

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](mailto: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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>3,4</sup>.

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<sup>5,6</sup>.

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<sup>7,8</sup>. By April 2020, 90% of all consultations in primary care  
77 were delivered remotely<sup>9</sup>.


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 framework<sup>20</sup>.

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.

<b>Study/Year</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Disease types/Conditions</b>	<b>Themes identified</b>	<b>Data capture method</b>
Health Watch, 2020	Adults >18yrs (England only)	Any	Convenience, communication, usability, IT literacy	Online surveys, interviews, focus groups
Karavadra et al., 2020 <sup>29</sup>	Pregnant women	Any	Accessibility, communication, media influence	Online surveys
Ladds et al., 2020 <sup>30</sup>	UK-wide	Long Covid patients	Accessibility, care quality, patient safety/privacy	Interviews, online focus groups
Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust, 2020 <sup>32</sup>	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 <sup>23</sup>	UK-wide	Any	Accessibility, convenience, IT literacy	Social media comments
Duncan & Cheng, 2021 <sup>24</sup>	Adults >18yrs (England only)	Any	Accessibility, communication, IT literacy	Online surveys

Howells et al., 2022 <sup>25</sup>	Homelessness (UK-wide)	Any	Accessibility, affordability, inequality	Semi-structured interviews
Health Foundation, 2022 <sup>31</sup>	Adults >18yrs (England only)	Ambulatory care sensitive conditions (such as asthma, diabetes, epilepsy, hypertensive disease, dementia and heart failure) <sup>41</sup>	Continuity of care, care quality	2 x surveys (study start & end), Interviews, focus groups
Turner et al., 2022 <sup>33</sup>	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 <sup>26</sup>	Adults >18yrs	Mental health (anxiety, depression)	Usability, connectivity	Semi-structured interviews
Verity & Brown, 2023 <sup>34</sup>	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<sup>35,36</sup>. 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
<b>Accessibility</b>				
• 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%
<b>Care Delivery</b>				
• 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%
<b>System Functionality</b>				
• Usability	21	7.0%	7	58.3%
• Convenience	83	27.6%	9	75.0%
• Communication	55	18.3%	10	83.3%
<b>Other Factors</b>				
• 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 Verity<sup>34</sup> 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 care<sup>34</sup>. 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 Howells<sup>25</sup> (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 restrictions<sup>25</sup>. Similarly, in HealthWatch<sup>27</sup> 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 HealthWatch<sup>27</sup> and Verity<sup>34</sup>, 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 HealthWatch<sup>27</sup> 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 Turner<sup>33</sup>, as well as a social media comment captured in Ainley<sup>23</sup>. In Verity<sup>34</sup> similar support  
154 was sought from friends, interpreters or support workers. Duncan<sup>24</sup> reported a patient using

155 online system instructions from another GP practice to access their own GPs system  
156 effectively. A HealthWatch<sup>27</sup> 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 Verity<sup>34</sup> 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 patients<sup>31</sup> the elderly<sup>23,32</sup>, dementia patients and blind or  
166 deaf patients without interpretation assistance.<sup>27</sup>

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 Oxleas<sup>32</sup> 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 outcomes<sup>32</sup>. 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 model<sup>27</sup>, whilst negative care quality comments related to impersonal  
184 communication<sup>28</sup>, lack of empathy<sup>25</sup> and no access to physical examination<sup>32,34</sup>. 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 Ladds<sup>30</sup>. Notably, one respondent in Ladds<sup>30</sup>  
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 Foundation<sup>31</sup> 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 Foundation<sup>31</sup> 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’<sup>34</sup>. Other positive sentiments related to the ability to upload attachments and the  
222 availability of support resources such as YouTube links.<sup>27</sup>

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’<sup>27</sup>, ‘quite laborious’<sup>32</sup> and ‘death by a thousand questions’<sup>28</sup>.  
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.<sup>27</sup> In relation to  
229 information gathering prior to consultation, two patients perceived the process as redundant if  
230 practitioners already hold their medical records.<sup>27</sup>

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 device<sup>28</sup>.

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 Ainley<sup>23</sup> delayed contact with primary care due to a media-influenced  
258 perception of an over-stretched health service and another in HealthWatch<sup>28</sup> 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 Oxleas<sup>32</sup>, 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 delivery<sup>9</sup>,  
275 contributing to positive sentiments around ‘convenience’. The largest study included in this  
276 review, Oxleas<sup>32</sup> 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 Verity<sup>34</sup> and Turner<sup>33</sup>, 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 HealthWatch<sup>28</sup>, 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<sup>25,34</sup> 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 purposes<sup>42</sup>.
- 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 nations<sup>37</sup>.

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 services<sup>38</sup>. 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 efficiency<sup>39</sup>. 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 future<sup>40</sup>.

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<sup>10,11,12</sup>.

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

<b>PICOs</b>	<b>Inclusion Criteria</b>	<b>Exclusion Criteria</b>
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).

<b>PubMed and EMBASE literature search terms:</b>
("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])
<b>Science Direct literature search terms:</b>
("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")
<b>Grey literature search terms:</b>
‘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<sup>16,17</sup>.

359

360 Data collection process

361

362 Qualitative data from selected literature were captured in QDA Miner<sup>18</sup> to code themes from  
363 ingested data<sup>19</sup>. 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, Brahma 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](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](https://www.healthwatch.co.uk/sites/healthwatch.co.uk/files/20210215%20GP%20access%20during%20COVID19%20report%20final_0.pdf)  
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-](https://www.health.org.uk/sites/default/files/2022-12/continuity_of_care_final_independent_evaluation_mixedmethodsevalreport_2022.pdf)  
497 [12/continuity\\_of\\_care\\_final\\_independent\\_evaluation\\_mixedmethodsevalreport\\_2022.](https://www.health.org.uk/sites/default/files/2022-12/continuity_of_care_final_independent_evaluation_mixedmethodsevalreport_2022.pdf)  
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-](https://healthinnovationnetwork.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Remote-experience-reportV7.pdf)  
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

