

1 **Title: Patient Safety of Remote Primary Care: A Qualitative Study Assessing**
2 **Risks and Mitigation and Prevention Strategies**

3
4 **Authors**

5 Olivia Lounsbury¹, Edmond Li², Tetiana Lunova², Jackie van Dael³, Niki O'Brien², Ahmed
6 Alboksmaty⁴, Alay Rangel-Cristales², Ara Darzi², Ana Luisa Neves⁵

7
8 ¹ Department of Pediatrics, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine

9 ² Institute of Global Health Innovation, Department of Surgery and Cancer, Imperial College
10 London

11 ³ Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford

12 ⁴ Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Cambridge

13 ⁵ Department of Primary Care and Public Health, Imperial College London

14
15 Corresponding author: Edmond Li (Edmond.li19@imperial.ac.uk)

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 **Funding**

25 EL, AD and ALN are funded by the NIHR Patient Safety Research Collaborative, with
26 infrastructure support from Imperial NIHR Biomedical Research Centre. The views expressed
27 in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of NIHR or the
28 Department of Health and Social Care.

29
30 **Competing interests**

31 AD is executive chair of Preemptive Health and Medicine at Flagship Pioneering. All other
32 authors do not have any competing interests.

33
34 **Ethical approval**

35 Overall ethical approval for this project was granted by the Imperial College Research Ethics
36 Committee (ICREC) (Reference 21IC6789).

37
38 **Acknowledgements**

39 OL, EL, JvD, NB, AA, and ALN contributed to the conception and design of the study. All
40 authors contributed to writing the manuscript, provided critical revision and approved the final
41 version of the manuscript. OL, EL, and ALN guarantee the integrity of the work.

42
43 **Keywords: virtual care, patient safety, quality improvement**

44 **Abstract**

45

46 **Background:** While virtual care delivery has numerous advantages, it can also introduce safety risks and
47 unintended consequences. Considering that it has become an integral part of today's healthcare service,
48 uncovering its unintended consequences is imperative to ensure patient safety.

49

50 **Objectives:** This study aimed to identify patient safety risks associated with virtual primary care, as well
51 as strategies to mitigate these risks based on the perspectives of patients and healthcare providers.

52

53 **Methods:** Three focus groups were conducted followed by semi-structured interviews with patients,
54 carers and healthcare providers working in primary care. Transcripts were systematically reviewed, and
55 thematic analysis was performed by two independent researchers.

56

57 **Results:** A total of 42 participants took part in the study. Three main areas for patient safety risks
58 associated with virtual primary care were identified, including suboptimal clinical decision-making,
59 negative impact on patients' access to care, and worsening the workforce crisis. Strategies to mitigate
60 these risks included providing information for patients, training triage personnel, making technical
61 support available, standardising guidelines, setting up systems for feedback, improving continuity of
62 care, communication, and safety netting.

63

64 **Conclusions:** Patients and providers now have a heightened awareness of the strengths and pitfalls of
65 virtual care due to their increased familiarity with the use of virtual care technologies. Existing policies
66 need to be updated and new ones devised to minimise risks associated with virtual care and support
67 patient and provider workflows.

68

69 **Public Interest Summary**

70 The COVID-19 pandemic galvanized an emergent necessity to deliver care virtually in order to reduce
71 disease transmission. However, given the urgency of the crisis, virtual care was being delivered with
72 minimal protective measures for safety.

73

74 This study examines the lived experiences of both patients and providers around virtual care use in
75 England. Potential risks of virtual care delivery, and strategies to mitigate these risks, are identified from
76 both perspectives. The risks identified vary from the technological learning curve to the challenges
77 associated with modified patient-provider communication. The potential solutions identified range from
78 strategies to improve micro-level patient-provider interactions to larger-scale system changes to
79 improve the continuity of care.

80

81 Support for patients and providers alike should be allocated to alleviate unnecessary burdens associated
82 with virtual care. Ensuring patient safety necessitates seamless coordination and interoperability
83 between virtual and in-person healthcare to maintain harmony between the two modes of healthcare
84 delivery.

85

86

87 **Introduction**

88

89 Medical care has been provided via telemedicine for several decades and was adopted initially to reduce
healthcare costs, improve quality, and expand access to care (1, 2). Despite years of investment and

90 innovation, it was not until the start of the COVID-19 pandemic that virtual care became widely
91 implemented. The rapid spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus abruptly forced patients, providers, and
92 healthcare systems to make significant adjustments to their routine practices for delivering and
93 receiving healthcare (3). To adapt to the emerging challenges and reduce COVID-19 transmission, virtual
94 services, including phone, video, or online consultations, quickly became a major route of primary care
95 delivery (4, 5).

96 The COVID-19 pandemic exposed the potential advantages of virtual care, with some studies indicating a
97 possible role for more efficient patient triage, reduction of delays in diagnosis and treatment, lower
98 travel costs, and improved physician work flexibility (3, 6, 7). The shift from in-person to virtual
99 consultations has minimised virus transmission while maintaining a comparable quality of care and
100 relatively high patient satisfaction levels (8). Virtual care has expanded access for some groups, but it
101 has been acknowledged that access can be difficult for those without stable internet, or with hearing or
102 visual impairments (9, 10). Virtual care has also been associated with healthcare cost reduction and
103 lower hospital admission rates in certain population groups, such as older persons (11).

