CFIR constructs that help to inform the pros and cons of obstetric
128 telemedicine implementation from the viewpoints of a diverse range of providers who are newly
129 conducting this practice.

130 ***Provider description***

131 The participants in this study were predominantly White (74%), with Black (11%),
132 Hispanic (11%) and Asian (5%) providers represented as well (Table 1). Over a third (37%) had
133 been in practice for up to 5 years, while over 58% had been in practice for more than 15 years.

134 ***Provider perceptions of implementation***

135 Prior to this implementation of obstetric telemedicine, almost all providers had never
136 used telemedicine in practice before. With the rapid implementation of obstetric telemedicine
137 early in the COVID-19 pandemic, obstetric providers shared their perceptions.

138 *Quality*

139 The quality of telemedicine visits referred to providers' perception of the safety (avoiding
140 risk or harm) and efficacy of telemedicine visits to have desired outcomes. Most providers did
141 not have any concerns about the safety and efficacy of telemedicine visits. However, a few
142 providers (11 years or more in practice) had concerns about solely using telemedicine for new
143 patients with unrecognized urgent conditions or for patients who required a physical examination
144 or ultrasound (IC1).

145 *Adaptability*

146 The adaptability of telemedicine visits entailed the degree to which changes could be
147 made to telemedicine visits for it to work effectively in a clinic. Such changes included the use of
148 multiple platforms (e.g. Microsoft Teams, Doximity dialer, etc.) to conduct telemedicine visits
149 efficiently, the flexibility of both scheduling patient appointments and allotting extra time to
150 transition between scheduled in-person and telemedicine appointments, or simply for
151 troubleshooting technical issues if necessary. Likewise, the ability to incorporate support staff
152 during telemedicine visits to improve workflow made telemedicine work effectively (IC2).

153 *Relative Advantage*

154 The relative advantage of telemedicine visits referred to providers' perception of the
155 advantages of implementing obstetric telemedicine compared to in-person obstetric visits.
156 Generally, providers regarded telemedicine as comparable to in-person obstetric visits.

157 Convenience, comfort, and decreased exposure to COVID-19 were the most common themes
158 associated with the relative advantage of obstetric telemedicine. Convenience was described by
159 providers as less travel commute and parking issues, less visit wait times, reduced need for
160 childcare, fewer missed or late appointments, more flexibility in scheduling appointments, and
161 longer visits for counseling. Additionally, providers expressed added benefits of telemedicine for
162 both patients and providers to include the convenience of less distractions and a decreased risk of
163 exposure to COVID-19 infection (IC3). Providers also discussed the personal connections they
164 were able to have with patients because of how comfortable patients were in their home
165 environment during telemedicine visits (IC4). Although providers described telemedicine as
166 having several advantages compared to traditional in-person visits, most providers agreed that
167 the limitations of not being able to perform physical exams, including assessing vital signs (e.g.
168 blood pressure (BP), fetal heart sounds, weight), patients' lack of access to labs and ultrasounds,
169 and technology-related issues, made telemedicine less advantageous to in-person visits.

170 *Complexity*

171 The complexity of telemedicine visits was defined as the perceived difficulty of its
172 implementation. Most providers described telemedicine visits as simple or not complicated to
173 implement. However, a few providers in practice for 16 years or longer, found telemedicine to be
174 slightly more complex in terms of the multiple steps involved in the process of conducting a
175 telemedicine visit (IC5).

176 *Patient Needs & Resources*

177 This construct encompassed the extent to which patient needs, and barriers and
178 facilitators to meet those needs were known and prioritized by the clinic. In the context of the
179 COVID-19 pandemic which restricted access to healthcare services, telemedicine offered an

180 alternative option to access obstetric care. Themes encompassing this construct – patients’ need
181 for convenience, comfort, decreased exposure to COVID-19 infection, and physical examination,
182 were similar to those under the relative advantage construct. For example, one provider
183 discussed how the convenience of obstetric telemedicine visits and the flexibility to include
184 family members for support at these visits was helpful to patients (OS1). Many providers
185 mentioned the need expressed by patients to hear the fetus’ heartbeat during visits. However, this
186 was only possible if the patient had an at-home fetal heart doppler machine.

