

1 **Title**

2

3 Patient experiences of UK primary care online triage and consultation platforms during
4 COVID-19: A systematic review.

5

6 **Authors**

7

8 Mr Christopher Roberts, Population Data Science at Swansea University Medical School,
9 Senior Impact and Engagement Officer

10 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6350-5984>

11

12 Dr Jomin George, Population Data Science at Swansea University Medical School, Lecturer,
13 MSc Health Informatics

14 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-9499-4758>

15

16 Ms Judy Jenkins, Population Data Science at Swansea University Medical School, Senior
17 Lecturer, Programme Director, MSc Health Informatics

18 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6722-600X>

19

20 Corresponding author: christopher.roberts@swansea.ac.uk

21

22

23 **Abstract**

24

25 *Background*

26

27 Online triage and consultation platforms are being increasingly used by healthcare providers
28 in the UK for patient/clinician interactions. COVID-19 accelerated the shift towards the use
29 of these platforms to maintain healthcare provision and reduce transmission. Strict directives
30 were introduced by the UK Government to avoid in-person contact wherever possible in
31 March 2020.

32

33 *Aim*

34

35 To examine patients' experiences of online triage and consultation in UK primary care during
36 the COVID-19 pandemic and offer considerations for their continued use.

37

38 *Design*

39

40 This study follows the PRISMA framework and includes qualitative studies conducted in UK
41 primary care based on the experiences of patient users of any such online platform during the
42 period of March 2020 to April 2023. Studies were included using the PICO format. Three
43 literature databases were searched for relevant studies: PubMed, Science Direct and
44 EMBASE. CASP is used to assess data quality.

45

46 *Results*

47

48 540 studies were reviewed and reduced to 12 studies that met the inclusion criteria. Study
49 characteristics were identified as: year of study, study population, disease types/conditions,
50 patient response themes and the study's data capture method. A thematic inductive approach
51 identifies three overarching themes (Accessibility, Care delivery, System functionality) and
52 10 sub-themes (Affordability, IT literacy, Communication, Convenience, Care quality,
53 Patient safety/privacy, Usability, Continuity of care, Inequality and Media influence).

54

55 *Conclusion*

56

57 This review highlights aspects of patient satisfaction and benefit but also those most
58 concerning for patients. This study reviews the rapid, compulsory adoption of these systems
59 during COVID-19 with implications for their future implementation beyond the pandemic.

60 **Introduction**

61

62 The use of online triage and consultation platforms is increasingly used amongst healthcare
63 providers in the UK.¹ These platforms are provided by private sector vendors, from an
64 approved National Health Service (NHS) supplier list, and they allow patients to remotely
65 communicate, synchronously or asynchronously, with a healthcare practitioner.² Key features
66 of the online platforms can include message exchange, appointment booking, symptom
67 checking, photo sharing, signposting to other services and direct video consultation^{3,4}.

68

69 The use of these online tools has been driven by increasing workload pressures facing the
70 NHS, increasing patient acceptance of and accessibility to technology, and a downward trend
71 in patient satisfaction^{5,6}.

72

73 During the COVID-19 pandemic, the shift towards the use of these platforms was accelerated
74 due to viral transmission mitigation measures introduced by the UK Government and
75 guidance from healthcare authorities to implement more of these remote systems to maintain
76 levels of healthcare provision^{7,8}. By April 2020, 90% of all consultations in primary care
77 were delivered remotely⁹.


78

79 **Results**

80

81 The literature search yielded a total of 540 results. 12 studies met the inclusion criteria using
82 the PRISMA checklist framework²⁰.

83



84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97

Figure 1 - PRISMA Flow Diagram of study selection

Study characteristics

UK-based studies were limited. The studies spanned a pandemic timeframe between January 2020 and April 2023. Populations represented in the studies were broadly inclusive and predominantly undertaken within the primary care landscape of England. Four of the twelve studies examined patient experiences within specific disease or condition types. 10 themes emerged. In all but one of the studies patient experience data was captured either by survey, interview or focus group. In the exception, data was gathered from social media comments posted on the platform Twitter (now known as X). Study characteristics are captured in Table 3.