104 While this means of care delivery can potentially address several challenges associated with face-to-face
105 care delivery, particularly for emergency situations like the COVID-19 pandemic, it can also introduce
106 safety risks and unintended consequences. Research into patient perspectives suggests patients have
107 lower confidence in the safety of virtual care - particularly virtual consultations -, stemming from
108 concerns about the clinician's inability to read their body language, difficulties in communicating
109 effectively, and fewer opportunities for patients to raise issues (12, 13). Some evidence also suggests
110 that virtual consultations, particularly via telephone, are helpful in addressing minor conditions but may
111 increase the likelihood of missing rare but serious conditions (13). Given the abrupt introduction of
112 virtual care delivery due to the pandemic, its safety risks are not largely understood.

113 Because virtual care has become an integral part of today's healthcare service, uncovering its risks and
114 exploring potential strategies are imperative for safe, high-quality care delivery. There is limited
115 knowledge of patients' and physicians' perceptions of safety risks associated with virtual primary care.
116 As frontline users, both patients and service providers have the potential to identify different safety
117 issues; it is therefore vital to consider their views to comprehensively define risks and mitigation
118 strategies (14). The aim of the current research is to identify patient safety risks associated with virtual
119 primary care, as well as strategies to mitigate these risks, based on the perspectives of patients and
120 healthcare providers.

121 Methods

122

123 **Overview of the Methods Used**

124

125 A qualitative approach consisting of online focus groups and semi-structured interviews was adopted.
126 The team includes researchers trained in qualitative research with backgrounds in clinical medicine,
127 public health, and patient safety. The study reporting was performed in accordance with the
128 Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative (COREQ) checklist.

129

130 **Study Population**

131 Study participants included patients and healthcare workers working in a primary care setting (e.g.,
132 general practitioners (GP), community nurses, pharmacists). Patients were included if aged 18 years or
133 older and fluent in English.

134

135 **Recruitment**

136 Patient participants were recruited via charity newsletters (e.g., Open Age), social media (i.e., LinkedIn,
137 Twitter), online platforms (e.g., VOICE UK and People in Research), and the Research Partners Group at
138 the Patient Safety Translational Research Centre at Imperial College London. Participants for the focus
139 groups and interviews were recruited through the researchers' professional networks, research
140 networks and social media (i.e., LinkedIn, Twitter) using a convenience sampling approach. All
141 participants were given background on the study and informed of its purpose.

142

143 **Data Collection**

144 Three, 60-minute focus groups were conducted between September and November 2021, with a total of
145 16 participants (eight patients, four GPs, two nurses, one pharmacist, and one preferred not to answer).
146 Each focus group included five to six participants. Two researchers were present in each of the focus
147 groups (JvD, EL), one facilitating the discussion while the other taking field notes. A total of 26
148 interviews were completed by two researchers (OL, EL) between February and May 2022, including eight
149 general practitioners, one healthcare student, 11 patients and carers (six preferred not to answer).
150 Interviews lasted between 30-60 minutes. Participants did not have previous relationships with the
151 interviewers.

152

153 Semi-structured topic guides were used in both the focus groups and interviews (**Appendix 1 and 2**).
154 Focus groups and interviews were conducted in English using remote conference software (i.e., Zoom),
155 recorded and transcribed verbatim. No participant review of the transcripts was performed, and no
156 follow-up focus groups or interviews were conducted.

157

158 **Data Analysis**

159 Thematic analysis was performed in which transcripts were systematically reviewed and coded by two
160 independent researchers (15). The coding was both deductive and inductive in its approach and involved
161 an iterative exploration of the data, with initial themes discussed and revised within the interdisciplinary
162 research team. Data saturation was determined through discussion with researchers involved in coding
163 once no new themes emerged.

164

165

166 **Results**

167 **Participant Characteristics**

168 A total of 42 participants were included (focus groups, n= 16; interviews, n=26). One individual
169 participated in both the interview and focus group. A full description of the participants is provided in
170 **Table 1**. Participant identifiers used alongside included quotes are only known to members of the
171 research team and do not correspond with any other identifiers or roles outside of the study.

172

173 **Table 1. Characteristics of study participants**

		Focus Group, n	Interview, n (%)	Total, n (%)
--	--	-------------------	---------------------	-----------------

		(%)		
Gender	Male	5 (31%)	5 (19%)	10 (24%)
	Female	10 (63%)	17 (65%)	27 (64%)
	Other (Please describe)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Prefer not to answer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Missing	1 (6.3%)	4 (15%)	5 (12%)
Age	18-24	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1 (2%)
	25-34	4 (25%)	3 (12%)	7 (17%)
	35-44	6 (38%)	9 (35%)	15 (36%)
	45-54	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	2 (5%)
	55-64	2 (13%)	4 (15%)	6 (14%)
	≥ 65	3 (19%)	3 (12%)	6 (14%)
	Prefer not to answer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Missing	1 (6%)	4 (15%)	5 (12%)
Participant Roles	Physicians (General Practice/Family Medicine)	4 (25%)	8 (31%)	12 (29%)
	Patient	8 (50%)	10 (39%)	18 (43%)
	Carer	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1 (2%)
	Other Health Professional	3 (18%)	0 (0%)	3 (7%)

