

1 Original manuscript

2 **Awareness, Attitude, and Perception of Telemedicine Among Trinidad and**
3 **Tobago Population**

4

5

6 Ngozika Esther Ezinne^{1†}, Dipesh Bhattarai^{2α}, Anayochukwu Edward Anyasodor^{3 α}, Ellen K.
7 Antwi-Adjei^{4,5β} Kingsley Kene Ekemiri^{1β}, James Andrew Armitage^{2β}, Uchechukwu Levi
8 Osuagwu^{6,7α*}

9

10

11 ¹Optometry Unit, Department of Clinical Surgical Sciences, University of the West Indies,
12 Trinidad and Tobago

13 ²School of Medicine (Optometry), Deakin University, Victoria, Australia

14 ³Rural Health Research Institute, Charles Sturt University, Orange, NSW Australia

15 ⁴School of Optometry, University of Alabama at Birmingham, AL, USA

16 ⁵Department of Optometry and Visual Science, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and
17 Technology, Ghana

18 ⁶School of Medicine, Bathurst Rural Clinical School, Western Sydney University, Bathurst
19 NSW, Australia.

20 ⁷African Vision Research Institute, Department of optometry, University of KwaZulu-Natal,

21 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**
Durban South Africa

22 *Corresponding author:

23 Email: l.osuagwu@Westernsydney.edu.au (ULO)

24

25

26 † These authors contributed equally to this work.

27 ^α These authors contributed equally to this work

28 ^β These authors contributed equally to this work

29

30 **Abstract**

31 **Aim**

32 To assess the awareness, attitude and perception of Trinidad and Tobago population towards
33 telemedicine

34 **Method**

35 A cross-sectional study was conducted using a structured questionnaire on patients that visited
36 health centres in the North Central region. A systematic random sampling method was used to
37 select participants. Descriptive statistics including mean and standard deviation were used to
38 calculate categorical and continuous variables. Comparison between the categorical groups of
39 the demographic variables for each of the three main outcome variables were analysed through
40 one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Statistical significance was defined as $P < 0.05$.

41 **Results**

42 A total of 528 participated in the study. Most (60%) of them were female, and aged 21 to 40
43 years (62.1%). Awareness of telemedicine was 34.4%, but the majority (82.5%) had never used
44 telemedicine before. About half (51.3%) acknowledged the necessity of telemedicine but few
45 (36.4%) were satisfied with the services. Most (64%) were willing to try mobile-based
46 healthcare apps. Concerns over lack of familiarity with telemedicine platforms (44.5%) and
47 result accuracy (15.5%) were the major barriers to using telemedicine. Awareness of
48 telemedicine was significantly associated with being female ($P < 0.001$), a medical profession
49 ($P = 0.004$), familiarity in use of computers ($P = 0.004$) and frequent interaction with doctors
50 online ($P < 0.001$). Positive attitude towards telemedicine was associated with having a
51 diploma, being a medical professional, being computer literate and frequent interaction with
52 doctor online. Positive perception towards telemedicine was associated with marital status

53 (Single or Previously Married) ($P = 0.011$), one's ability to use the computer ($P = 0.009$), their
54 level of competency in computer usage ($P = 0.002$), and frequency of interacting with doctors
55 online ($P < 0.002$).

56 **Conclusion**

57 The study revealed that although the level of telemedicine awareness is low, the majority of
58 respondents demonstrated positive attitude and perception towards telemedicine. The findings
59 suggest the need to educate the public on the benefits of telemedicine and create awareness of
60 its use in T&T.

61

62 Introduction

63 Telemedicine, a change in paradigm in healthcare, leverages technology including text
64 messages, emails, telephone or audio and video consultation to provide remote health care
65 services [1]. Telemedicine refers to the usage of technology such as internet, wireless
66 technology, satellite and telephone media to deliver health care remotely [2]. Depending on the
67 available telecommunication technology and the infrastructure, telemedicine occurs
68 synchronously in real-time between a patient and a provider or asynchronously where images,
69 test results and information are captured, stored and forwarded from one location to another
70 for later review by the provider [3,4].

71 Prior to shifts induced by the COVID-19 pandemic, telemedicine, although promising,
72 remained underutilized in many regions [5]. The primary role of telemedicine was mainly to
73 offer remote consultations, especially for underserved rural populations [6]. Across specialties
74 such as optometry, mental health, paediatrics, and more, telemedicine's offers a new era of
75 healthcare delivery [2,7–9]. Notably, the advantages of telemedicine go beyond convenience
76 to transformative solution for the healthcare sector that are potentially cost-effective and
77 accessible during an epidemic [8,10–13].

78 The emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic reshaped global healthcare landscapes and
79 accelerated the adoption of telemedicine as a necessity rather than a choice [14,15]. In the face
80 of global uncertainties, telemedicine became a crucial tool for continuity by providing a lifeline
81 to medical care while minimizing viral transmission risks [16]. In addition, telemedicine
82 offered a solution to the challenges posed by restrictions on physical consultations, limited
83 healthcare infrastructure, and a heightened need for minimizing human interactions [6]. While
84 telemedicine emerged as a valuable tool, it also brought several core challenges including
85 technological issues with data security and privacy [17].

86 Amidst these advancements, a distinct disparity emerged. While telemedicine found its
87 foothold across continents, the role of telemedicine in the Caribbean remains undocumented
88 [18]. Unveiling the potential drivers and barriers for its acceptance in specific regions, such as
89 Trinidad and Tobago (T&T), has now gained paramount importance in the post-COVID-19
90 era. T&T, with its unique sociocultural dynamics drawn from its multiracial population and
91 free health care system, makes the country an interesting place to explore the adoption,
92 awareness, and perception of telemedicine. Furthermore, the fact that its neighbouring
93 countries have made significant progress in telemedicine practices including formulation of
94 guidelines and policies [1], makes it important to study the situation in T & T. A study of the
95 utility of telemedicine among Jamaicans [19] showed that the majority preferred face-to-face
96 consultation to telemedicine which may be due to lack of awareness about the benefits of
97 telemedicine [1]. Evaluating telemedicine awareness and perception is key to ensuring that
98 current healthcare strategies align with evolving patient preferences and technological
99 advancements.