Study/Year	Population	Disease types/Conditions	Themes identified	Data capture method
Health Watch, 2020	Adults >18yrs (England only)	Any	Convenience, communication, usability, IT literacy	Online surveys, interviews, focus groups
Karavadra et al., 2020 ²⁹	Pregnant women	Any	Accessibility, communication, media influence	Online surveys
Ladds et al., 2020 ³⁰	UK-wide	Long Covid patients	Accessibility, care quality, patient safety/privacy	Interviews, online focus groups
Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust, 2020 ³²	Patients accessing Adult Mental Health (AMH), Adult Community Health (ACH), and Children and Young People (CYP) services	Mental health, learning disabilities, other	Convenience, care quality, patient safety/privacy	Surveys
Ainley et al., 2021 ²³	UK-wide	Any	Accessibility, convenience, IT literacy	Social media comments
Duncan & Cheng, 2021 ²⁴	Adults >18yrs (England only)	Any	Accessibility, communication, IT literacy	Online surveys

Howells et al., 2022 ²⁵	Homelessness (UK-wide)	Any	Accessibility, affordability, inequality	Semi-structured interviews
Health Foundation, 2022 ³¹	Adults >18yrs (England only)	Ambulatory care sensitive conditions (such as asthma, diabetes, epilepsy, hypertensive disease, dementia and heart failure) ⁴¹	Continuity of care, care quality	2 x surveys (study start & end), Interviews, focus groups
Turner et al., 2022 ³³	Adults >18yrs (England only)	Any	Accessibility, communication, continuity of care, patient safety/privacy	Semi-structured interviews
Health Watch, 2021	Adults >18yrs (England only)	Any	Accessibility, IT literacy	Online surveys
Haun et al., 2023 ²⁶	Adults >18yrs	Mental health (anxiety, depression)	Usability, connectivity	Semi-structured interviews
Verity & Brown, 2023 ³⁴	Under-represented groups (Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities, sex workers, vulnerable migrants, and homelessness)	Any	Accessibility, IT literacy, affordability	Semi-structured interviews

Table 3 – Study characteristics from earliest to most recently published.

sufficiently rigorous?												
Is there a clear statement of findings?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Is the research valuable?	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

110

111 Table 4 - Summary of CASP quality appraisal of selected literature

112

113 *Data analysis*

114

115 This review adopts a data-led, inductive thematic analysis framework to derive themes and
 116 codes reflective of the data represented in the studies^{35,36}. The data were categorised into
 117 three overarching themes with 10 sub-themes under each. The frequency of each thematically
 118 coded data point is shown in the QDA Miner extract (figure 2).

119

	Count	% Codes	Cases	% Cases
Accessibility				
• Affordability	8	2.7%	4	33.3%
• IT Literacy	20	6.6%	7	58.3%
• Inequality	9	3.0%	5	41.7%
• Connectivity	2	0.7%	2	16.7%
Care Delivery				
• Care quality	54	17.9%	11	91.7%
• Patient safety/privacy	27	9.0%	7	58.3%
• Continuity of care	20	6.6%	7	58.3%
System Functionality				
• Usability	21	7.0%	7	58.3%
• Convenience	83	27.6%	9	75.0%
• Communication	55	18.3%	10	83.3%
Other Factors				
• Media influence	2	0.7%	2	16.7%

120

121

122

Figure 2. Number of data points by theme using QDA Miner

123

124 *Main themes*

125

126 *Accessibility - Affordability*

127

128 Eight data points around the theme of Affordability were revealed. This theme was most
129 prominent in Verity³⁴ who examined the remote primary care experiences of minority and
130 high-need groups (Gypsy and Travellers, sex workers, vulnerable migrants, and those
131 experiencing homelessness). Within the 21 data points, respondents reported financial
132 barriers to access due to having non-contract, ‘top-up’ mobile phones with limited credit and
133 limited data allowance to transfer multi-media files, such as photographs, requested by GPs
134 to adequately provide care³⁴. Affordability crossed over with the theme of IT Literacy, with
135 one participant stating that even with access to technology they did not possess the skills to
136 effectively use it.

137

138 In Howells²⁵ (experiences of homeless people), similar themes emerged from two
139 participants. One respondent reported ‘on hold’ phone delays at their GP would use up
140 available call credit and another that a shared computer managed by a homeless hostel was
141 unavailable due to Covid restrictions²⁵. Similarly, in HealthWatch²⁷ one participant expressed
142 cost constraints over call waiting times with their GP after being unable to use the online
143 booking system.