	Student	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1 (2%)
	Prefer not to answer	1 (7%)	2 (8%)	3 (7%)
	Missing	0 (0%)	4 (15%)	4 (10%)
Ethnic Group	White (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British, Irish, Gypsy or Irish Traveller, Any other White background)	10 (63%)	18 (69%)	28 (68%)
	Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups (White and Black Caribbean, White and Black African, White and Asian, Any other Mixed/Multiple ethnic backgrounds)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Asian/Asian British (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Chinese, Any other Asian background)	3 (19%)	1 (4%)	4 (10%)
	Black/African/Caribbean/Black British (African, Caribbean, Any other Black/African/Caribbean background)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	2 (5%)
	Other Ethnic Group (Arab, Any other ethnic group)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	2 (5%)
	Prefer not to answer	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
	Missing	1 (6%)	4 (15%)	5 (12%)
Region of Work or Care Access	East of England	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	London	8 (50%)	3 (12%)	11 (27%)
	Midlands	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1 (2%)
	North East and Yorkshire	2 (13%)	8 (31%)	10 (24%)
	North West	0 (0%)	3 (12%)	3 (7%)
	South East	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	2 (5%)

	South West	2 (13%)	2 (8%)	4 (10%)
	Prefer not to answer	2 (13%)	4 (15%)	6 (15%)
	Missing*	1 (6%)	4 (15%)	5 (12%)

174 ^{Four} interview participants and one focus group participant did not return the demographic questionnaire
175 and are indicated as “Missing” in the table below.

176 Patient Safety Risks Associated with Virtual Primary Care

177 Both patients and GPs indicated that there were a variety of technologies used in the delivery of virtual
178 primary care, including telephone, video, email, chats, mobile apps, and online forms. Three main
179 themes with relevant sub-themes were developed to describe potential patient safety risks associated
180 with the use of virtual primary care.

181 a. Suboptimal Clinical Decision Making

182 Suboptimal clinical decision-making may be a result of limited or misinterpreted patient-provided
183 information, lack of formal guidance, or more defensive clinical practice.

184

185 Limited or misinterpreted patient provided information

186 Participants noted the significantly greater need to rely on patient-provided information in virtual care
187 environments, which may be inadequate for a comprehensive and accurate clinical assessment, given
188 the patient’s limited knowledge about which signs are relevant to report. Patients voiced concerns
189 about their ability to assess and report on their signs, particularly related to clinical characteristics
190 perceived as ‘subjective’ (i.e., swelling, redness). Participants also noted that those with mental health
191 conditions may minimise the severity of their symptoms; there were concerns about worsening mental
192 health conditions if a provider is not able to detect subtle signs associated with mental health
193 challenges.

194

195 Lack of formal guidance

196 The lack of formal guidance was largely highlighted by providers, including concerns of not having
197 structured guidance for remote provision of care, or the need to improve the limited guidance available
198 on when and how to perform virtual consultation, and when should one escalate to in-person care.

199

200 Defensive medicine

201 Providers stated that there was an increased tendency to practise defensive medicine in virtual care. As
202 a result, providers employed strategies such as ordering additional tests, or changing prescribing
203 practices as mechanisms for risk mitigation, which in themselves introduce unnecessary risks for harm
204 (e.g., overprescribing antibiotics). Some healthcare workers described this as a way of minimising a
205 sense of uncertainty that came with not performing physical examinations in person. Some participants
206 highlighted positive adaptations to this uncertainty, including increased safety netting.

207 b. Negative Impact on Patients’ Access to Care

208 Participants identified a number of ways in which virtual care compromised access to care, in particular
209 for already disadvantaged groups.

210
211 **Delays in care**
212 Patients experienced a sense of feeling overwhelmed by having to complete complicated online booking
213 forms or feeling like they were inappropriately advised by a reception at the booking stage (*e.g.*,
214 inappropriate modality of appointment). Delays in care were often noted to be the result of serial,
215 stepwise escalations in care, until an eventual face-to-face appointment, which some providers referred
216 to as “delaying the inevitable”.

217
218 **Poor continuity**
219 Patients perceived minimal continuity with the same provider when receiving care virtually, which
220 contributed to inadequate monitoring practices. Participants highlighted that longitudinal records are
221 more difficult to compile through virtual care visits because many of the assessments providers would
222 conduct, such as gait assessments, are largely impossible virtually.

223
224 **Digital exclusion**
225 Many participants indicated that a significant safety risk when using virtual care technologies is digital
226 exclusion, which could be the result of the lack of access to the technology or stable, high-quality
227 internet, or inability to use the technology itself (*e.g.*, due to low digital literacy or visual/hearing
228 impairments). For some individuals, this could be further compounded by additional challenges such as
229 language barriers and reliance on translation by their informal carers, thus posing privacy issues,
230 especially for sensitive topics (*e.g.*, mental health).

231
232 **Patients’ use of alternative routes/services to access health care**
233 Patients who are unable to access virtual care may be more likely to ignore the health condition until
234 severe deterioration occurred; others noted that some patients will access healthcare in other ways,
235 such as via Accident & Emergency (A&E) services.

236 **c. Worsening the Workforce Crisis**

237 Participants indicated that the use of virtual care may worsen the existing workforce crisis, particularly
238 via digital fatigue and decreased worker satisfaction.

239
240 **Digital fatigue**
241 The inclusion of virtual care in practice was perceived by providers as ‘another thing to monitor’, a
242 concern that was exacerbated by their past experience with digital systems that did not support the
243 coordination of information they expected.