100 Telemedicine helps to navigate the challenges by providing alternatives for patients
101 who may not want an in-person consultation with a healthcare provider to receive care
102 [13,20,21]. Its use is essential at bridging the gap in health care delivery at times when face to
103 face consultation may not be possible such as during a disease outbreak, an epidemic, or a
104 pandemic. As the pandemic continues to impact healthcare delivery, the readiness of societies
105 to embrace telemedicine as a viable alternative to traditional healthcare becomes an imperative
106 question.

107 This study seeks to bridge the knowledge gap and provide insights into the awareness
108 and perception of telemedicine in T&T. By understanding the factors that shape the reception
109 of telemedicine among the public, this research aims to provide evidence for healthcare
110 policymakers, providers, and technologists to integrate telemedicine more seamlessly into the

111 evolving healthcare landscape. Past studies [9,18] awareness, knowledge, and perception of
112 telemedicine have focused on health care practitioners with little or no evidence of what the
113 public the telemedicine users thinks about it. Moreso, in T & T, there is a paucity of information
114 on telemedicine both from the practitioners' perspective and from the public. This study was
115 therefore designed to provide evidence from the public perspective about their level of
116 awareness, knowledge and how their perception of telemedicine practice in T&T. Findings
117 from this study will provide an understanding of what the public thinks about telemedicine
118 practice in T&T, provide evidence that can be used for comparison with other studies, and for
119 policy decision making by the relevant government agencies when designing programs around
120 telemedicine.

121

122 **Materials and methods**

123 **Study design and setting**

124 This cross-sectional study was conducted in Trinidad and Tobago, a twin island nation
125 in the Southeastern West Indies, with a population of 1,363,985. The country has 101 health
126 centres that offer free primary healthcare services, administered by five regional health
127 authorities. This study focused on the North Central Regional Health Authority (NCRHA),
128 which operates 15 health centres. The method of selection of this authority to ensure its
129 representativeness is described below.

130 **Study Population**

131 Participants included all individuals aged 18 years and above who sought healthcare
132 services at NCRHA health centres. Participants were recruited between 10th August 2021 and

133 30th December 2021. Inclusion criteria were adults aged 18 years and older, who visited
134 selected health centres and provided voluntary consent. Those who were critically ill during
135 data collection were excluded.

136 **Sample size**

137 The sample size was determined using a single-proportion population formula. With a
138 confidence level of 95% ($Z_{\alpha/2} = 1.96$), an estimated awareness and perception proportion of
139 50%, and a 5% margin of error, the sample size was calculated as 385. Considering non-
140 response rates, the final sample size was doubled to 770.

141 **Sampling technique**

142 Five health centres were randomly chosen from the 15 in NCRHA. The total sample
143 size was divided by 5 to allocate participants to each centre. Systematic random selection was
144 employed, choosing every third patient from the register. In case of unavailability or
145 unwillingness to participate in the study, the next patient on the list was selected.

146 **Data collection**

147 A validated questionnaire used in similar studies in India and the Philippines [22,23]
148 was adapted after modification to contextualise for the T&T population and face validity was
149 verified by pretesting on 20 persons not part of the study. The final questionnaire which is
150 presented as a supplementary file (S1 Appendix) covered items including: demography (age
151 groups, sex, marital status, religion, ethnicity, residence, educational status, occupation and
152 income which was grouped according to salary/pay scales in T & T, computer use variable
153 (ability to use computer, level of proficiency in use of computer; type of device used), presence

154 of chronic disease, and frequency of interaction with doctor. Two trained optometry students
155 acted as research assistants, collecting face-to-face data during clinic days and assisted the
156 participants to complete the questionnaire where necessary. Supervision and double data entry
157 were employed to ensure accuracy, and data cleaning was performed prior to analysis. The
158 number of completed questionnaires from each centre is shown in Supplementary file 2 (S2
159 Appendix).

160 **Ethical Considerations**

161 The study adhered to the Declaration of Helsinki. Approval was obtained from the
162 Research and Ethics Committee of the University of the West Indies, Saint Augustine campus
163 (CREC-SA/0633/11/2020). Permissions were also secured from health centre administrators.
164 Participants were provided with information and reasons to participate, and written informed
165 consent was obtained. Confidentiality was maintained, and COVID-19 protocols were
166 followed.

167 **Data analysis**

168 Descriptive statistics were employed, presenting proportions for categorical variables
169 and means (with standard deviations, SD) for continuous variables. In the questionnaire, 'Yes'
170 responses were scored as 1 and 'No' responses as 0. For perception items, scores ranged from
171 0 ('strongly disagree') to 4 ('strongly agree'). 'Neutral' responses were assigned a score of 2 for
172 perception items. Raw scores for each item were converted to percentages, checked for
173 normality, and correlated using the Pearson correlation coefficient. The calculated mean
174 percentage scores were compared using paired t-tests between the three domains. Comparison
175 between the categorical groups of the demographic variables for each of the three main
176 outcome variables (awareness, attitude, and perception) were analysed through one-way

177 analysis of variance (ANOVA). Statistical significance was set at $P < 0.05$. Further analysis was
178 conducted to explore this relationship between participants perceived satisfaction and
179 residence. All data collected were exported to Statistical Package for Social Sciences for
180 Windows, version 29 (IBM Corp., Armonk, N.Y., USA).

181

182 Results

183 A total of 528 participants successfully completed the survey, mostly females (60.0%)
184 and 62.1% were aged between 21 and 40 years. The majority (60.4%) were not married at the
185 time of this study. Among the participants, 77.4% identified as Christians, 54.5% were of Afro-
186 Trinidad ethnicity, and 51.5% resided in the peri-urban areas of Trinidad and Tobago.
187 Regarding educational attainment, 46.5% held a diploma as their highest qualification, and
188 92.7% were employed in non-medical services. Regarding self-reported health condition,
189 82.1% indicated the absence of chronic diseases, whereas 17.9% reported having chronic
190 conditions. Proficiency in computer usage was affirmed by 91.8% of participants, with 58.1%
191 self-rating their skills as intermediate. In terms of online medical interactions, only 10.1%
192 reported frequent engagement with doctors, while 46.4% reported never having interacted with
193 doctors online. Further details of the characteristics are shown in Table 2.