144

145 *Accessibility - IT Literacy*

146

147 The theme of IT Literacy featured most prominently in HealthWatch²⁷ and Verity³⁴, the
148 former a study consisting of a high proportion of over 60s (63%) and the latter consisting of
149 marginalised groups. Every response under this theme in HealthWatch²⁷ stated a reliance on
150 someone else, predominantly a family member, to use the online systems with one participant
151 suggesting the implementation of a volunteer-led programme of support. The need for
152 support for elderly patients unfamiliar with technology was echoed by one participant in
153 Turner³³, as well as a social media comment captured in Ainley²³. In Verity³⁴ similar support
154 was sought from friends, interpreters or support workers. Duncan²⁴ reported a patient using

155 online system instructions from another GP practice to access their own GPs system
156 effectively. A HealthWatch²⁷ participant highlighted IT illiteracy, exacerbated by a language
157 barrier, as the reason they were unable to navigate their GPs online system.

158

159 *Accessibility – Inequality*

160

161 All four participants coded under Inequality in Verity³⁴ expressed frustration that online
162 systems marginalised them further for reason of a lack of formal identification to use the
163 health service, low written literacy levels and a perceived discriminatory reluctance for
164 physical health examination. Inequalities over access to care were also raised by
165 breastfeeding women, mental health patients³¹ the elderly^{23,32}, dementia patients and blind or
166 deaf patients without interpretation assistance.²⁷

167

168 *Care Delivery - Care Quality*

169

170 The theme of care quality was the third highest reported in the literature and was evident in
171 11 out the 12 studies included. This theme featured heavily (23 out of 54 responses) in
172 Oxleas³² patient survey of health service users in the Southeast London region during the first
173 few months of the pandemic. Participants broadly felt the remote delivery of care matched
174 that of in-person care quality. This perception was aided by the availability of a video
175 consultation option with several respondents positively reporting that this enabled them to
176 effectively communicate symptoms and pain, removed stress and anxiety of in-person
177 attendance and delivered satisfactory treatment and outcomes³². This was balanced by some
178 negative perceptions that included: an aggravation of mental health conditions, a lack of
179 emotional connection and an over-reliance on outdated patient records which, due to a lack of
180 physical examination, were perceived as not reflecting patients' current condition.

181

182 Elsewhere in the literature some patients commented positively on GPs transition to the
183 remote model²⁷, whilst negative care quality comments related to impersonal
184 communication²⁸, lack of empathy²⁵ and no access to physical examination^{32,34}. Thematic
185 cross-over was revealed between Care Quality and Continuity of Care whereby a lack of the
186 latter negatively affected the former in Ladds³⁰. Notably, one respondent in Ladds³⁰
187 recognised a pattern in the online system's logic processing to ensure the query was met with
188 a direct GP response as opposed to being redirected to other support services. The patient felt

189 it necessary to knowingly enter inaccurate health information which subsequently led to
190 concern over the care that was received.

191

192 *Care Delivery - Patient Safety/Privacy*

193

194 10 participants across the studies who gave positive responses related it to their reluctance to
195 attend in-person appointments, which were exacerbated by COVID-19, due to having
196 mobility constraints, chronic tiredness, frequent panic attacks or other multi-morbidities.

197 Three respondents reacted positively to patient safety citing health benefits of not being
198 potentially exposed to the COVID-19. Three patients were concerned about their privacy
199 when using online consultation platforms; two relating to hesitancy using the platform at
200 home for fear of revealing sensitive health information and another with concerns over who
201 would have access to their health information once submitted to the online system.

202

203 *Care Delivery - Continuity of Care*

204

205 Seven patients experienced frustration or dismay at having to explain, often complex, health
206 history as the online system did not allow patients to seek care from a familiar practitioner,
207 with one patient in Health Foundation³¹ who perceived patients were seen as “faceless
208 creatures”. Conversely, five patients relayed positive continuity of care sentiments where
209 online systems allowed patients to consult with a GP familiar to them and their health history.
210 Notably, one respondent in Health Foundation³¹ reported using an online system with a
211 published rota of practitioner availability but found it was not always accurate.