187 Barriers to meeting these needs included a lack of patient access to at-home monitoring
188 devices such as BP machines, weight scales, and fetal heart doppler machines to measure vital
189 signs; health insurance policies not covering the purchase of these at-home monitoring devices;
190 the impracticality of having a physical examination, lab work or ultrasound done if required
191 (OS2); and access to technology such as reliable internet service which was required to
192 participate in telemedicine visits (OS3). Some providers mentioned patient privacy and
193 distractions as barriers to patient comfort and a more efficient telemedicine visit (OS4). Overall,
194 providers felt that telemedicine as an alternative option to in-person obstetric visits met most of
195 these patient needs. This was particularly for low-risk obstetric patients not requiring a physical
196 examination and for patients with certain hearing or mobility limitations (OS5).

197 *Implementation Climate*

198 Implementation climate referred to the shared receptivity of providers to telemedicine
199 visits within their clinics. Overall, providers were receptive to the implementation of
200 telemedicine visits. One provider reported that although some providers were initially nervous
201 about the implementation of telemedicine, it was however well received (IS1).

202 *Readiness for Implementation*

203 The tangible and immediate indicators of overall commitment to the decision to
204 implement telemedicine visits is described by the readiness for implementation construct.
205 Regarding the question “*Did you feel the training prepared you to carry out telemedicine*
206 *visits?*”, all providers acknowledged feeling prepared to implement telemedicine visits. We
207 further investigated two of the three sub-constructs under the main construct readiness for
208 implementation, that is, 1) available resources and 2) access to knowledge and information.

209 *Available Resources*

210 This sub-construct included resources devoted for the implementation and on-going
211 operation of telemedicine visits. Generally, themes associated with resources available for
212 implementation as reported by providers included technology access and support, staff support,
213 time availability, and access to at-home monitoring devices (e.g. BP machine, etc.). For some
214 providers, resources for telemedicine implementation was considered adequate, while for others
215 the opposite held true. For example, access to telemedicine platforms such as Microsoft Teams
216 and Doximity, and the availability of staff to troubleshoot both technical issues and assist with
217 the telemedicine visit process was considered ample (IS2). However, some providers did not
218 have adequate staff support (IS3). Likewise, provision of time allotted for telemedicine visits
219 was sufficient and appropriate for some, but not all providers (IS4). Finally, some patients had
220 access to BP machines, weight scales, and fetal heart dopplers provided to them by the clinic,
221 while other patients did not have access because they were not covered by insurance and were
222 too expensive (IS5). This created a barrier for patients’ desire to hear the baby’s heartbeat and
223 for providers to complete comprehensive telemedicine visits.

224 *Access to Knowledge and Information*

225 This construct included access to available information and knowledge associated with
226 OB telemedicine and its use. Providers reported generally gaining knowledge and access to
227 information about telemedicine visits through in-person and online trainings. In particular,
228 providers with fewer years in practice revealed that the process of familiarizing oneself with
229 telemedicine was easier for younger or more tech savvy colleagues (IS6). One provider sought
230 obstetric telemedicine information provided by their clinic and compared it to information
231 provided at other larger institutions (IS7). Although most providers gained knowledge and
232 information from trainings offered, some indicated there was no need for continued trainings,
233 while others indicated certain aspects they considered missing or needing additional trainings.
234 These included information and trainings related to telemedicine billing and reimbursements
235 (IS8), improvements in provider-patient interaction (IS9), and troubleshooting technological
236 issues (IS10).

237 *Knowledge & Beliefs about the Intervention*

238 The construct of knowledge and beliefs about obstetric telemedicine referred to
239 providers' attitudes and values placed towards telemedicine visits and its implementation in their
240 clinics. Overall, all providers had positive reactions to implementation as it related to their
241 knowledge and beliefs about telemedicine. Providers mostly considered telemedicine a
242 usefulness alternative to deliver obstetric care especially for low-risk obstetric patients (IN1).
243 Additionally, some providers believed the implementation of telemedicine enabled obstetric
244 providers to continue employment during the COVID-19 pandemic, and despite few providers
245 believing its implementation was rushed, some providers expressed the desire for telemedicine to
246 continue beyond the pandemic (IN2).