194 **Table 2:** Socio-demographic characteristics of the study participants (N=528).

| Variable | Subgroup | Frequency (%) |
|------------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| Gender | Female | 315 (59.7) |
| | Male | 210 (39.8) |
| Age group, years | Less than 20 | 18 (3.4) |
| | 21-40 | 328 (62.1) |
| | 41-60 | 128 (24.2) |
| | Above 61 | 54 (10.2) |
| Marital status | Single or Previously Married | 319 (60.4) |

| | | |
|--|--|------------|
| | Married | 209 (39.6) |
| Religion | Christian | 408 (77.4) |
| | Non-Christian | 119 (22.6) |
| Ethnicity | Afro-Trinidad | 287 (54.5) |
| | Indo-Trinidad | 68 (12.9) |
| | Mixed | 164 (31.1) |
| | Others | 8 (1.5) |
| Residence | Urban | 167 (32.0) |
| | Peri-urban | 269 (51.5) |
| | Rural | 86 (16.5) |
| Highest educational qualification | Diploma or below | 239 (46.5) |
| | Bachelors | 201 (39.1) |
| | Post-graduate | 74 (14.4) |
| Occupation | Non-medical | 420 (92.7) |
| | Medical | 33 (7.3) |
| Employment status | Public | 137 (26.6) |
| | Non-public | 277 (53.7) |
| | Unemployed | 102 (19.8) |
| Income status [†] | Poor <3000.00 TTD (Minimum wage) | 18 (3.4) |
| | Not so good (3000 to 5000 TTD) | 50 (9.5) |
| | Average/reasonable (6000 to 10, 000 TTD) | 319 (60.9) |
| | Good (11,000 to 29, 000 TTD) | 129 (24.6) |
| | Very good (30, 000 and above) | 8 (1.5) |
| Presence of chronic disease | Yes | 94 (17.9) |
| | No | 431 (82.1) |
| Ability to use computer effectively | Yes | 484 (91.8) |
| | No | 43 (8.2) |
| Level of use of computer | Beginner | 27 (5.1) |
| | Intermediate | 306 (58.1) |
| | Professional | 194 (36.8) |
| Smart device used. | Phones | 266 (54.2) |
| | Laptops/Tablets | 41 (8.4) |
| | Both | 184 (37.5) |
| Frequency of interacting with your doctor online | Frequent (At least once in a week) | 52 (10.1) |
| | Seldom (Less than once in a month) | 225 (43.5) |
| | Never | 240 (46.4) |

195 [†]= Grouped according to salary or pay scales in Trinidad and Tobago

196

197 Table 3 displays participants’ responses regarding telemedicine awareness, attitude and
 198 perception. Approximately two-thirds (65.6%) indicated being unaware of telemedicine, while
 199 82.5% reported that they never used it.

200

201 **Table 3:** Participant responses on awareness, attitude and perception towards telemedicine in
 202 Trinidad and Tobago (N=528).

| Variables | Frequency (%) |
|--|----------------------|
| Awareness of telemedicine | |
| Yes | 180 (34.3) |
| No | 343 (65.6) |
| Use of telemedicine | |
| Yes | 91 (17.5) |
| No | 430 (82.5) |
| Aware of any telemedicine platform | |
| Yes | 48 (9.2) |
| No | 472 (90.8) |
| Correctly named at least one telemedicine platform | |
| Yes | 45 (10.2) |
| No | 474 (89.8) |
| Attitude | |
| Are you concerned with privacy issues or confidentiality of your information if you interact with your doctor online? | |
| Yes | 174 (33.8) |
| No | 233 (45.2) |
| Maybe | 108 (21.0) |
| Would you be willing to try mobile based health care app? | |
| Yes | 335 (64.4) |
| No | 26 (5.0) |
| Maybe | 159 (30.6) |
| Please indicate mode of telemedicine you would prefer. | |
| Video consultation | 156 (30.5) |
| Audio consultation | 21 (4.1) |
| Text based consultation | 10 (2.0) |
| Combination of any of the two | 210 (41.0) |
| All the above | 115 (22.5) |
| Perception | |
| Do you agree on the necessity of telemedicine? | |
| Strongly disagree | 16 (3.1) |
| Disagree | 15 (3.0) |
| Neutral | 216 (42.5) |
| Agree | 148 (29.1) |
| Strongly agree | 113 (22.2) |
| Satisfied with telemedicine | |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Strongly disagree | 21 (11.2) |
| Disagree | 11 (5.9) |
| Neutral | 87 (46.5) |
| Agree | 40 (21.4) |
| Strongly agree | 28 (15.0) |
| Better preference to going to hospital during a pandemic | |
| Strongly disagree | 62 (12.8) |
| Disagree | 54 (11.1) |
| Neutral | 140 (28.8) |
| Agree | 129 (26.5) |
| Strongly agree | 101 (20.8) |
| Willing to use telemedicine in the future | |
| Strongly disagree | 11 (2.2) |
| Disagree | 15 (3.0) |
| Neutral | 149 (29.7) |
| Agree | 172 (34.3) |
| Strongly agree | 154 (30.7) |
| Telemedicine is a viable approach for providing medical care services to patients | |
| Strongly disagree | 19 (3.7) |
| Disagree | 11 (2.2) |
| Neutral | 170 (33.3) |
| Agree | 242 (47.5) |
| Strongly agree | 68 (13.3) |
| Use of telemedicine system can save time and money | |
| Strongly disagree | 20 (3.9) |
| Disagree | 11 (2.2) |
| Neutral | 123 (24.1) |
| Agree | 272 (53.2) |
| Strongly agree | 85 (16.6) |

203

204

205 The participants' perceptions of telemedicine are shown in table 3. Approximately half

206 (51.3%) acknowledged the necessity of telemedicine, while 42.5% were neutral. Only about

207 one-third (36.4%) expressed satisfaction with telemedicine services, and 47.3% preferred in-

208 person hospital visits during a pandemic. Notably, around two-thirds (64%) expressed

209 willingness to use telemedicine in the future. Moreover, 60.8% agreed that telemedicine is a

210 viable pathway for medical care, and 69.8% agreed that telemedicine can save time and money.

211 Responses of participants on whether they were satisfied with the use of telemedicine revealed

212 that 36.2% were satisfied, 17.3% dissatisfied and 46.5% remained neutral. Their responses

213 differed significantly with residence status such that significantly more people in the urban
214 (38.9%) and peri-urban regions (37.4%) expressed satisfaction with the use of telemedicine
215 compared to fewer people (28.2%; $P=0.013$) in the rural regions.