244
245 **Decreased worker satisfaction**
246 The introduction of virtual care has, in some ways, decreased satisfaction with the professional,
247 according to provider participants. Some noted that offering virtual care has given the impression that
248 providers are not keen to provide care for patients; they felt this was damaging to their morale.
249 Similarly, providers were sometimes dissatisfied, or did not find value in the tasks associated with the
250 provision of virtual care.

251
252 **Textbox 1: Patient Safety Risks Associated with Virtual Primary Care**

Theme 1. Suboptimal Clinical Decision-Making

Subtheme 1.1.1: Limited or misinterpreted patient provided information

- “I had to try and explain what my foot was looking like on one issue, which is why in the end I had to go and see the consultant. And actually, it was very difficult. And he was saying, Well, how swollen is it? And I was looking at it thinking I don't know if it's very swollen or minimally swollen...In my mind it's very swollen, but is it? It would have been much, much easier by video to have been able to actually show it... [FG1 P4]
- “A couple of my friends with severe mental health problems will minimise everything and not explain stuff properly and if the healthcare professional isn't able to pick up on any non-verbal cues then they don't delve and they just say, okay, you're saying you're fine.” [I13]
- “I would still be rather hesitant in fully trusting that they understand what my symptoms are and that they're giving me the right advice. Because most of the advice would be based on what I'm telling them and I'm not a clinician.” [I15]

Subtheme 1.1.2: Lack of formal guidance

- “We're operating without any direction as to 'this is safe' or 'this is correct or not'. We're just using our core clinical judgement.” [FG1 P5]
- “There are divergent views within my practice as to the threshold as to what requires a face-to-face consultation and what can be done remotely...I'm not aware of any formal guidance” [I25]

Subtheme 1.1.3: Defensive medicine

- “There is a sort of issue that GPs might like to practise defensive medicine [and] issue prescriptions inappropriately, because they don't know the severity of it” [FG3 P4]
- “I think you have to have a lower threshold, to sending [patients] to hospital. Probably more threshold than you would when you actually see them face-to-face.” [I9]

Theme 2. Negative Impact on Patients' Access to Care

Subtheme 1.2.1: Delays in care

- “I've noticed that [it] is difficult if you don't get much information from a patient...then you do a telephone consultation. And then say, Well, we need a video consultation, and then a video consultation, and then a face-to-face. So one of the challenges is not getting enough information in the first point of contact because then it delays things.” [FG1 P5]
- “...[I am often] astonished when you're told it's a two week wait, and what you're requesting is some urgent medication or referrals of a post-operative care...” [FG1 P4]

Subtheme 1.2.2: Poor continuity

- “I was getting loads of treatment, but nothing that worked until my fifth consultation, which ended up as a visit and then it was solved like that...I felt because it was phone calls, and I was constantly speaking to different people, I felt like a nuisance. So it was really something that could have been solved in one 10-minute visit that took three weeks...You should be able to say, I saw Doctor X; I need to speak to Doctor X again rather than have to go through the whole thing again with Doctor C. So again, it's continuity and having that point of contact.” [I28]
- “The other difficulty [in virtual care] is getting to speak or to see the same doctor more than once. And that I think is a major, major problem in large practices. You get

a lot from a patient by seeing them at different intervals and seeing what's changed over a long period of time...And on the phone, you get absolutely nothing of that and by seeing a different doctor, every time you get nothing of that either." [FG3 P1]

Subtheme 1.2.3: Digital exclusion

- "In the Northeast, we have the lowest rate of computers that people have access to in their own homes...My concern is that the discrepancy between those who can afford broadband, and who can afford to have access to a laptop, iPad, whatever, at home, is going to get wider; it's not narrowing." [FG1 P4]
- "So, not always, but certain elderly people that either don't know how to use their device or having problems with hearing, or people that have dementia for example and are trying to have a consultation remotely, even if there's another person present, is even more challenging than it is in person." [I2]
- "Minority populations where women may not speak the language...And so, access to a GP or medical help is through, you know, family members, sometimes the husband or other family members. I felt uncomfortable before, where I wasn't sure if I was getting all the information." [I9]

Subtheme 1.2.4: Patients' use of alternative routes/services to access health care

- "So what I envisaged that the safety problems have been is that people ended up going to A&E or calling 111, and that delays the process of being seen." [FG2 P5]
- "They fear that this is just a back door way of saying yes we are doing healthcare, but they don't really care about me as an individual until I'm on my deathbed. And I say that because again and again, I'm hearing one thing and one thing only, that I cannot get an appointment to go and see a GP. So, most people have now effectively switched off and they're not even trying to get a GP appointment. They try to paddle along on a daily basis until their health deteriorates so much that they have to call an ambulance or they end up going into A&E and then they're hospitalised." [I15]

Theme 3. Worsening the Workforce Crisis

Subtheme 1.3.1: Digital fatigue

- "It's just another route from which patients can consult and contact the practice and already we're having to manage emails and manage our kind of record system with tasks and notes coming through that or getting messages now through our text messaging service and photos as well through that. Getting letters. You know, we're getting all sorts of things in lots of different directions and it just is overwhelming" [I25]
- "The problem with all these tools and everything like that, is it actually it just adds more work (...) at the moment, when I go in, I have to monitor emails, tasks, e-consultation messages, instant messages. (...) So there are lots of modalities of accessing the GP, you get messages all over from, and then you get someone phoning up. (...) So another tool or another platform, another password, no thank you." [I4]