247 *Engaging*

248 The question “*What steps were taken to encourage patients to commit to using*
249 *telemedicine visits?*” referred to the construct of engaging. Mostly, providers reported that
250 patients were encouraged to commit to participating in telemedicine visits by educating them
251 about the simplicity and advantages of telemedicine (similar to those mentioned under the
252 relative advantage construct), explaining to them what the process of a typical telemedicine visit
253 entailed, as well as reassuring them of adequate patient care (Pr1). One provider reported that
254 because of the COVID-19 pandemic, patients were not given an option to opt-out of
255 telemedicine visits. Nevertheless, it has now become part of routine care in the clinic (Pr2).

256

257 **Discussion**

258 The implementation of the obstetric telemedicine care model was deemed favorable, safe
259 and an alternative option for patients during the COVID-19 pandemic. The majority of providers
260 found this model of care to be easy to use and implement even though they did not have past
261 exposure to telemedicine. Barriers to telemedicine noted included lack of home monitoring
262 devices for blood pressure and fetal heart tones, knowledge of billing, and concerns regarding
263 patient privacy. These advantages and barriers are similar to those reported in other studies
264 analyzing rapid telemedicine implementation in the post-COVID era.⁸⁻¹⁴

265 It is encouraging that most of the barriers identified by providers can be addressed.
266 Furthermore, the pros noted in this evaluation suggest that it may be advantageous to extend
267 telemedicine beyond the pandemic in order to improve the efficiency and access of healthcare
268 services provision in the future. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists has
269 provided guidance to providers in the form of a telemedicine implementation guide²³ and guide
270 for telemedicine implementation during the pandemic.²⁴

271 ***Strengths and Limitations***

272 One of the major strengths of this study was the ability to quickly evaluate a rapid
273 implementation of telemedicine during a pandemic. We were able to capture this feedback
274 during the rollout of a new model of care and in a prospective fashion. Our results compare
275 favorably with the current research which shows that telemedicine was well received during the
276 COVID pandemic.⁸⁻¹⁴ Additionally, we were able to perform this evaluation with a robust
277 theoretical framework. Weaknesses include that this study is single site within the context of a
278 unique situation (rapid implementation due to the COVID-19 pandemic); therefore, the results
279 may differ from future implementation of telemedicine where more advanced planning and
280 training would be possible prior to implementation.

281 ***Future research***

282 Future research is needed on how to integrate telemedicine into care for high-risk
283 pregnancies, patient privacy concerns and access to internet and at-home monitoring devices.
284 Additional funding is needed to provide patients with at home monitoring devices through
285 insurance reimbursement or other funding mechanisms, especially for low-income women who
286 cannot afford these devices due to high out-of-pocket costs. Additional guidance and
287 standardization of a telemedicine prenatal care model for low-risk women from national
288 professional organizations such as ACOG and the American College of Nurse-Midwives would
289 be advantageous for both providers and patients in implementation of this model across the
290 country. For high-risk women, more research is needed to determine the best protocols for
291 surveillance and number of visits needed during pregnancy. Further evaluation is also needed to
292 explore this care model from patient perspectives. It would be useful to learn of the strategies

293 used and challenges encountered from the perspectives of leadership/administration, and to
294 further explore the outer setting of the community context related to obstetric care access.

295 ***Conclusion***

296 The implementation of the obstetric telemedicine care model was deemed a favorable,
297 safe alternative option for patients during the COVID-19 pandemic in our program evaluation
298 and shows promise for continuation. Future research and evaluation should assess providers' and
299 patients' perspectives about a hybrid obstetric care model, patient privacy concerns and access to
300 internet and at-home monitoring devices.

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327 References

328

329 1. Johns Hopkins University & Medicine. Coronavirus Resource Center.

330 <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/>. Published 2021. Accessed February 12, 2021.

331 2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC COVID Data Tracker.

332 https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#cases_casesper100klast7days. Published 2021.

333 Accessed February 12, 2021.

334 3. Fryer K, Delgado A, Foti T, Reid CN, Marshall J. Implementation of Obstetric Telehealth
335 During COVID-19 and Beyond. *Matern Child Health J.* 2020;24(9):1104-1110.

336 doi:10.1007/s10995-020-02967-7

337 4. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Telemedicine.

338 <https://www.medicare.gov/medicaid/benefits/telemedicine/index.html>. Published 2021.

339 Accessed January 19, 2021.

340 5. American Hospital Association. Fact Sheet: Telehealth.