216

217 Table 3 also outlines participants' attitudes towards telemedicine and their preferred
218 mode of use. Table 4 illustrates the perceived barriers to using telemedicine. A reasonable
219 proportion (33.8%) expressed concerns regarding online privacy and confidentiality when
220 sharing personal information. Conversely, 45.2% were not concerned about this issue. The
221 majority (64.4%) indicated willingness to try mobile-based healthcare apps. Concerns over
222 lack of familiarity with the technique (44.5%) and result accuracy (15.5%) emerged as the
223 primary barriers to using telemedicine.

224 **Table 4:** Perceived barriers among participants in using telemedicine.

| Barriers to using telemedicine | Frequency (%) |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Unfamiliar with the technique | 230 (44.5) |
| Concern with accuracy of the result | 80 (15.5) |
| Privacy and security concern | 74 (14.3) |
| Not interested | 42 (8.1) |
| Cost | 28 (5.4) |
| Policy barrier | 22 (4.3) |
| Unavailability of trained staff | 12 (2.3) |
| No guideline for use | 8 (1.5) |
| Poor internet | 7 (1.4) |
| Others | 14 (2.7) |

225

226 Table 5 shows the results of one-way ANOVA comparing the mean attitude and
227 perception scores towards telemedicine for participants by their demographic variables.
228 Significant differences in mean awareness scores towards telemedicine were observed between
229 genders, with females having higher scores (1.60 [95%CI: 1.46, 1.73]) than males (1.25
230 [95%CI:1.13, 1.37], $P < 0.001$). Similarly, medical professionals showed greater attitude scores
231 towards telemedicine compared to non-medical professionals (2.03 [95%CI:1.55, 2.51] vs 1.45

232 [95%CI:1.35, 1.55], P=0.004). Those proficient in the use of computer (1.50 [95%CI:1.40,
233 1.60] vs 1.00 [95%CI:0.70, 1.30], P=0.004) and advanced computer users (1.65 [95%CI:1.50,
234 1.81] vs 1.07 [95%CI:0.66, 1.48], P=0.004) exhibited higher attitude scores. Participants
235 frequently interacting with doctors online (2.40 [95%CI:2.04, 2.76]) scored higher on attitude
236 compared to those interacting seldom (1.61 [95%CI:1.46, 1.76]) or never (1.16 [95%CI:1.05,
237 1.27], P<0.001).

238 **Table 5:** Mean scores [95% confidence intervals, CI] for awareness and perception of
239 telemedicine among Trinidad and Tobago population. (N=385).

| Subgroups | Awareness Mean [95% CI] | P-value | Perception Mean [95% CI] | P-value |
|--|----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Gender | | | | |
| Female | 1.60 [1.46, 1.73] | <0.001 | 3.52 [3.45, 3.59] | 0.608 |
| Male | 1.25 [1.13, 1.37] | | 3.49 [3.42, 3.57] | |
| Age group in years | | | | |
| Less than 20 | 1.28 [0.80, 1.75] | 0.691 | 3.65 [3.35, 3.96] | 0.075 |
| 21-40 | 1.47 [1.35, 1.60] | | 3.55 [3.49, 3.61] | |
| 41-60 | 1.51 [1.31, 1.70] | | 3.40 [3.28, 3.52] | |
| Above 61 | 1.33 [1.08, 1.59] | | 3.48 [3.33, 3.63] | |
| Marital status | | | | |
| Single or Previously Married | 1.48 [1.35, 1.60] | 0.678 | 3.56 [3.50, 3.63] | 0.011 |
| Married | 1.44 [1.29, 1.58] | | 3.42 [3.34, 3.51] | |
| Religion | | | | |
| Christian | 1.52 [1.41, 1.63] | 0.021 | 3.52 [3.45, 3.57] | 0.736 |
| Non-Christian | 1.25 [1.06, 1.44] | | 3.49 [3.38, 3.61] | |
| Ethnicity | | | | |
| Afro-Trinidad | 1.38 [1.26, 1.50] | 0.277 | 3.51 [3.44, 3.58] | 0.760 |
| Indo-Trinidad | 1.62 [1.31, 1.93] | | 3.58 [3.43, 3.72] | |
| Mixed | 1.52 [1.35, 1.69] | | 3.50 [3.40, 3.59] | |
| Others | 1.75 [0.59, 2.91] | | 3.40 [2.84, 3.97] | |
| Residence | | | | |
| Urban | 1.49 [1.31, 1.66] | 0.975 | 3.54 [3.45, 3.63] | 0.579 |
| Peri-urban | 1.46 [1.33, 1.59] | | 3.48 [3.41, 3.55] | |
| Rural | 1.48 [1.24, 1.71] | | 3.52 [3.38, 3.67] | |
| Highest educational qualification | | | | |
| Diploma or below | 1.35 [1.22, 1.48] | 0.001 | 3.46 [3.38, 3.54] | 0.062 |
| Bachelors | 1.47 [1.31, 1.63] | | 3.52 [3.45, 3.59] | |
| Post-graduate | 1.89 [1.62, 2.16] | | 3.65 [3.49, 3.80] | |
| Occupation | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Medical | 2.03 [1.55, 2.51] | 0.004 | 3.53 [3.47, 3.59] | 0.445 |
| Non-medical | 1.45 [1.35, 1.55] | | 3.61 [3.41, 3.82] | |
| Employment status | | | | |
| Public | 1.45 [1.25, 1.65] | 0.935 | 3.54 [3.43, 3.64] | 0.701 |
| Private | 1.48 [1.35, 1.61] | | 3.50 [3.43, 3.57] | |
| Unemployed | 1.43 [1.23, 1.63] | | 3.47 [3.36, 3.59] | |
| Income status | | | | |
| Poor <3000.00 TTD (Minimum wage) | 1.36 [0.90, 1.85] | 0.287 | 3.31 [2.81, 3.82] | 0.071 |
| Not so good (3000 to 5000 TTD) | 1.10 [0.87, 1.33] | | 3.43 [3.30, 3.55] | |
| Average/reasonable (6000 to 10, 000 TTD) | 1.29 [1.18, 1.39] | | 3.52 [3.45, 3.58] | |
| Good (11,000 to 29, 000 TTD) | 1.42 [1.27, 1.57] | | 3.51 [3.41, 3.62] | |
| Excellent (30, 000 and above) | 1.50 [0.93, 2.07] | | 4.02 [3.58, 4.46] | |
| Presence of chronic disease | | | | |
| Yes | 1.66 [1.39, 1.93] | 0.053 | 3.49 [3.35, 3.63] | 0.700 |
| No | 1.42 [1.32, 1.52] | | 3.51 [3.46, 3.57] | |
| Ability to use computer effectively | | | | |
| Yes | 1.50 [1.40, 1.60] | 0.004 | 3.53 [3.48, 3.58] | 0.009 |
| No | 1.00 [0.70, 1.30] | | 3.28 [3.04, 3.51] | |
| Level of use of computer | | | | |
| Beginner | 1.07 [0.66, 1.48] | 0.003 | 3.17 [2.90, 3.44] | 0.002 |
| Intermediate | 1.37 [1.24, 1.50] | | 3.49 [3.42, 3.55] | |
| Professional | 1.65 [1.50, 1.81] | | 3.59 [3.50, 3.67] | |
| Smart device used | | | | |
| Phones | 1.37 [1.24, 1.49] | 0.013 | 3.54 [3.47, 3.61] | 0.788 |
| Laptops/Tablets | 1.44 [1.10, 1.78] | | 3.47 [3.27, 3.67] | |
| Both | 1.68 [1.51, 1.85] | | 3.53 [3.44, 3.62] | |
| Frequency of interacting with your doctor online | | | | |
| Frequent | 2.40 [2.04, 2.76] | <0.001 | 3.76 [3.62, 3.91] | <0.001 |
| Seldom | 1.61 [1.46, 1.76] | | 3.54 [3.46, 3.61] | |
| Never | 1.16 [1.05, 1.27] | | 3.43 [3.35, 3.50] | |