Subtheme 1.3.2: Decreased worker satisfaction

- "I personally think it's done harm to the image of General Practice. Because people feel they are being fobbed off because doctors won't see them. You only have to read the comments (...) saying 'GPs are lazy', 'don't see patients', 'tell everyone to go to A&E', 'why don't they see patients anymore?'. And part of that is because the work is hidden away now because you're like a call centre." [I4]

- “Sometimes I think when you're doing a lot of remote triage, this is not what I thought that my role would be. You know, like, when I imagined myself as a doctor, I didn't really think I was going to be spending so much time on the phone. So it's like almost, I dare say, professional identity crisis, but it is very different from what I thought I would be doing.” [19]

253


254 Strategies to Mitigate Patient Safety Risks in Virtual Primary Care

255 Despite the number of risks identified by both patients and providers, both groups put forth both
256 overlapping and mutually exclusive suggestions for improvement. An overview of these potential
257 solutions is provided in **Figure 1**.

258

259

Figure 1: Overview of strategies identified by patients and providers



260

261

262 Both patients and providers noted that there is value in equipping the patient with information before a
263 virtual appointment, to better direct patients to the appropriate service. Participants indicated that the
264 NHS website itself may be best suited as the venue for this information, with the caveat that it be
265 redesigned for improved user experience. Providers perceived value in equipping patients with ways to
266 ‘collect’ information needed for an effective clinical assessment (e.g., digital) but emphasised the
267 importance of patient education in this context. Both providers and patients emphasised the role of
268 receptionists and triage personnel in acquiring important information before the appointment to inform
269 the choice of the appropriate modality of consultation, often citing the importance of training to do so.

270

271 Technology challenges during virtual care were described as burdensome and distracting. Participants
272 recognised the importance of establishing ‘backup plans’ for instances in which the connection was lost.
273 Improved technological support was prioritised, with participants citing the need for readily available IT
274 expertise to troubleshoot the issue. With a significant, but not exclusive, emphasis on the virtual care
275 technology, participants described the importance of systems for feedback to developers about the
276 virtual care experience. Participants indicated that visible responsiveness to feedback and regular

277 updates on changes in technologies would likely increase their willingness to use the platforms for
278 virtual care delivery.

279
280 Improved continuity of care was deemed important by participants and its recommended
281 operationalisation took a number of forms. One participant highlighted the increased importance of
282 (and burden on) caregivers in maintaining continuity of care in the virtual environment, particularly
283 when escalating from virtual to in-person care.

284
285 A cross-cutting theme across each step of the virtual care journey was the importance of reassurance
286 and communication with patients. The onus was placed on the providers to ensure their communication
287 was not perceived as transactional and that the relational needs of patients were still met
288 virtually. Participants illustrated examples of mutual agreements between the patient and provider
289 around what to monitor after the virtual appointment and what to do if concerned; this form of virtual
290 care safety netting provided participants with a sense of confidence in the next steps. One participant
291 mentioned the utility of reassuring patients that the information they were receiving was from a
292 validated source.

293 Altogether, participants suggested that these strategies can collectively contribute to reducing existing
294 inequities in accessing primary care.

295

296 **Textbox 2: Strategies to Mitigate Patient Safety Risks in Virtual Primary Care**

Theme 2.1: Information for patients before the appointment

- “I just sent them a link sometimes about what to expect and how to prepare for the video, like use good lighting, find a quiet room, so there are no distractions...Having a very clear agenda beforehand about what the video consultation is going to be about is really useful. And it might help you to plan how you're going to manage the situation because if they've got multiple problems, it may have just been quicker just to bring them in for a face-to-face from the start.” [I3]
- “[The website] may even help them think whether the service that they're coming into is the correct one for them. So say they had features of cauda equina syndrome, they should probably be in A&E.” [I3]
- “There needs to be... some kind of facilities to complement the video consultation. One of the key things we found when we tried to do that was doing it in real-time is not very efficient. So trying to get someone to use a digital stethoscope for the first time, once you're in the middle of a video consultation is not good.” [I3]

Theme 2.2: Training and support for triage personnel

- “If the receptionists are well trained, they can signpost quite well as to whether this needs to go immediately to a more urgent treatment centre or whether they'll be able to wait for a telephone call later that day.” [FG1 P1]
- “I would like there to be a robust system for the screening. So instead of having the initial call with a receptionist, and you have it with the dedicated healthcare assistant or a nurse, because then if they can filter you to where you're supposed to be going...Because if you go through, say a receptionist because they're not medically trained, then you might just be actually

duplicating work and wasting time” [FG3 P2]

Theme 2.3: Making tech support available

- “Who to step things up to when there’s a problem. So, if there’s a technical problem, is there a person that I can then reach out to if there’s some other safeguarding or whatever other issue, where do I go with that?” [I2]
- “The idea of an IT-type person, an IT or digital person at the practice, would probably be good. Someone that is physically there that you can go to when you’re having some kind of issue and that they’re specifically trained on that system and with those issues to help you.” [I2]
- “Laying out [the next steps if there's a problem], for example, if something does go wrong, and there's a loss of connection” [I27]

Theme 2.4: Standardised guidelines around when to escalate from virtual to in person care