212

213 *System Functionality – Usability*

214

215 Seven of the 12 included studies surfaced comments relating to the usability and functionality
216 of the online system. The frequency of positive (6) and negative (6) patient views were
217 balanced in the studies. Elements of frustration included a lack of system notifications,
218 unfamiliar software within the bespoke platforms, restrictions on certain types of devices, the
219 use of jargon, and disparate points of access requiring multiple login credentials. Causation of
220 positive Usability views were unclear, for example, one participant commented, ‘it’s
221 simple’³⁴. Other positive sentiments related to the ability to upload attachments and the
222 availability of support resources such as YouTube links.²⁷

223

224 One contentious system feature was the facility to enter triage information by text before
225 video consultation. Three patients commented negatively that the triage questioning was
226 unnecessarily ‘very lengthy’²⁷, ‘quite laborious’³² and ‘death by a thousand questions’²⁸.
227 Contrary to these statements, two patients felt the process meant they were more ‘prepared’
228 and had enabled the patient to ‘collect [their] thoughts’ prior to consultation.²⁷ In relation to
229 information gathering prior to consultation, two patients perceived the process as redundant if
230 practitioners already hold their medical records.²⁷

231

232 *System Functionality – Convenience*

233

234 This was the most prominent factor throughout all of the selected literature with 83
235 respondents alluding to it and featured in nine out the 12 studies. Comments were largely
236 positive citing reasons of ease, speed, efficiency, and affording patients the ability to fit
237 appointments around family and work commitments. The largest volume of comments
238 around time savings related to a reduction in travel times and waiting room attendances. Only
239 one patient conveyed a negative response to ‘convenience’ which related to at-work
240 restrictions on accessing an online device²⁸.

241

242 *System Functionality – Communication*

243

244 Communication was the second most prominent factor and featured in 10 of the 12 studies.
245 Comments were overwhelmingly negative in tone with patients referencing communication
246 deficiencies in the transition to the triage and consultation processes during COVID-19, a
247 lack of advanced notice before appointments, no indication of when preferred practitioner
248 was available, inability to get through by phone when experiencing system problems, and
249 predominantly, a lack of physical communication cues when compared to face-to-face
250 consultations. Only three positive comments were retrieved to suggest that the online
251 platform was equitable to face-to-face contact with their GP. A notable thematic cross-over
252 was observed between Communication and Patient Safety/Privacy and Care Quality, whereby
253 the former impacted negatively on the latter two factors.

254

255 *Media Influence*

256

257 One participant in Ainley²³ delayed contact with primary care due to a media-influenced
258 perception of an over-stretched health service and another in HealthWatch²⁸ thought face-to-
259 face GP contact should resume in-line with other businesses following a media-reported
260 relaxation of ‘lockdown’ rules.

261

262 **Discussion**

263

264 *Summary*

265

266 Examination of the 12 studies included in this review presented no clear evidence that
267 patients’ experiences were generally positive or negative. This review’s thematic analysis,
268 however, does indicate elements of satisfaction or frustration through an inductive thematic
269 investigation that provides useful considerations for future online platform development.

270

271 The largest number of positive patient responses in the literature fell under theme of
272 ‘Convenience’. The majority of these responses were seen in Oxleas³², a study conducted
273 during the early phase of the pandemic. Due to the swift adoption of online systems, at scale,
274 this intervention may have been seen as a novel approach to primary healthcare delivery⁹,
275 contributing to positive sentiments around ‘convenience’. The largest study included in this
276 review, Oxleas³² captured responses from, principally, the 35-54 age demographic, many of
277 whom welcomed the implementation of online GP access, citing reasons of convenience due
278 to work and family commitments. Whereas in Verity³⁴ and Turner³³, studies which recruited
279 older patients, the theme of convenience failed to feature. These studies were also conducted
280 later during the pandemic, possibly once the novelty of online GP access had somewhat
281 waned.

282

283 This review has also highlighted regional variation within the same themes. In
284 HealthWatch²⁸, patients from Northern and Southern counties of England reported varying
285 care quality perceptions of their regional online systems. Different responses were also
286 evident depending on socio-demographic factors. Two of the studies^{25,34} captured responses
287 from marginalised groups where themes of affordability and inequality featured prominently
288 in contrast to the other included studies.