240 Bolded *P* values represent statistically significant subgroups using one-way analysis of variance.

241

242 Perception scores towards telemedicine also exhibited significant variation based on
 243 marital status (Single or Previously Married 3.56 [95%CI: 3.50, 3.63] vs Married: 3.42
 244 [95%CI: 3.34, 3.51]; *P* = 0.011), computer usage proficiency (Yes 3.53 [95%CI: 3.48, 3.58] vs
 245 No 3.28 [95%CI: 3.04, 3.51]; *P* = 0.009), computer usage level (Professional 3.59 [95%CI:
 246 3.50, 3.67] vs Intermediate 3.49 [95%CI: 3.42, 3.55] vs Beginner 3.17 [95%CI: 2.90, 3.44] *P*

247 = 0.002), and frequency of interacting with doctors online (Frequent 3.76 [95%CI: 3.62, 3.91]
248 vs Intermediate 3.54 [95%CI: 3.46, 3.61] vs Beginner 3.43 [95%CI: 3.35, 3.50] P < 0.002).

249

250 **Discussion**

251 Telemedicine has been in existence for over a decade, but the awareness and utilization
252 of telemedicine has not been well covered especially in developing countries including
253 Trinidad and Tobago. COVID-19 pandemic led to a surge in the use of telemedicine in
254 developed countries as an alternative for individuals seeking health care services. Awareness,
255 attitude, and perception of telemedicine have not been previously assessed in a Caribbean
256 population. To the best of our knowledge, our study was the first to assess the awareness and
257 perception of telemedicine among Trinidad and Tobago population. There was an overall poor
258 awareness of telemedicine, its platforms and its utilization. Most of the participants showed a
259 positive attitude, were willing to try a mobile based app or other forms of telemedicine and
260 were not so concerned about the confidentiality of the information obtained. On the other hand,
261 many see it as a necessity, and a viable approach to medical services and are willing to try it in
262 the future. However, a good proportion are not satisfied with it and do not see it as a better
263 choice than going to a hospital. Awareness of telemedicine was significantly associated with
264 being female, a medical professional, and being a user of smartphones. Also, awareness,
265 positive attitude and perception towards telemedicine were significantly associated with the
266 ability to use computer, level of computer skill and frequency of online interaction.
267 Unfamiliarity with the telemedicine techniques and concern with accuracy of results obtained
268 were the major barriers to adoption of the telemedicine by the public. Other findings from the
269 study are discussed below.

270 **Awareness of telemedicine**

271 The level of awareness of telemedicine recorded in our study is lower than findings
272 from a previous study [9] among optometrists in T&T. It is also lower than 57.4%, 58.7% and
273 70.1% recorded in Ethiopia [24], Nigeria [25] and Pakistan [8] respectively. The poor
274 awareness of telemedicine recorded in our study could be because telemedicine is still at its
275 early stage in T&T, hence not popular among health care service providers. This is a cause for
276 concern, especially given the substantial surge in new technologies during the recent COVID-
277 19 pandemic [26,27]. This underscores the imperative for government agencies to raise
278 awareness concerning the significance of telemedicine in disease management for a successful
279 adoption and utilization by the population [28]. Other factors are absence of regulatory
280 frameworks governing telemedicine, compounded by limited integration of telemedicine into
281 the healthcare system, and lack of policies addressing the digital gap.

282 Another notable finding is the infrequent use of telemedicine recorded in the present
283 study which is consistent with findings from other developing countries [9,29,30], despite
284 reports of surge in the use of telemedicine recorded in some developed countries [31,32]. This
285 trend aligns with the poor awareness observed in our study and could be linked to ineffective
286 adoption strategies. It is not surprising that awareness of telemedicine was significantly
287 associated with females in the present study as studies [33,34] revealed that females are more
288 digitally literate because they use phones more than males. On the other hand, those in medical
289 profession are expected to be more aware of telemedicine as they are involved with different
290 forms of medical care, hence will tend to get more information or alternatives to getting best
291 care for their patients thereby exposing them to telemedicine than others.

292 **Attitude**

293 Our findings showed that T&T population have a favourable attitude towards
294 telemedicine as the majority are willing to try mobile based health app and are not concerned
295 about confidentiality issues raised as a major barrier in the utilization in previous studies
296 [35,36]. Similar findings were recorded in studies on Jordanian [30] and Chinese populations
297 [32]. A positive attitude is essential for a new technology to be adopted and used by the
298 population, therefore there is a need to address this barrier.