341 <https://www.aha.org/system/files/2019-02/fact-sheet-telehealth-2-4-19.pdf>. Published

342 February 2019. Accessed January 20, 2021.

343 6. Robeznieks A. Which medical specialties use telemedicine the most? [https://www.ama-](https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/digital/which-medical-specialties-use-telemedicine-most)
344 [assn.org/practice-management/digital/which-medical-specialties-use-telemedicine-most](https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/digital/which-medical-specialties-use-telemedicine-most).

345 Published January 11, 2019. Accessed January 20, 2021.

346 7. Colbert GB, Venegas-vera AV, Lerma E V. Utility of telemedicine in the COVID-19 era.

347 *Rev Cardiovasc Med.* 2020;21(4):583. doi:10.31083/j.rcm.2020.04.188

348 8. Barney A, Buckelew S, Mesheriakova V, Raymond-Flesch M, Barney A. The COVID-19

349 Pandemic and Rapid Implementation of Adolescent and Young Adult Telemedicine:

350 Challenges and Opportunities for Innovation. *J Adolesc Heal.* 2020;67:164-171.

- 351 doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.05.006
- 352 9. Loeb AE, Rao SS, Ficke JR, Morris CD, Riley LH, Levin AS. Departmental Experience
353 and Lessons Learned With Accelerated Introduction of Telemedicine During the COVID-
354 19 Crisis. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg.* 2020;28(11):e469-e476. doi:10.5435/JAAOS-D-20-
355 00380
- 356 10. Smith WR, Atala AJ, Terlecki RP, Kelly EE, Matthews CA. Implementation Guide for
357 Rapid Integration of an Outpatient Telemedicine Program During the COVID-19
358 Pandemic. *J Am Coll Surg.* 2020;231(2):216-222.e2.
359 doi:10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2020.04.030
- 360 11. Bishop CE, Jackson LE, Vats KR, Azzuqa AA. Prenatal neonatology telemedicine
361 consultation for patients with fetal anomalies during the COVID-19 pandemic era: rapid
362 implementation and lessons learned. *J Perinatol.* 2020;40(10):1451-1452.
363 doi:10.1038/s41372-020-00787-9
- 364 12. Yellowlees P, Nakagawa K, Pakyurek M, Hanson A, Elder J, Kales HC. Rapid conversion
365 of an outpatient psychiatric clinic to a 100% virtual telepsychiatry clinic in response to
366 COVID-19. *Psychiatr Serv.* 2020;71(7):749-752. doi:10.1176/appi.ps.202000230
- 367 13. Peahl AF, Smith RD, Moniz MH. Prenatal care redesign: creating flexible maternity care
368 models through virtual care. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2020;223(3):389.e1-389.e10.
369 doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2020.05.029
- 370 14. Aziz A, Zork N, Aubey JJ, et al. Telehealth for High-Risk Pregnancies in the Setting of
371 the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Am J Perinatol.* 2020;37(8):800-808. doi:10.1055/s-0040-
372 1712121
- 373 15. CFIR Research Team. The Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research .