289

290 *Strengths*

291

- 292 • This is the first time online triage and consultation systems have been systematically
293 reviewed based on qualitative, experiential data from patients during COVID-19.
- 294 • The literature sourced for this review contained data from multiple modalities of data
295 capture (surveys, focus groups, interviews).
- 296 • Includes data on high-need health groups.
- 297 • The selected literature provided evidence from across the significant periods of the
298 COVID-19 pandemic timeframe (March 2020 to May 2023).

299

300 *limitations*

301

- 302 • Small volume of patient experience data available perhaps indicative of the ‘all-
303 hands-on-deck’ approach to swiftly containing Covid-19 or limited access to patients
304 for research purposes⁴².
- 305 • Some socio-demographic and specific health conditions not accounted for in the
306 available literature.
- 307 • Limited evidence from the UK’s devolved nations which could overlook variances as
308 health care delivery is devolved, however, evidence suggests a similar approach was
309 adopted across nations³⁷.

310

311 *Recommendations*

312

313 These interconnected themes should be considered for the longevity and successful
314 development of online platforms. This review provides crucial evidence towards reversing a
315 stark decline in levels of patient satisfaction with healthcare services³⁸. Public trust is
316 important for healthcare and public bodies because it can improve population health through
317 increased patient engagement with consultations, treatments and therapies thereby reducing
318 costs and improving efficiency³⁹. An absence of public trust can also contribute towards
319 vaccine hesitancy, making it difficult for public authorities to manage public health crises,
320 such as COVID-19, in the future⁴⁰.

321

322 The broad range of themes presented suggests a holistic approach to online care delivery is
323 needed, one that considers system selection and adoption, staff training for preparedness and

324 adequate communication with patients about process changes. More data pertaining to patient
325 experience to facilitate further research would be advantageous.

326

327 **Method**

328

329 *Study design*

330

331 This systematic review follows the PRISMA study design framework which establishes a
332 robust approach to scientific literature review^{10,11,12}.

333

334 *Inclusion and exclusion criteria*

335

336 This review includes qualitative studies conducted in the UK primary care landscape that
337 have generated data based on the experiences of patient users of any online triage and
338 consultation platform during the COVID-19 pandemic period of March 2020 to April 2023.

339 Literature was assessed for inclusivity using the PICO framework (Table 1).

340

PICOs	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Population	UK primary care patients	GPs, nurses, receptionists or other clinical staff
Intervention	Direct or indirect experience of using any online triage or consultation tool during the COVID-19 pandemic	Patients with no knowledge of using online triage or consultation tools during COVID-19 and patients with solely pre-COVID-19 experiences.
Comparison	None - No comparison is made with pre-COVID-19 use of these tools	N/A
Outcome	First-hand experiences, positive or negative, of using the intervention	Aggregated, quantitative scores of qualitative patient responses.

341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351

Table 1 - PICO Framework of inclusion and exclusion criteria

Information sources and search strategy

Three databases were searched: PubMed, Science Direct and EMBASE. Sources of grey literature included The Nuffield Trust, The Kings Fund, The Health Foundation and Health Watch. Searches were conducted between March and April 2023. The search term ‘Covid’ was used as a proxy for restricting by date. A combination of Boolean operators and specific phrase search terms were used for each database (Table 2).

PubMed and EMBASE literature search terms:
("online triage"[Title/Abstract] OR "online consultation"[Title/Abstract] OR "telehealth"[Title/Abstract] OR "remote consultation"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("covid"[Title/Abstract] OR "coronavirus"[Title/Abstract] OR "SARS-COV-2"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("primary care"[Title/Abstract] OR "general practice"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("experience"[Title/Abstract] OR "experiences"[Title/Abstract] OR "views"[Title/Abstract] OR "perceptions"[Title/Abstract])
Science Direct literature search terms:
("online triage" OR "online consultation" OR "telehealth" OR "remote consultation") ("covid" OR "Coronavirus" OR "SARS-COV-2") ("primary care" OR "general practice") ("experience" OR "views" OR "perspective")
Grey literature search terms:
‘primary care covid experience’

352
353
354
355
356
357
358

Table 2 – Search terms for each literature source database.

Selection process

Results of the literature search were reviewed using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme’s (CASP) checklist^{16,17}.