- “Just to be more aware of this threshold when you're worried that a patient needs to be seen or, or in hospital...I guess if you go through examples in training, for example, that helps a little bit” [I9]
- “ I think not having an obvious place to access those guidelines and referral requirements really slows down patient care. And you often don’t find out about it until a couple of weeks down the line when your referral is returned, or the triage summary is sent back to you with this, that and the other. So that would be really helpful if we had a clear access to ... really local guidelines, not national guidelines.” [I24]
- “It'd be useful to have things like scoring systems for remote care, such as the fever pain scores, for when ...you can't examine the tonsils...Would be really helpful to give us that reassurance that okay, am I doing the right thing or not because there is so much uncertainty.” [FG1 P5]

Theme 2.5: Setting up systems for responsiveness to end-user feedback

- “Depending on who’s made the program, they might feel that it’s an intuitive thing, but I don’t think it always is, and I’d like to see some feedback going back the other way when things aren’t working...They have a feedback form, where you can say what’s going on and then visibly within a couple of months you see that something is happening, and they keep you updated on the changes.” [I2]
- “Checking in with people, do you feel comfortable, do you like the system, don’t you like the system, why don’t you like the system, both from the staff side and the patient side, because if people don’t like using something, they’re not going to use it, or they’re not going to use it well and that could also possibly cause patient safety issues.” [I2]
- “We need to get that trust...Don’t expect the communities to come to you. We need to go out there into the communities, need to try to understand the challenges that these communities are experiencing on a daily basis. Whether it’s to do with simple, basic healthcare needs or whether it is about literacy of healthcare needs.” [I15]

Theme 2.6: Improved continuity of care and safety netting

- “Sort of guidance for carers in that sort of instance. You know, this is what you should be looking out for. Please get in touch if this is the case or if this isn’t the case then have to do that.” [I25]

- “It can be a bit ad hoc as to which ones are sent...It'd be really nice if there was a suite of resources there of safety netting materials that were really high quality.” [I3]
- “Do you feel you would benefit from seeing me face-to-face or are you happy with what I've suggested to try out for a couple of weeks and if it doesn't work out then you come back and see me. So all those kinds of reassurances I think would be good to finish off.” [I12]
- “I suppose maybe like some sort of a feedback survey... It's almost like that flowchart sort of system working, Is your condition more under control? If you said “no”, then you'd automatically be prompted then to rebook in... So...no one's falling behind.” [I17]

Theme 2.7: Better communication and patient reassurance

- “It's giving them that level of confidence, engaging with them, understanding the routes, and then giving them reassurance that actually it is the human being who will be interacting with, you're not talking to the computer.” [I15]
- “I don't think most GPs change their communication skills significantly even though it is a different format or if they do it's just more closed questions and closed questions can lead to a transactional approach. So, training on how to get that relational care through remote consulting would be useful.” [I25]

297

298

299 [Discussion](#)

300 [Summary of Key Findings](#)

301 Three main areas for patient safety risks associated with virtual primary care were identified, including
302 suboptimal clinical decision-making, negative impact on patients' access to care, and worsening the
303 workforce crisis. Strategies to mitigate these risks included providing information for patients, training
304 triage personnel, making technical support available, standardising guidelines, setting up systems for
305 feedback, improving continuity of care, communication, and safety netting.

306

307 [Findings as Compared with Previous Studies](#)

308 The challenges of obtaining meaningful patient information and conducting accurate virtual assessments
309 are congruent with previous literature. A systematic review by Ftouni et al., reported concerns of
310 compromised physical assessment capabilities in the virtual care setting (16), and additional evidence
311 suggests practitioners experience more uncertainty in virtual clinical decisions due to the compromised
312 ability to conduct a reliable clinical assessment (7, 17). This study supports these findings and adds that
313 there is an increased demand placed on the patients to take on the role as a 'supplier' of the
314 information needed for clinical decision-making.

315

316 In addition to the challenges of conducting a clinical assessment in virtual care, there is also a unique
317 barrier to establishing a holistic understanding of the patient's health and well-being due to the
318 compromised ability to perceive non-verbal cues. Previous studies have suggested that providers
319 perceive virtual care consultations to be less information-dense for these reasons (7, 18). Our study
320 largely corroborates these findings and highlights how other pre-existing in-person challenges (e.g.,
321 language barriers) can be further exacerbated.

322

323 Our findings corroborate unique virtual care access challenges based on a range of disadvantages, such
324 as older age or access to technologies. Even before the marked increase in the use of virtual care

325 technologies, lack of access to care has been a significant contributor to the underutilisation of
326 preventive services and therefore poorer outcomes (21). Though some of these barriers have been
327 attenuated with the introduction of virtual care (22), virtual care has introduced another layer of care
328 access challenges that particularly impact communities that are often already disadvantaged. Previous
329 research exploring the virtual care access challenges has found that increased use of virtual care
330 consultations may exacerbate the digital divide for vulnerable patients (23-25).

331
332 In line with the findings of this work, previous literature has also highlighted that virtual care can
333 decrease provider job satisfaction (7). Specifically, both patients and providers have cited concerns of
334 the worsened providers' work-life balance with increased use of virtual care (26).

335 336 **Strengths, Limitations, and Future Research**

337 This study used a topic guide developed based on existing literature and findings about remote care
338 from earlier studies undertaken by our research group, and engaged both practitioners and patients,
339 stimulating particularly rich discussions. The subsequent analyses were performed by two independent
340 researchers with backgrounds in clinical medicine, public health, and patient safety, in consultation with
341 other senior researchers with further expertise in qualitative research methods. The focus groups were
342 conducted online which helped to maximise its accessibility to interested participants located all across
343 the UK.