- 374 <https://cfirguide.org/>. Published 2021. Accessed February 12, 2021.
- 375 16. CFIR Research Team. Constructs – The Consolidated Framework for Implementation
376 Research. <https://cfirguide.org/constructs/>. Published 2021. Accessed February 12, 2021.
- 377 17. CFIR Research Team. Welcome to the Interview Guide Tool.
378 <https://cfirguide.org/guide/app/#/>. Published 2021. Accessed February 12, 2021.
- 379 18. Bernard H, Ryan G. *Analyzing Qualitative Data: Systematic Approaches*. Thousand Oaks,
380 CA: SAGE; 2010.
- 381 19. Saldana J. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Third. SAGE Publications
382 Ltd; 2015.
- 383 20. VERBI Software. MAXQDA 2020 [computer software]. 2019. Available from
384 maxqda.com.
- 385 21. Creswell JW, Creswell JD. *Research Design : Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed*
386 *Methods Approaches*. Fifth. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE; 2018.
- 387 22. Lincoln YS, Guba EG. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications;
388 1985.
389 [https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=2oA9aWlNeooC&oi=fnd&pg=PA5&sig=GoKaBo0eIoPy4qeqRyuozZo1CqM&dq=naturalistic+inquiry&prev=http://scholar.google.com/scholar%3Fq%3Dnaturalistic%2Binquiry%26num%3D100%26hl%3Den%26lr%3D#v=onepage&q=naturalistic inq.](https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=2oA9aWlNeooC&oi=fnd&pg=PA5&sig=GoKaBo0eIoPy4qeqRyuozZo1CqM&dq=naturalistic+inquiry&prev=http://scholar.google.com/scholar%3Fq%3Dnaturalistic%2Binquiry%26num%3D100%26hl%3Den%26lr%3D#v=onepage&q=naturalistic%20inquiry)
- 393 23. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. COVID-19 FAQs for Obstetrician-
394 Gynecologists, Telehealth | ACOG. Washington, DC: ACOG.
395 [https://www.acog.org/clinical-information/physician-faqs/covid-19-faqs-for-ob-gyns-](https://www.acog.org/clinical-information/physician-faqs/covid-19-faqs-for-ob-gyns-telehealth)
396 [telehealth](https://www.acog.org/clinical-information/physician-faqs/covid-19-faqs-for-ob-gyns-telehealth). Published 2020. Accessed February 10, 2021.

397 24. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Implementing Telehealth in
398 Practice. Committee Opinion No. 798. *Obs Gynecol.* 2020;135:e73-9.
399 [https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/committee-](https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/committee-opinion/articles/2020/02/implementing-telehealth-in-practice)
400 [opinion/articles/2020/02/implementing-telehealth-in-practice](https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/committee-opinion/articles/2020/02/implementing-telehealth-in-practice). Accessed February 11,
401 2021.
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418

419 **Table 1.** Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) constructs used to assess
 420 implementation of obstetric telemedicine visits guided by CFIR*

Domain	Construct	Definition
Intervention Characteristics	Evidence Strength and Quality	Perception about the quality and validity of evidence supporting the belief the intervention will have desired outcomes
	Relative Advantage	Perception of the advantage of implementing the intervention compared to other programs
	Adaptability	Degree to which intervention can be changed to meet local needs
	Complexity	Perception about the difficulty of implementing the intervention
Outer Setting	Patient Needs and Resources	Extent to which the needs of patients are known and prioritized
Inner Setting	Implementation Climate	Shared receptivity of individuals to an intervention
	Readiness for implementation	Actual organizational commitment to implement the intervention
	Available Resources	Level of resources allocated for implementation and continued use of intervention

	Access to Knowledge and Information	Access and use of knowledge and information about the intervention
Characteristics of Individuals	Knowledge and Beliefs about the Intervention	Individual's attitudes and values towards the intervention
Process	Engaging	Encouragement of individuals in the implementation and use of the intervention

421 *These CFIR items¹⁶ were specifically intended for this study and constructs are listed in the order they appear in
422 the text.

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445 **Table 2.** Demographic characteristics of obstetric providers implementing telemedicine
446

	Survey Questionnaire (n = 19)	Interview (n = 13)
Years in Practice	n	n
0-5	7 (37%)	5 (38%)
6-10	0 (0%)	2 (15%)
11-15	1 (5%)	1 (8%)
16-20	3 (16%)	3 (23%)
21-25	3 (16%)	0 (0%)
26-30	3 (16%)	1 (8%)
30+	2 (11%)	0 (0%)
Age/years		
20-30	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
31-40	6 (32%)	6 (46%)
41-50	5 (26%)	5 (38%)
51-60	5 (26%)	1 (8%)
61-70	3 (16%)	1 (8%)
70+	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Race/Ethnicity		
White	14 (74%)	10 (77%)
Black or African American	2 (11%)	1 (8%)
Hispanic	2 (11%)	1 (8%)
Asian	1 (5%)	1 (8%)

American Indian or Alaskan Native

0 (0%)

0 (0%)

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470 **Table 3** Participant quotes