359

360 Data collection process

361

362 Qualitative data from selected literature were captured in QDA Miner¹⁸ to code themes from
363 ingested data¹⁹. Data from literature sources came from the ‘results’ section of each
364 publication and for grey literature were gathered from a complete review of the document.
365 ‘Discussion’ sections were examined to indicate main themes. In papers with a mixed-
366 methods approach patient experience data was carefully evaluated to ensure comments were
367 not from quantitative aggregates of patient surveys that used Likert scaling for instance. Risk
368 of bias was minimised using the CASP framework.

369

370 **References**

371

372 1. Bakhai M, Atherton H. How to conduct written online consultations with patients in
373 primary care. *bmj*. 2021 Feb 24;372.

374

375 2. Nijland N, van Gemert-Pijnen J, Boer H, Steehouder M, Seydel E. Evaluation of
376 internet-based technology for supporting self-care: problems encountered by patients
377 and caregivers when using self-care applications. *Journal of medical Internet research*.
378 2008 May 15;10(2):e957.

379

380 3. Baines R, Tredinnick-Rowe J, Jones R, Chatterjee A. Barriers and enablers in
381 implementing electronic consultations in primary care: scoping review. *Journal of*
382 *Medical Internet Research*. 2020 Nov 12;22(11):e19375.

383

384 4. England NH, Improvement NH. Advice on how to establish a remote ‘total triage’
385 model in general practice using online consultations. London: NHS England. 2020.

386

387 5. Edwards HB, Marques E, Hollingworth W, Horwood J, Farr M, Bernard E, Salisbury
388 C, Northstone K. Use of a primary care online consultation system, by whom, when
389 and why: evaluation of a pilot observational study in 36 general practices in South
390 West England. *BMJ open*. 2017 Nov 1;7(11):e016901.

391

392 6. Eccles A, Hopper M, Turk A, Atherton H. Patient use of an online triage platform: a
393 mixed-methods retrospective exploration in UK primary care. *British Journal of*
394 *General Practice*. 2019 May 1;69(682):e336-44.

395

396 7. Miles DK, Stedman M, Heald AH. “Stay at Home, Protect the National Health
397 Service, Save Lives”: A cost benefit analysis of the lockdown in the United Kingdom.
398 *International Journal of Clinical Practice*. 2021 Mar;75(3):e13674.

399

400 8. Royal College of General Practitioners [internet]. GP consultations post-COVID
401 should be a combination of remote and face to face, depending on patient need, says
402 College. [cited 2023 Apr 11]. Available from:

403 <https://www.rcgp.org.uk/news/2021/may/gp-consultations-post-covid>

404

405 9. Murphy M, Scott LJ, Salisbury C, Turner A, Scott A, Denholm R, Lewis R, Iyer G,
406 Macleod J, Horwood J. Implementation of remote consulting in UK primary care
407 following the COVID-19 pandemic: a mixed-methods longitudinal study. *British*
408 *Journal of General Practice*. 2021 Mar 1;71(704):e166-77.

409

410 10. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD,
411 Shamseer L, Tetzlaff JM, Akl EA, Brennan SE, Chou R. The PRISMA 2020
412 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *International journal*
413 *of surgery*. 2021 Apr 1;88:105906.

414

415 11. Tugwell P, Tovey D. PRISMA 2020. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2021 Jun
416 1;134:A5-6.

417

418 12. Page MJ, Moher D, McKenzie JE. Introduction to PRISMA 2020 and implications for
419 research synthesis methodologists. *Research synthesis methods*. 2022 Mar;13(2):156-
420 63.

421

422 13. Booth A, Cantrell A, Preston L, Chambers D, Goyder E. What is the evidence for the
423 effectiveness, appropriateness and feasibility of group clinics for patients with chronic
424 conditions? A systematic review.

425

426 14. Trinoskey J, Brahmī FA, Gall C. Zotero: A product review. *Journal of Electronic*
427 *Resources in Medical Libraries*. 2009 Sep 9;6(3):224-9.

428

429 15. Erz H. Zotero 6: A Review.

430

431 16. CASP C. CASP qualitative checklist. *Critical Appraisal Skills Programme*. 2018 Apr
432 21.