299 **Perception**

300 Although, majority of our study participants agreed that telemedicine is a necessity and
301 a viable health care service that can save time, they are not satisfied with the service and do not
302 perceive it to be a better option than going to a hospital contrary to other study findings [37–
303 40]. This could be because majority of the respondents (51.5%) were residence in peri-urban
304 areas, where there is transportation and easy access to a hospital. Similarly a study had reported
305 that telemedicine is not convenient for patients with better access to care [4]. A study in rural
306 Alabama where there is lack of transportation and specialist care reported higher satisfaction
307 among the participants after telemedicine encounter [3,4], probably because healthcare in the
308 US is not necessarily free compared with T&T.

309 Negative attitudes towards telemedicine could impede telemedicine adoption,
310 diminishing its potential to enhance healthcare accessibility and efficiency. Furthermore,
311 training on various telemedicine modes and techniques are highly recommended to enhance
312 understanding of telemedicine and its associated health benefits [37,41–43] which will
313 necessitate the development of strategies and investment in continuous professional
314 development for healthcare providers in virtual care [44]. In addition, the fact that positive
315 perception of telemedicine is associated with the use of computer and level of computer skill
316 is expected as those are the basic things essential for an adoption or utilization of telemedicine

317 and are recorded in previous studies [30,35] as reasons for poor awareness and reception of
318 telemedicine. Consequently, policies should prioritize increasing telemedicine perception to
319 encourage the public to maximize its benefits especially in natural disasters or emergencies.

320 People were generally satisfied (albeit many were neutral) with the use of telemedicine
321 which was consistent with previous studies [45–47] . However, significantly more people in
322 the urban and peri urban regions expressed satisfaction with the use of telemedicine compared
323 with rural residents. This finding was consistent with previous study [47] which reported that
324 rural residence in addition to factors such as educational attainment, prior Internet use were the
325 main predictors that increase the likelihood of being amenable to telemedicine. This higher
326 satisfaction with telemedicine use among urban residents may be related to factors such as
327 better accessibility to technology and infrastructure, where Urban regions typically have better
328 access to high-speed internet, reliable telecommunications networks, and advanced technology
329 infrastructure, which are crucial for the smooth functioning of telemedicine services. On the
330 other hand, rural areas often face challenges related to poor internet connectivity and
331 technological resources, making it difficult for them to fully utilize telemedicine services.

332 **Barriers**

333 Despite the global proliferation of telemedicine, numerous challenges persist [2]. These
334 highlighted barriers such as technological unfamiliarity, concern for privacy and accuracy of
335 results recorded in the current study. It is evident that performance, encompassing result
336 accuracy hinders telemedicine adoption [48]. However, it should be noted that privacy risks
337 do not consistently deter the adoption of technology-driven healthcare [22]. Other recorded
338 barriers in previous studies were resistance to change, high cost of technology, underdeveloped
339 infrastructure, shortage of technical staff expertise, healthcare provider resistance to change,

340 patient's resistance to change, lack of training on information technology, cultural aspects, legal
341 issues, patient's age, and patient's education level [35,48].

342 Telemedicine has merits and demerits but the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.
343 There is a potential market for telemedicine in Trinidad and Tobago if more awareness of the
344 service is created. There is therefore a need to establish policies and strategies for easy
345 adoption and utilization of telemedicine in Trinidad and Tobago as adoption of any new
346 technology depends on understanding of its concept by users, obtaining its required skills and
347 the suitable working environment. Moreover, establishing platforms and organizing
348 telemedicine workshops as well as use of secured high-quality audio and video are necessary
349 for tackling barriers with the usage.

350 **Strengths and limitations**

351 The strength of our study is the fact that our study added new and important information
352 to the literature and is the first to assess the awareness, attitude, and perception of telemedicine
353 in a Caribbean population. Also, the study assesses these participants' predisposition for
354 telemedicine prior to implementation. Additionally, the study had an adequate sample size
355 sufficient to give an insight about telemedicine in T&T. Nevertheless, our study is not without
356 limitations that should be acknowledged. Firstly, the study employed a cross-sectional study
357 design, which precludes the investigation of causal relationships. Also, the use of questionnaire
358 and close-ended questions could have caused certain participants' responses to be missed as
359 study participants are subjected to bias.

360 **Conclusion**

361 The study revealed that although the level of telemedicine awareness is low, majority
362 demonstrated positive attitude and perception towards telemedicine. Therefore, there is a need

363 for more telemedicine awareness and education campaign for the T&T population especially
364 those in the rural areas.

365 **Acknowledgement**

366 We thank the University of the West Indies, Saint Augustine campus academic research grant
367 for their support during data collection.

368 **References**

- 369 1. Naik N, Ibrahim S, Sircar S, Patil V, Hameed BMZ, Rai BP, et al. Attitudes and
370 perceptions of outpatients towards adoption of telemedicine in healthcare during
371 COVID-19 pandemic. *Irish J Med Sci (1971 -)*. 2022;191: 1505–1512.
372 doi:10.1007/s11845-021-02729-6
- 373 2. Scott Kruse C, Karem P, Shifflett K, Vegi L, Ravi K, Brooks M. Evaluating barriers to
374 adopting telemedicine worldwide: A systematic review. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2018;24:
375 4–12. doi:10.1177/1357633X16674087
- 376 3. Owsley C, Swain TA, McGwin G, Nghiem VTH, Register S, Asif IM, et al. Alabama
377 Screening and Intervention for Glaucoma and Eye Health through Telemedicine (AL-
378 SIGHT): Baseline Results. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2024;257: 66–75.
379 doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2023.09.001
- 380 4. Valikodath NG, Leveque TK, Wang SY, Lee PP, Newman-Casey PA, Hansen SO, et
381 al. Patient Attitudes Toward Telemedicine for Diabetic Retinopathy. *Telemed e-
382 Health*. 2017;23: 205–212. doi:10.1089/tmj.2016.0108
- 383 5. Kruse C, Fohn J, Wilson N, Nunez Patlan E, Zipp S, Mileski M. Utilization Barriers
384 and Medical Outcomes Commensurate With the Use of Telehealth Among Older