Construct	ID	Quotes
Intervention Characteristics (IC)		
Quality	IC1	<p><i>“On the safety perspective, the only thing I would say is that I think it’s really increasingly important on telemedicine that because we are not able to visualize the patient, that we give them precautions - so, for example, if someone’s coming in with abdominal pain and we’re not able to fully assess it, that we want to make sure we have close follow-up, so that these patients aren’t lost to follow up and two, that we give them precautions of this, “If your pain is not getting better or you experience X, Y, and Z, that you return for care,” ...I do get a little worried, especially if we’re prescribing other treatment or working up a problem that we haven’t fully assessed, that the patient may not make or be lost a follow up.” – T1 (0-5 years)</i></p>
Adaptability	IC2	<p><i>“Well, obviously the technology portion, getting all the technology arranged so that we could do that. Workflow in terms of having the staffing available to pre-triage with the patient and get them prepared for the telemedicine, and on the back-end our nursing staff being able to then help distribute whatever orders we have to give, so if lab needs to be done or prescriptions need to be mailed and that sort of thing, after the fact.” – T11 (16-20 years)</i></p>

Relative Advantage	IC3	<p><i>“So, decreased risk of COVID exposure for both the patient and the provider. Improved efficiency of time because the patient does not have to travel to the clinic so it’s faster. There’s less distraction to the provider. So, I’m not in my office, I’m not being pulled to answer a bunch of patient or questions about other patients. I can really just focus on the patient. Then I typically do telemedicine from home. So, I didn’t have to travel, so the decreased risk of exposure for me.” – T1 (0-5 years)</i></p>
	IC4	<p><i>“I guess just the fact that they’re in their home and they could even share – that’s an even more personal connection, like they can literally move their phone around and say, “Oh, this is the baby’s room,” and just kind of give you that even more personal connection, thinking about bringing the baby home to this space, and being able to connect in that way.” – T7 (16-20 years)</i></p> <p><i>I found some tremendous gains because the patient is comfortable in their own homes. Any of the anxieties that they might have coming to see a doctor was dramatically reduced. I felt a different sense of connection with a patient because of their comfort level, I think that they were able to speak more clearly or addressing things they have on their mind with more ease. What’s also is interesting is...you could see living conditions or maybe they could have safe living conditions or adequate food or these sorts of</i></p>

		<p><i>things, so you get a window into their life a little bit more to see how their living environment might be a little bit, you know? In some regard, that's helpful...I felt like they felt very comfortable in their ability to that type of conversation with the doctor, more so than they do in the office setting. It just felt more intimate...because it's just the patient and the doctor that there's not any other staff around or the noise from the hallway or coming from a waiting room setting or you don't have privacy. I feel like they felt a sense of intimacy and privacy.” – T11 (16-20 years)</i></p>
Complexity	IC5	<p><i>“It's maybe slightly more complicated than an in-person visit only in that you're doing all of the data entry in terms of vital signs, reviewing their medications, reviewing their history and a lot of times, that's done by a medical assistant or a nurse in the office. So, you're more responsible for the entirety of the visit and documenting more things than we would in-person. So I would say the complexity is just slightly more complex only in that there's more work involved.” – T13 (16-20 years)</i></p>
Outer Setting (OS)		
Patient Needs & Resources	OS1	<p><i>“Definitely travel time is a major expense, but I think that probably the moment that I felt like telemedicine was really the most useful was there were some postpartum patients that were depressed and they were really having a hard time, and I just don't know how they would have left the house. First of all, especially given the</i></p>

		<p><i>pandemic, they wouldn't have been able to bring their newborn in with them. So, they would have to leave their newborn at home to come and talk to us. So, telemedicine provided an avenue that they could talk to us and, also, we could get visitors like their spouses, their mothers and their parents to chime in and say, "I'm really worried about the person and I think they need help." That would not have been possible given our current model where we weren't allowing visitors, and people were having to drive in and park and all that. So, yes, reduced times, the ability to have spouses and loved ones be a part of the telemedicine experience than in the actual visits if the patient wanted that." – T2 (11-15 years)</i></p>
	OS2	<p><i>"Some of them, they thought their insurance would pay for it. Their insurance doesn't pay for it and they ended up saying, "Well, I'm not going to buy it myself." – T8 (31+ years)</i></p> <p><i>"Well, it is OB so more patients are still comfortable seeing the provider and being able to hear their baby's heartbeat, and that they can't do. Technically, if they want to, they would have to buy a monitor, a Doppler, to be able to listen to the baby, and we would be, on the other side, telling them, 'Yes. That's your baby.' Then the other thing is being prenatal and OB, we do a lot of in-patient where we need to draw labs, do ultrasound. There are limitations of when we can do with telemedicine." – T12 (6-10 years)</i></p>