433

434 17. Long HA, French DP, Brooks JM. Optimising the value of the critical appraisal skills
435 programme (CASP) tool for quality appraisal in qualitative evidence synthesis.
436 *Research Methods in Medicine & Health Sciences*. 2020 Sep;1(1):31-42.

437

- 438 18. Provalis Research [internet]. QDA Miner. [cited 2023 Mar 20]. Available from:
439 <https://provalisresearch.com/products/qualitative-data-analysis-software/freeware/>
440
- 441 19. Adu P. A step-by-step guide to qualitative data coding. Routledge; 2019 Apr 5.
442
- 443 20. PRISMA [internet]. PRISMA Checklist. [cited 2023 Mar 25]. Available from:
444 [http://prisma-](http://prisma-statement.org/PRISMAstatement/checklist.aspx?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1)
445 [statement.org/PRISMAstatement/checklist.aspx?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1](http://prisma-statement.org/PRISMAstatement/checklist.aspx?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1)
446
- 447 21. Carter P, Martin G. Challenges facing Healthwatch, a new consumer champion in
448 England. International journal of health policy and management. 2016 Apr;5(4):259.
449
- 450 22. Department of Health and Social Care [internet]. Data saves lives: reshaping health
451 and social care with data. [cited 2023 10 Apr]. Available from:
452 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/data-saves-lives-reshaping-health-and-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/data-saves-lives-reshaping-health-and-social-care-with-data/data-saves-lives-reshaping-health-and-social-care-with-data)
453 [social-care-with-data/data-saves-lives-reshaping-health-and-social-care-with-data](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/data-saves-lives-reshaping-health-and-social-care-with-data/data-saves-lives-reshaping-health-and-social-care-with-data)
454
- 455 23. Ainley E, Witwicki C, Tallett A, Graham C. Using twitter comments to understand
456 people's experiences of UK health care during the COVID-19 pandemic: Thematic
457 and sentiment analysis. Journal of Medical Internet Research. 2021 Oct
458 25;23(10):e31101.
459
- 460 24. Duncan LJ, Cheng KF. Public perception of NHS general practice during the first six
461 months of the COVID-19 pandemic in England. F1000Research. 2021;10.
462
- 463 25. Howells K, Amp M, Burrows M, Brown J, Brennan R, Dickinson J, Jackson S, Yeung
464 WL, Ashcroft D, Campbell S, Blakeman T. Remote primary care during the COVID-
465 19 pandemic for people experiencing homelessness: a qualitative study. British
466 Journal of General Practice. 2022 Jul 1;72(720):e492-500.
467
- 468 26. Haun MW, Oeljeklaus L, Hoffmann M, Tönnies J, Wensing M, Szecsenyi J, Peters-
469 Klimm F, Krisam R, Kronsteiner D, Hartmann M, Friederich HC. Primary care
470 patients' experiences of video consultations for depression and anxiety: a qualitative

- 471 interview study embedded in a randomized feasibility trial. BMC Health Services
472 Research. 2023 Dec;23(1):1-0.
473
- 474 27. Healthwatch.co.uk [internet]. The Doctor Will Zoom You Now: getting the most out
475 of the virtual health and care experience. [cited 2023 Apr 12]. Available from:
476 https://www.healthwatch.co.uk/sites/healthwatch.co.uk/files/The_Dr_Will_Zoom_You_Now_-_Insights_Report.pdf
477
478
- 479 28. Healthwatch.co.uk [internet]. GP access during COVID-19. [cited 2023 Apr 15].
480 Available from:
481 [https://www.healthwatch.co.uk/sites/healthwatch.co.uk/files/20210215%20GP%20ac
482 cess%20during%20COVID19%20report%20final_0.pdf](https://www.healthwatch.co.uk/sites/healthwatch.co.uk/files/20210215%20GP%20access%20during%20COVID19%20report%20final_0.pdf)
483
- 484 29. Karavadra B, Stockl A, Prosser-Snelling E, Simpson P, Morris E. Women's
485 perceptions of COVID-19 and their healthcare experiences: a qualitative thematic
486 analysis of a national survey of pregnant women in the United Kingdom. BMC
487 pregnancy and childbirth. 2020 Dec;20(1):1-8.
488
- 489 30. Ladds E, Rushforth A, Wieringa S, Taylor S, Rayner C, Husain L, Greenhalgh T.
490 Persistent symptoms after Covid-19: qualitative study of 114 "long Covid" patients
491 and draft quality principles for services. BMC health services research. 2020
492 Dec;20(1):1-3.
493
- 494 31. The Health Foundation [Internet]. Increasing continuity of care in general practice
495 programme. [cited 2023 Apr 12]. Available from:
496 [https://www.health.org.uk/sites/default/files/2022-
497 12/continuity_of_care_final_independent_evaluation_mixedmethodsevalreport_2022.
498 pdf](https://www.health.org.uk/sites/default/files/2022-12/continuity_of_care_final_independent_evaluation_mixedmethodsevalreport_2022.pdf)
499
- 500 32. Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust [internet]. Patient Experience of Remote Consultations
501 during the COVID-19 Pandemic. [cited 2023 Apr 15]. Available from:
502 [https://healthinnovationnetwork.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Remote-
503 experience-reportV7.pdf](https://healthinnovationnetwork.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Remote-experience-reportV7.pdf)
504