- 385 Adults: Systematic Review. *JMIR Med Informatics*. 2020;8: e20359.
386 doi:10.2196/20359
- 387 6. Bashir MS, Lalithabai DS, AlOtaiby S, Abu-Shaheen A. Health care professionals'
388 knowledge and attitudes toward telemedicine. *Front Public Heal*. 2023;11.
389 doi:10.3389/fpubh.2023.957681
- 390 7. Kamal SA, Shafiq M, Kakria P. Investigating acceptance of telemedicine services
391 through an extended technology acceptance model (TAM). *Technol Soc*. 2020;60:
392 101212. doi:10.1016/j.techsoc.2019.101212
- 393 8. Tariq W, Asar MAT, Tahir MJ, Ullah I, Ahmad Q, Raza A, et al. Impact of the
394 COVID-19 pandemic on knowledge, perceptions, and effects of telemedicine among
395 the general population of Pakistan: A national survey. *Front Public Heal*. 2023;10.
396 doi:10.3389/fpubh.2022.1036800
- 397 9. Ezinne NE, Anyasodor AE, Bhattarai D, Ekemiri KK, Aliah J, Kureem P, et al.
398 Knowledge, attitude and perception of optometrists in Trinidad and Tobago towards
399 teleoptometry. *Heliyon*. 2023;9: e13686. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e13686
- 400 10. Agnisarman SO, Chalil Madathil K, Smith K, Ashok A, Welch B, McElligott JT.
401 Lessons learned from the usability assessment of home-based telemedicine systems.
402 *Appl Ergon*. 2017;58: 424–434. doi:10.1016/j.apergo.2016.08.003
- 403 11. Keshvaridoost S, Bahaadinbeigy K, Fatehi F. Role of Telehealth in the Management of
404 COVID-19: Lessons Learned from Previous SARS, MERS, and Ebola Outbreaks.
405 *Telemed e-Health*. 2020;26: 850–852. doi:10.1089/tmj.2020.0105
- 406 12. Haider Z, Aweid B, Subramanian P, Iranpour F. Telemedicine in orthopaedics during
407 COVID-19 and beyond: A systematic review. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2022;28: 391–403.

- 408 doi:10.1177/1357633X20938241
- 409 13. Kichloo A, Albosta M, Dettloff K, Wani F, El-Amir Z, Singh J, et al. Telemedicine,
410 the current COVID-19 pandemic and the future: a narrative review and perspectives
411 moving forward in the USA. *Fam Med Community Heal*. 2020;8: e000530.
412 doi:10.1136/fmch-2020-000530
- 413 14. Omboni S, Padwal RS, Alessa T, Benczúr B, Green BB, Hubbard I, et al. The
414 worldwide impact of telemedicine during COVID-19: current evidence and
415 recommendations for the future. *Connect Heal*. 2022. doi:10.20517/ch.2021.03
- 416 15. Alajwari HA, Alfayez A, Alsalman D, Alanezi F, Alhodaib H, Al-Rayes S, et al.
417 Knowledge and attitude of Saudi Arabian citizens towards telemedicine during the
418 COVID-19 pandemic. *Int Health*. 2021. doi:10.1093/inthealth/ihab082
- 419 16. Gao Y, Liu R, Zhou Q, Wang X, Huang L, Shi Q, et al. Application of telemedicine
420 during the coronavirus disease epidemics: a rapid review and meta-analysis. *Ann*
421 *Transl Med*. 2020;8: 626–626. doi:10.21037/atm-20-3315
- 422 17. Gajarawala SN, Pelkowski JN. Telehealth Benefits and Barriers. *J Nurse Pract*.
423 2021;17: 218–221. doi:10.1016/j.nurpra.2020.09.013
- 424 18. Ezeonwumelu IJ, Obijiaku IJ, Ogbueche CM, Nwaozuru U. Healthcare provider-to-
425 patient perspectives on the uptake of teleconsultation services in the Nigerian
426 healthcare system during the COVID-19 pandemic era. Botelho JT da S, editor. *PLOS*
427 *Glob Public Heal*. 2022;2: e0000189. doi:10.1371/journal.pgph.0000189
- 428 19. Paul Andrew Bourne, Justeen Brown, Cameisha Blake, Ayisha Jones, Imani Sinclair,
429 James Fallah, Calvin Campbell, Clifton Foster CM. Assessment of Jamaicans use of
430 Telemedicine during Coronavirus disease 19 (COVID-19) Pandemic. *Int J Curr Res*

- 431 Med Med Sci. 2021;4: 2582–1628.
- 432 20. Khosla S. Implementation of Synchronous Telemedicine into Clinical Practice. *Sleep*
433 *Med Clin.* 2020;15: 347–358. doi:10.1016/j.jsmc.2020.05.002
- 434 21. Ftouni R, AlJardali B, Hamdanieh M, Ftouni L, Salem N. Challenges of Telemedicine
435 during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak.*
436 2022;22: 207. doi:10.1186/s12911-022-01952-0
- 437 22. Umayam KAD, Rosadia ANN, Tan RNR, Salazar DJR, Masakayan RLL, Santiago
438 GMB, et al. Knowledge, Attitudes and Perceptions on the Use of Telemedicine Among
439 Adults Aged 18-34 in Manila, Philippines During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Med*
440 *Univ St Tomas.* 2022;6: 858–867. doi:10.35460/2546-1621.2021-0144
- 441 23. Malhotra K, Sivaraman A, Regunath H. Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic as
442 Catalyst for Telemedicine Adoption: A Single-Center Experience. *Telemed Reports.*
443 2020;1: 16–21. doi:10.1089/tmr.2020.0003
- 444 24. Assaye BT, Jemere AT, Nigatu AM. Knowledge and awareness of health professionals
445 towards telemedicine services in Northwest, Ethiopia. *Digit Heal.* 2022;8:
446 205520762211432. doi:10.1177/20552076221143250
- 447 25. Arize I, Onwujekwe O. Acceptability and willingness to pay for telemedicine services
448 in Enugu state, southeast Nigeria. *Digit Heal.* 2017;3: 205520761771552.
449 doi:10.1177/2055207617715524
- 450 26. Freeman S, Marston HR, Ross C, Morgan DJ, Wilson G, Gates J, et al. Progress
451 towards enhanced access and use of technology during the COVID-19 pandemic: A
452 need to be mindful of the continued digital divide for many rural and northern
453 communities. *Healthc Manag Forum.* 2022;35: 286–290.