	OS3	<p><i>“...we definitely have patients that have a lack of a solid internet connection...Reliable internet - that’s true, yes; which could make the visit hard.” – T5 (0-5 years)</i></p> <p><i>“Every once in a while, the connection will be a little difficult and that the screen will freeze or you can’t hear everything they say but...It depends on their Wi-Fi connection...Probably maybe like 10 to 20% of visits, there’s some like freezing of the screen or we have to repeat things, or you have to wait for it to catch up in real time or whatever.” – T13 (16-20 years)</i></p>
	OS4	<p><i>“If they need to talk about something very sensitive and they are in their homes and feel uncomfortable about that, that might be a barrier to it [telemedicine].” – T8 (31+ years)</i></p> <p><i>“Many times, it took longer for me because I don’t know, I think for patients there were like some extra distractions, or they just want to talk a lot more than they normally do. You know trying to work from home and having like a cat walk in across the computer and then my patients want to talk to my cat, or having my elementary school kids e-learning in the office next to me and they want to say hi to my patients and my patients going to say hi to them, that slows it down a bit. Like it’s cute the first time but the</i></p>

		<i>30th time, I'm just like 'No, keep going I have 10 more patients this morning.'” – T7 (16-20 years)</i>
	OS5	<i>“If you are someone that depends on public transportation and you missed the bus. For whatever reason, your Uber doesn't show or whatever you want. Here, there's no reason why you'll have missed your appointment if you're at your home, okay? So it provides that - it can eliminate the concern for transportation. It's also for patients who have mobility issues; wheelchairs, walkers, all that sort...I also think that it also allows for - I'll just say people who acted as an interpreter for us, they could just sit right alongside the patient and interpret off a phone if they know ahead of time. We've had patients who are deaf that we have their speech individuals and they're pairing people right there with the visit. So they don't have to take off work themselves. So, all that made it a great opportunity to make sure they got an appointment.” – T8 (31+ years)</i>
Inner Setting (IS)		
Implementation Climate	IS1	<i>“I think we probably had a handful of people who were nervous about it [telemedicine],but I think everybody else thought it was a great idea, and I think even the people that were nervous about it, once they started doing it, found that it was very doable and a very good option. So, I would say that the reception was overall very, very good or excellent.” – T5 (0-5 years)</i>

Available Resources	IS2	<p><i>“The ability to dial the patient’s phone number or not – I’m using through Doximity – I had not done that prior to this roll-out. That was really useful... Obviously, it’s Microsoft Teams scheduling that was really key because there are people that work for the telehealth clinic, they get on and they text me in the chat to say this person is ready or this person is not ready yet and they have a question about this with their support people that they have devoted to telehealth that make sure that it all runs smoothly and then all this billing stuff gets taken care of, so they wouldn’t be able to do telehealth without them and they actually connect the patient and collect their information and their payment and all that kind of stuff...and then there’s the charge nurses...also are people that I go to for support, like if I have a question about the appropriateness of whether this person should really be a telehealth patient. I go talk to them and they talk me down to the ledge and they say ‘Why don’t you find out what they need and we’ll try to get them in the office as quickly as possible?’ ...they’re kind of problem solvers and troubleshooters as well.” – T2 (11-15 years)</i></p>
	IS3	<p><i>“Also the other thing that’s missing with telemedicine is there’s no medical assistance, so I was doing all the things that I don’t necessarily normally do like documenting vital signs, updating</i></p>

		<p><i>their medical list or pharmacy when needed. So I was missing having a medical assistance do those things.” – T10 (6-10 years)</i></p>
	IS4	<p><i>“So, I think instead of having 15 or 20-minute patient encounters, like having the 30 minutes blocks really allowed for a little troubleshooting and not having patients delayed in their appointment time if there’s a problem came up, because there was a little bit extra time for that kind of trouble buffer.” – T5 (0-5 years)</i></p> <p><i>“I would say there would have to be specific schedules made for telehealth so the physician director has to set aside time where they specifically schedule providers for telehealth versus trying to filter in telehealth into our regular schedule...there would have to be a commitment on the part of the physician to prioritize telehealth.” – T2 (11-15 years)</i></p>
	IS5	<p><i>“I would say lacking certain resources, the availability of needing a quick lab or if fetal non-stress test is indicated, checking a blood pressure. I mean we encourage everybody to get blood pressure cuffs and we prescribed them for patients but not everybody got them...Some of them say it wasn’t covered by insurance and it was too expensive.” – T10 (6-10 years)</i></p>