344 Nonetheless, some limitations need to be acknowledged. While our study was focused on the usage of
345 virtual care tools in primary care as a whole, what this meant for participants varied greatly. The broad
346 definition used during the focus groups and interviews limited our ability to form a deeper
347 understanding of and recommendations for specific forms of virtual care technologies. However, this
348 could have been potentially offset by the fact that the diverse range of views captured simply reflected
349 the myriad of virtual care tools currently in use across the NHS. Though patients were recruited from
350 diverse sources using a variety of different approaches, recruitment was limited to the external
351 platforms accessible to the research team; hence, some groups may have been missed (*e.g.*, those not
352 engaged with online patient communities). Despite prioritising diversity in our recruitment, the majority
353 of the participants were white females. Thus, our study might not have sufficiently captured the
354 experiences of practitioners or patients from ethnic minority backgrounds.

355
356 It is important to note that this study examined subjective perceptions. Though these findings are
357 important in exploratory, in-depth research, it is imperative to expand on these qualitative findings with
358 additional objective measures of patient safety to understand if, how and to what extent the perceived
359 safety risks come to fruition in virtual care settings.

360
361 As illustrated in this study, the safe use of virtual care is contingent on patients' availability of the
362 necessary technology, their knowledge of how to use technology to meaningfully engage, and their
363 perceptions of privacy. Further research is needed on how to minimise the digital divide and
364 acknowledge unique nuances for different populations. This may include follow-up studies focusing on
365 individuals with language barriers, lack of stable addresses, low digital skills, or complex needs.

366 367 368 **Implications for Policy and Practice**

369 Both patients and providers experienced uncertainty around when the use of virtual care is or is not
370 suitable, highlighting the need for clear guidance and policies to minimise uncertainty in triaging for

371 virtual care delivery. Policies that promote greater collaboration between virtual care and face-to-face
372 settings can encourage a holistic representation of a patient's journey and enhance their overall
373 experience when seeking care in the health system. For example, if an influx of patients with respiratory
374 symptoms is anticipated for flu season during the autumn months, it would likely be useful to develop
375 standardised guidance clearly delineating how patients should access care from virtual care and in-
376 person consultations, while maintaining flexibility for adaptation to ongoing and unforeseen safety
377 challenges (28).

378
379 Addressing the perception surrounding the supposed 'inferiority' of virtual consultations would likewise
380 need to be multifaceted. This may range from indirect measures such as improving how novel
381 technologies are systematically implemented into clinical settings, supporting more robust technical
382 support, and providing a robust evaluation of the impact of the different modalities on the quality of
383 care delivered. Introducing better guidance on how to standardise the safety netting discussions at the
384 end of virtual care appointments can also contribute to mitigating some of the perceptions that virtual
385 consultations are 'inferior to' in-person consultations.

386
387 Given that providers cited significant challenges and frustrations with using subpar technologies for
388 virtual care visits, standards for a thorough evaluation of any new technology should be applied to
389 ensure the technology, if adopted, is congruent with the existing clinical workflows. Continuous
390 communication between virtual care technology developers and end users is crucial to ensure end-user
391 satisfaction. A continuous feedback loop between end-users and developers can provide real-world
392 insights, ensuring that it reflects the end-users' needs and preferences.

393
394

395 **Conclusion**

396 The uptick in the use of virtual care delivery during the COVID-19 pandemic has demonstrated the
397 complex and often intertwined relationships between patient safety risks, benefits, challenges, and
398 potential strategies. The pandemic has expedited the use of these technologies and made apparent the
399 need for improved and better-coordinated guidance surrounding their use. Our study has highlighted
400 that patients and providers now have a heightened awareness of the strengths and pitfalls of virtual
401 care delivery, due to their increased familiarity with the use of virtual care technologies. Given the
402 greater clarity around how this technology can support care delivery, existing policies need to be
403 updated and new policies need to be devised to minimise risks associated with virtual care and support
404 patient and provider workflows.

405

406 **Declarations**

407 **Consent for Publication**

408 All participants provided written informed consent for anonymised quotes from their interviews
409 to be used in the publication of this study.

410 **Availability of Data and Materials**

411 Data is available upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

412 **Appendices**

413

414 **Appendix 1** – Focus group topic guide.

415

416 **Appendix 2** – Semi-structured interview topic guide.

417

418 **Appendix 3** – Study participant consent form.

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430 **References**

431

432 1. Kahn JM. Virtual visits--confronting the challenges of telemedicine. *N Engl J Med.*

433 2015;372(18):1684-5.

434 2. Snoswell CL, Taylor ML, Comans TA, Smith AC, Gray LC, Caffery LJ. Determining if Telehealth Can
435 Reduce Health System Costs: Scoping Review. *J Med Internet Res.* 2020;22(10):e17298.

436 3. Hughes L, Petrella A, Phillips N, Taylor RM. Virtual care and the impact of COVID-19 on nursing:
437 A single centre evaluation. *J Adv Nurs.* 2022;78(2):498-509.

438 4. Mold F, Cooke D, Ip A, Roy P, Denton S, Armes J. COVID-19 and beyond: virtual consultations in
439 primary care-reflecting on the evidence base for implementation and ensuring reach: commentary
440 article. *BMJ Health Care Inform.* 2021;28(1).