- 454 doi:10.1177/08404704221108314
- 455 27. Garfin DR. Technology as a coping tool during the coronavirus disease 2019
456 (COVID-19) pandemic: Implications and recommendations. *Stress Heal.* 2020;36:
457 555–559. doi:10.1002/smi.2975
- 458 28. Jakovljevic M, Matter-Walstra K, Sugahara T, Sharma T, Reshetnikov V, Merrick J, et
459 al. Cost-effectiveness and resource allocation (CERA) 18 years of evolution: maturity
460 of adulthood and promise beyond tomorrow. *Cost Eff Resour Alloc.* 2020;18: 15.
461 doi:10.1186/s12962-020-00210-2
- 462 29. Petersen F, Brown A, Pather S, Tucker WD. Challenges for the adoption of ICT for
463 diabetes self-management in South Africa. *Electron J Inf Syst Dev Ctries.* 2020;86.
464 doi:10.1002/isd2.12113
- 465 30. Murshidi R, Hammouri M, Taha H, Kitaneh R, Alshneikat M, Al-Qawasmeh A, et al.
466 Knowledge, Attitudes, and Perceptions of Jordanians Toward Adopting and Using
467 Telemedicine: National Cross-sectional Study. *JMIR Hum factors.* 2022;9: e41499.
468 doi:10.2196/41499
- 469 31. Cui F, He X, Zhai Y, Lyu M, Shi J, Sun D, et al. Application of Telemedicine Services
470 Based on a Regional Telemedicine Platform in China From 2014 to 2020:
471 Longitudinal Trend Analysis. *J Med Internet Res.* 2021;23: e28009.
472 doi:10.2196/28009
- 473 32. Zhou X, Snoswell CL, Harding LE, Bambling M, Edirippulige S, Bai X, et al. The
474 Role of Telehealth in Reducing the Mental Health Burden from COVID-19. *Telemed
475 e-Health.* 2020;26: 377–379. doi:10.1089/tmj.2020.0068
- 476 33. Chen R, Jiang Q. Evolution of telemedicine in China during COVID-19 pandemic:

- 477 from 2020 to 2022. *J Public Health Policy*. 2022;43: 469–472. doi:10.1057/s41271-
478 022-00353-x
- 479 34. Yang S-Y, Lin C-Y, Huang Y-C, Chang J-H. Gender differences in the association of
480 smartphone use with the vitality and mental health of adolescent students. *J Am Coll*
481 *Heal*. 2018;66: 693–701. doi:10.1080/07448481.2018.1454930
- 482 35. Alboraie M, Allam MA, Youssef N, Abdalgaber M, El-Raey F, Abdeen N, et al.
483 Knowledge, Applicability, and Barriers of Telemedicine in Egypt: A National Survey.
484 Tsiknakis M, editor. *Int J Telemed Appl*. 2021;2021: 1–8. doi:10.1155/2021/5565652
- 485 36. Albaghdadi AT, Al Daajani MM. Perceptions, Satisfaction, and Barriers to
486 Telemedicine Use: A Community-Based Study From Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. *Cureus*.
487 2023;15: e40738. doi:10.7759/cureus.40738
- 488 37. AlKhanbashi R, Zedan H. Telemedicine Policy Availability and Awareness:
489 Directions for Improvement. *Smart Homecare Technol TeleHealth*. 2022;Volume 9:
490 1–9. doi:10.2147/SHTT.S368486
- 491 38. Albarrak AI, Mohammed R, Almarshoud N, Almujaalli L, Aljaeed R, Altuwaijiri S, et
492 al. Assessment of physician’s knowledge, perception and willingness of telemedicine
493 in Riyadh region, Saudi Arabia. *J Infect Public Health*. 2021;14: 97–102.
494 doi:10.1016/j.jiph.2019.04.006
- 495 39. Perzynski AT, Roach MJ, Shick S, Callahan B, Gunzler D, Cebul R, et al. Patient
496 portals and broadband internet inequality. *J Am Med Informatics Assoc*. 2017;24:
497 927–932. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocx020
- 498 40. Dwi Guna S, A F, . W, Azhar B. Patient’s Perception of Using Telemedicine During
499 COVID-19 Pandemic. *KnE Med*. 2023. doi:10.18502/kme.v3i1.12706

- 500 41. Anthony Jnr B. Implications of telehealth and digital care solutions during COVID-19
501 pandemic: a qualitative literature review. *Informatics Heal Soc Care*. 2021;46: 68–83.
502 doi:10.1080/17538157.2020.1839467
- 503 42. James HM, Papoutsi C, Wherton J, Greenhalgh T, Shaw SE. Spread, Scale-up, and
504 Sustainability of Video Consulting in Health Care: Systematic Review and Synthesis
505 Guided by the NASSS Framework. *J Med Internet Res*. 2021;23: e23775.
506 doi:10.2196/23775
- 507 43. Hartasanchez SA, Heen AF, Kunneman M, García-Bautista A, Hargraves IG, Prokop
508 LJ, et al. Remote shared decision making through telemedicine: A systematic review
509 of the literature. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2022;105: 356–365.
510 doi:10.1016/j.pec.2021.06.012
- 511 44. Curran V, Hollett A, Peddle E. Training for virtual care: What do the experts think?
512 *Digit Heal*. 2023;9: 205520762311790. doi:10.1177/20552076231179028
- 513 45. Poulsen KA, Millen CM, Lakshman UI, Buttner PG, Roberts LJ. Satisfaction with
514 rural rheumatology telemedicine service. *Int J Rheum Dis*. 2015;18: 304–314.
515 doi:10.1111/1756-185X.12491
- 516 46. Harkey LC, Jung SM, Newton ER, Patterson A. Patient Satisfaction with Telehealth in
517 Rural Settings: A Systematic Review. *Int J Telerehabilitation*. 2020;12: 53–64.
518 doi:10.5195/ijt.2020.6303
- 519 47. Call VRA, Erickson LD, Dailey NK, Hicken BL, Rupper R, Yorgason JB, et al.
520 Attitudes Toward Telemedicine in Urban, Rural, and Highly Rural Communities.
521 *Telemed e-Health*. 2015;21: 644–651. doi:10.1089/tmj.2014.0125
- 522 48. Wu T-C, Ho C-TB. Barriers to Telemedicine Adoption during the COVID-19

523 Pandemic in Taiwan: Comparison of Perceived Risks by Socioeconomic Status

524 Correlates. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2023;20. doi:10.3390/ijerph200

525

526

527 **Supporting information**

528 S1 Appendix: Sample of questionnaire used in the study

529 S2 Appendix: Questionnaire distribution

530 S2 Appendix: Raw data for telemedicine study in Trinidad and Tobago

531

532

533