<p>Access to Knowledge & Information</p>	<p>IS6</p>	<p><i>“We have a lot of more technologically savvy faculty, like we have a lot of young faculty who were trained with a lot of newer technology. So, I think it was a little bit easier for us...” – T5 (0-5 years)</i></p> <p><i>“We kind of just got thrown into it and say, ‘Hey, download this app and you’re going to be using it like this.’ We’ve got a short, kind of - like if you have questions, you can get into these sessions to be able to understand it more and how to use it...but I think the whole process is pretty easy if you are young and you’re used to using the internet, and the ability of the modern technology.” – T12 (6-10 years)</i></p>
	<p>IS7</p>	<p><i>“It was really helpful to kind of compare notes with other institutions across the country about what a pre-natal care schedule would look like - maybe look a little differently when they would come in person, when they would go telehealth. So, those resources comparing with other big institutions - that was helpful.” – T7 (16-20 years)</i></p>
	<p>IS8</p>	<p><i>“I think just more education on the financial part of telemedicine like the billing and how we can optimize billing...but also not have it become an increase financial burden on our patients, and kind of finding that sweet spot is I think somewhere we can improve.” – T1 (0-5 years)</i></p>

	IS9	<i>“I think that’s going be something long term that we would probably benefit from a discussion of how best to use audio/visual resources in healthcare. Things like eye contact and interpersonal interactions over a less natural medium would probably be helpful for most people so that we can optimize how patients see us…” – T6 (0-5 years)</i>
	IS10	<i>“If any, [needed] training would be to troubleshoot, you know, how come – I can’t hear the patient or the patient can’t hear me, those little glitches that could happen during a visit.” – T12 (16-20 years)</i>
Individual Characteristics (IN)		
Knowledge & Beliefs about the Intervention	IN1	<i>“I think it’s great. I think it’s a great alternative to let’s say patients who just can’t – let’s say they’re 30 minutes or 45 minutes away, and they have work, and they have a 30-minute break, but they can have a visit in. It allows more access to care. It’s a great addition. I don’t think we can take away in-person visits ever, but I definitely think it’s a great addition, great option to have, especially for low-risk patients.” – T4 (0-5 years)</i> <i>“I thought it was a good idea especially since we were pretty much mandated that we were only going to see the very necessary patients in the office and I was worried about our patients not having access to care. I saw it as a great alternative. So I was</i>

		<p><i>looking forward to learning it and adopting it for our care model.”</i></p> <p><i>– T13 (16-20 years)</i></p>
	IN2	<p><i>“As I said before, in the setting in the onset of the pandemic and the restrictions that were being applied, it was life-saving and it saved all of our jobs, and probably a lot of our lives because we were able to reduce visits...Moving forward, in a post-pandemic world, I do feel like it should</i></p> <p><i>play a role...I feel very positive about it. I don’t think it’s the answer to every problem, but I definitely want to work in a place where telemedicine is an option for patients that want that.” – T2</i></p> <p><i>(11-15 years)</i></p>
Process (Pr)		
Engaging	Pr1	<p><i>“Then, explaining what’s going to happen at each visit...giving them information about how to take a blood pressure at home, checking their weight at home...to replace what we do in the office at those visits. Educating the patient about how that is a reasonable option and it doesn’t compromise their care by doing it that way... we have this telemedicine option for you...We’re just trying to create a process that is safer for you and maybe advantageous to you in many ways like that. I didn’t want any patient to feel like we didn’t want to see them. I always constantly reassure them that if there’s an emergency or you have an issue, you need us to look at something or you’re not comfortable on the</i></p>

		<i>phone, you let us know and we're happy to adjust.” – T11 (16-20 years)</i>
	Pr2	<i>“That is because a lot of our offices closed. It was probably less encouragement...At one point they [patients] didn't have a choice and now it's being presented as a normal part of real care as opposed to an optional unique aspect of it.” – T6 (0-5 years)</i>

471

472