441 5. Neves AL, van Dael J, O'Brien N, Flott K, Ghafur S, Darzi A, et al. Use and impact of virtual
442 primary care on quality and safety: The public's perspectives during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Telemed
443 Telecare.* 2021:1357633x211066235.

444 6. Green MA, McKee M, Katikireddi SV. Remote general practitioner consultations during COVID-
445 19. *Lancet Digit Health.* 2022;4(1):e7.

446 7. Li E, Tsopra R, Jimenez G, Serafini A, Gusso G, Lingner H, et al. General practitioners' perceptions
447 of using virtual primary care during the COVID-19 pandemic: An international cross-sectional survey
448 study. *PLOS Digit Health.* 2022;1(5):e0000029.

449 8. Smith C, Kubanova B, Ahmed F, Manickavasagam J. The Effectiveness of Remote Consultations
450 During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Tool for Modernising the National Health Service (NHS). *Cureus.*
451 2022;14(12):e32301.

452 9. Bhatia RS, Chu C, Pang A, Tadrous M, Stamenova V, Cram P. Virtual care use before and during
453 the COVID-19 pandemic: a repeated cross-sectional study. *CMAJ Open.* 2021;9(1):E107-e14.

454 10. Gosse PJ, Kassardjian CD, Masellis M, Mitchell SB. Virtual care for patients with Alzheimer's
455 disease and related dementias during the COVID-19 era and beyond. *Cmaj.* 2021;193(11):E371-e7.

456 11. Lillcrap L, Hunter C, Goldswain P. Improving geriatric care and reducing hospitalisations in
457 regional and remote areas: The benefits of telehealth. *J Telemed Telecare.* 2021;27(7):397-408.

458 12. Anderson J, Walsh J, Anderson M, Burnley R. Patient Satisfaction With Remote Consultations in
459 a Primary Care Setting. *Cureus.* 2021;13(9):e17814.

- 460 13. Schutz S, Walthall H, Snowball J, Vagner R, Fernandez N, Bartram E, et al. Patient and clinician
461 experiences of remote consultation during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic: A service evaluation. *Digit Health*.
462 2022;8:20552076221115022.
- 463 14. Carman KL, Dardess P, Maurer M, Sofaer S, Adams K, Bechtel C, et al. Patient and family
464 engagement: a framework for understanding the elements and developing interventions and policies.
465 *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2013;32(2):223-31.
- 466 15. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*.
467 2006;3(2):77-101.
- 468 16. Ftouni R, AlJardali B, Hamdanieh M, Ftouni L, Salem N. Challenges of Telemedicine during the
469 COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2022;22(1):207.
- 470 17. Björndell C, Premberg Å. Physicians' experiences of video consultation with patients at a public
471 virtual primary care clinic: a qualitative interview study. *Scand J Prim Health Care*. 2021;39(1):67-76.
- 472 18. Akintomide E, Shah B, Sridharan S, Visram S, Sebire NJ, Peters C. Clinical perception of
473 effectiveness of virtual appointments and comparison with appointment outcomes at a specialist
474 children's hospital. *Future Healthc J*. 2021;8(3):e660-e5.
- 475 19. (ONS) OfNS. Language, England and Wales: Census 2021 2022 [
- 476 20. Braithwaite J, Wears RL, Hollnagel E. Resilient health care, volume 3: reconciling work-as-
477 imagined and work-as-done: CRC Press; 2016.
- 478 21. Barlow P, Mohan G, Nolan A, Lyons S. Area-level deprivation and geographic factors influencing
479 utilisation of General Practitioner services. *SSM Popul Health*. 2021;15:100870.
- 480 22. Mohammed HT, Hyseni L, Bui V, Gerritsen B, Fuller K, Sung J, et al. Exploring the use and
481 challenges of implementing virtual visits during COVID-19 in primary care and lessons for sustained use.
482 *PLoS One*. 2021;16(6):e0253665.
- 483 23. Sachs JW, Graven P, Gold JA, Kassakian SZ. Disparities in telephone and video telehealth
484 engagement during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMIA Open*. 2021;4(3):ooab056.
- 485 24. Mistry SK, Shaw M, Raffan F, Johnson G, Perren K, Shoko S, et al. Inequity in Access and Delivery
486 of Virtual Care Interventions: A Scoping Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022;19(15).
- 487 25. Saeed SA, Masters RM. Disparities in Health Care and the Digital Divide. *Curr Psychiatry Rep*.
488 2021;23(9):61.
- 489 26. Burton L, Rush KL, Smith MA, Davis S, Rodriguez Echeverria P, Suazo Hidalgo L, et al.
490 Empowering Patients Through Virtual Care Delivery: Qualitative Study With Micropractice Clinic Patients
491 and Health Care Providers. *JMIR Form Res*. 2022;6(4):e32528.
- 492 27. O'Riordan M, Dahinden A, Aktürk Z, Ortiz JM, Dağdeviren N, Elwyn G, et al. Dealing with
493 uncertainty in general practice: an essential skill for the general practitioner. *Qual Prim Care*.
494 2011;19(3):175-81.
- 495 28. Anderson JE, Ross AJ, Macrae C, Wiig S. Defining adaptive capacity in healthcare: A new
496 framework for researching resilient performance. *Appl Ergon*. 2020;87:103111.
- 497
498