- 505 33. Turner A, Morris R, Rakhra D, Stevenson F, McDonagh L, Hamilton F, Atherton H,
506 Farr M, Blake S, Banks J, Lasseter G. Unintended consequences of online
507 consultations: a qualitative study in UK primary care. *British Journal of General*
508 *Practice*. 2022 Feb 1;72(715):e128-37.
- 509
- 510 34. Verity A, Brown VT. Inclusion health patient perspectives on remote access to
511 general practice: a qualitative study. *BJGP open*. 2023 Apr 19.
- 512
- 513 35. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in*
514 *psychology*. 2006 Jan 1;3(2):77-101.
- 515
- 516 36. Byrne D. A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic
517 analysis. *Quality & quantity*. 2022 Jun;56(3):1391-412.
- 518
- 519
- 520 37. Anderson M, Pitchforth E, Asaria M, Brayne C, Casadei B, Charlesworth A, Coulter
521 A, Franklin BD, Donaldson C, Drummond M, Dunnell K. LSE–Lancet Commission
522 on the future of the NHS: re-laying the foundations for an equitable and efficient
523 health and care service after COVID-19. *The Lancet*. 2021 May 22;397(10288):1915-
524 78.
- 525
- 526 38. The Kings Fund [internet]. Public satisfaction with the NHS and social care in 2022:
527 Results from the British Social Attitudes survey. [cited 2023 Apr 14]. Available from:
528 [https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/public-satisfaction-nhs-and-social-care-](https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/public-satisfaction-nhs-and-social-care-2022)
529 [2022](https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/public-satisfaction-nhs-and-social-care-2022)
- 530
- 531 39. Gille F, Smith S, Mays N. Why public trust in health care systems matters and
532 deserves greater research attention. *Journal of health services research & policy*. 2015
533 Jan;20(1):62-4.
- 534
- 535 40. Goldenberg MJ. Vaccine hesitancy: public trust, expertise, and the war on science.
536 University of Pittsburgh Press; 2021 Mar 30.
- 537

- 538 41. NHS England [internet]. Emergency admissions for Ambulatory Care Sensitive
539 Conditions – characteristics and trends at national level. [cited 2023 Apr 15].
540 Available from: [https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/red-acsc-](https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/red-acsc-em-admissions-2.pdf)
541 [em-admissions-2.pdf](https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/red-acsc-em-admissions-2.pdf)
542
- 543 42. NHS Health Research Authority [internet]. Public involvement in a pandemic:
544 Lessons from the UK COVID-19 public involvement matching service. [cited 2023
545 Apr 14]. Available from: [https://s3.eu-west-](https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/www.hra.nhs.uk/media/documents/8948_Public_Involvement_in_Pandemic_Research_Report_V9_-_Accessible.pdf)
546 [2.amazonaws.com/www.hra.nhs.uk/media/documents/8948_Public_Involvement_in](https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/www.hra.nhs.uk/media/documents/8948_Public_Involvement_in_Pandemic_Research_Report_V9_-_Accessible.pdf)
547 [Pandemic_Research_Report_V9_-_Accessible.pdf](https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/www.hra.nhs.uk/media/documents/8948_Public_Involvement_in_Pandemic_Research_Report_V9_-_Accessible.pdf)
548

